

membership is made up of 12 persons—5 appointed by the White House, and 7 serving ex officio due to legislative or governmental positions.

In December of last year, Commission members disapproved the Langley site by a vote of 6 to 5. Soon after, two governmental employees serving on the Commission were replaced by two other individuals. One of those replaced was Fred S. Poorman, Deputy Public Buildings Administrator, who had abstained from voting. The other was Leon Zach, representing the Chief of Engineers. Mr. Zach had voted against Langley.

By a strange coincidence, immediately after these men were replaced, CIA requested a reconsideration of its proposal to relocate at Langley. At the next meeting of the Planning Commission, when the reconsideration took place, the two new men supported the site. Those were the only two votes that changed. The Commission was put on record as approving the site, by a vote of 7 to 5.

You can find these facts documented in the printed record of hearings held June 1 before the House Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, in connection with CIA's request for additional appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you will agree that the entire manner in which CIA's relocation request has been handled, points up the urgent need for an air-tight procedure free of politics and personal whims.

Fortunately, responsible leaders in Washington are already alerted to this need. The alarm was sounded months ago by the Federal City Council, when it spearheaded a factfinding drive to develop better relocation procedure. In June the District Bankers Association added its support to this campaign by adopting a resolution expressing "deep concern" over present relocation methods, and pledging "unstinting cooperation until a logical and orderly procedure for Federal agency relocation is finally secured."

Both of the city's planning agencies have launched studies with a view to coming up with specific recommendations for improved relocation procedure.

RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

However, we cannot shirk the fact that prime responsibility for study and adoption of a better procedure rests with Congress. In Washington, as the editors

of U. S. News & World Report have observed:

All fingers point to Congress. All the big decisions on affairs of the District of Columbia have to be made by District committees of the Senate and House, followed by action on the floor—just like any national law.

It was in recognition of our responsibilities in connection with Federal agency dispersal that I introduced House Joint Resolution 690 on July 17. This joint resolution sets forth Congress intent to preserve the District of Columbia as the seat of government as provided in article I of the Constitution. It calls for establishment of a basic policy for location of new Federal buildings as one means of implementing this intent.

Under the resolution, no funds appropriated before or after the date of its enactment shall be obligated or spent for construction of any building space for any agency of the Federal Government at any location outside the District of Columbia, but within 20 miles of the zero milestone, without express approval of Congress with respect to the proposed site for such construction.

By immediately adopting this resolution Congress can establish a policy and formally recognize its own decisive authority on relocation. I hope this will be done before the current session ends.

NEED FOR STUDY

However, I believe this resolution should be followed by a full-fledged study of present relocation methods, with a view to presenting specific recommendations to the next session of Congress. These proposals would outline further improvements which should be made in methods of relocating Federal agencies.

This study should take due cognizance of the new plan developed by General Services Administration for location of public buildings within the District and its environs. In accordance with GSA's proposed program, the National Capital Planning Commission is currently working to establish a floor for Federal employment in Washington—a minimum level below which population should not be depleted by Federal relocation.

The study which I am now proposing would go beyond these efforts with specific recommendations designed to:

First. Establish a standard operating procedure on relocation with adequate authority to see it is followed.

Second. Guarantee that planning agencies have sufficient time to study civic and economic effects of each proposed move.

Third. Insure that all agency officials are fully informed on relocation procedure.

Fourth. Give widest possible publicity to issues and problems involved in each agency relocation.

I hope this study will be launched before the current session ends. Until it is, the all-important matter of relocation of Federal agencies—to which the very future of our Nation's Capital is tied so closely—will continue to be decided on a basis of politics and personal whim, rather than on sound engineering and economic principles, as these relate to preservation of the Capital City.

In conclusion I would like to read the text of my House Joint Resolution 690:

Joint resolution to preserve the economic basis of the Nation's Capital by establishing a basic policy and an orderly procedure for the location of new Federal buildings in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia

Whereas Congress finds that there is a growing tendency on the part of Federal agencies to seek new locations in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, considering only the desires of the particular agency and without regard to the interests of the Government as a whole or the cumulative effect which such moves will have on the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it is the intention of the Congress to preserve the District of Columbia as the seat of Government as provided in article I of the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That it is declared to be the policy of the Congress that the development of the National Capital region shall be based upon the general concept that the District of Columbia shall be the seat of Government and that agencies which can be accommodated in the District of Columbia should be located there.

Sec. 2. All those responsible for the planning or construction of building space to accommodate agencies of the Federal Government within the greater metropolitan area of Washington shall be guided by the policy stated in the first section of this joint resolution.

Sec. 3. No funds appropriated before or after the date of enactment of this joint resolution shall be obligated or spent for the construction of any building space for any agency of the Federal Government at any location outside the District of Columbia, but within 20 miles of the zero milestone, without the express approval of the Congress with respect to the proposed site for such construction.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 20, 1956

(Legislative day of Monday, July 16, 1956)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 9:30 o'clock a. m., at the expiration of the recess.

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

Our Father God, who art the hope of all the ends of the earth and the light

of all our seeing, help us who grope in the darkness of earth's dim ways to remember that even the shadows themselves are born of light. Lift upon us the light of Thy countenance. Save us from the blighting company of those for whom humanity's wistful longings are but a target for sneers. Deliver us from political policies which are symptoms of spiritual disease. Give us courage and strength for the vast task of social rebuilding that needs to be dared if life for all men is to be made full and free.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., July 20, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EARLE C. CLEMENTS, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CLEMENTS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 19, 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 on July 19, 1956, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 146. An act for the relief of certain aliens;
S. 1622. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes;

S. 2704. An act to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 3246. An act to increase the amount authorized for the erection and equipment of suitable and adequate buildings and facilities for the use of the National Institute of Dental Research; and

S. 3982. An act to provide for the maintenance of production of tungsten, asbestos, fluor spar, and columbium-tantalum in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Masaji Marumoto, of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii, vice Phillip L. Rice, elevated;

Roger G. Connor, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for the district of Alaska, division No. 1, vice Theodore E. Munson, resigned; and

Ralph W. Gray, of Massachusetts, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts, vice Robert H. Beaudreau, resigned.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Morocco;

Christian M. Ravndal, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ecuador;

Walter K. Scott, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director for Management of the International Cooperation, in the Department of State; and

Edward Poor Montgomery, of the District of Columbia, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign and Diplomatic Service.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as in legislative session there may be the usual morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine business, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS (S. Doc. No. 143)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations and other authorizations for the fiscal year 1957, for various departments and agencies of the executive branch totaling \$350,565,038, and for the government of the District of Columbia in the amount of \$10,000 payable from District of Columbia funds (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AUDIT REPORT ON NAVY INDUSTRIAL FUND, UNITED STATES NAVAL POWDER FACTORY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Navy Industrial Fund, United States Naval Powder Factory, Bureau of Ordnance, Department of the Navy, for the period October 1, 1953, to June 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RESOLUTIONS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present, for appropriate reference, resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp depicting the Adams National Historic Site.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and, under the rule, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp depicting the Adams National Historic Site

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the Postmaster General of the United States to issue a special commemorative postage stamp depicting the Adams National Historic Site in honor of John Adams and his son, John Quincy Adams, former Presidents of the United States from Massachusetts; and be it further

Resolved, That the house of representatives urges upon the Congress the importance of keeping alive the memory of two such distinguished citizens from Massachusetts who fought so courageously for the freedom and

rights enjoyed by our citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

OVERTIME PAY TO CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES ON EMERGENCY FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by Local Union 762, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Quincy, Mass., relating to overtime pay to civilian employees for work on emergency flood control projects. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS

AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,

LOCAL UNION NO. 762,

Quincy, Mass., June 12, 1956.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: Recalling the unprecedented damage caused by the northeast floods in 1955, the 58th annual convention of the Massachusetts State Council of Carpenters adopted the following resolution:

"RESOLUTION NO. 4—ARMY ENGINEERS

"Whereas the New England division of the Army Engineers Corps is responsible for all construction for the Air Command for the Army, and for carrying out specific acts of Congress in the field of navigation, flood control, shore protection and allied matters; and

"Whereas because of the flood of 1955 at literally a minute's notice, the entire staff, military and civilian, augmented from Army engineers from all over the country did a tremendous job in supervising the various relief and emergency projects resulting from the floods; and

"Whereas said military and civilian members of the corps worked around the clock for days and days with little or no reimbursement for overtime because of military and civil service regulations applying to personnel in their status; and

"Whereas the Army engineers were handicapped in their efforts in the postflood work by ceiling of \$150,000 on each emergency project; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the State Council of Carpenters in convention assembled applauds the Army engineers for a job well done, and that the delegates and the local unions affiliated are urged to seek through proper channels in Washington a ceiling of \$500,000 on emergency projects and legislation to recompense more thoroughly the civilian employees for overtime work on such projects."

We the undersigned, all members of Local Union No. 762, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Quincy, Mass., believe the enactment of the resolution would be a vast help to similar projects in the future.

Thank you in advance for your help.

We wish you success in your numerous undertakings.

Sincerely,

William W. Vancovick, William L. Brown, John D. Gutio, Richard H. Schultz, Joseph L. Comis, John L. Gillis, Maurice A. Filch, Charles Weir, George C. Custer, Wm. Hancock, Richard H. Schutz, Harold Keith, John Tista, Wilfred Bleakley, Elmer J. Peterson, Sanley Dame, Henry Jellow, Albert N. Olson, William A. G. Andrew, Francis Lamb, Francis M. Clifford.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. J. Res. 174. Joint resolution providing for a study of the possibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas (Rept. No. 2671); and

H. Con. Res. 265. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China as the representatives of China in the United Nations (Rept. No. 2697).

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 3809. A bill to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery at Cedar Bluff Reservoir, Kans. (Rept. No. 2672).

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

H. R. 4635. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Robert T. C. Rasmussen, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions (Rept. No. 2673);

H. R. 8068. A bill for the relief of Elma Agnes Gibson Hollingsworth (Rept. No. 2674);

H. R. 9947. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Edward Wine (Rept. No. 2675); and

H. R. 10983. A bill for the relief of P. R. Cox (Rept. No. 2676).

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

S. 4200. A bill to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America (Rept. No. 2679).

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

H. R. 1420. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr. (Rept. No. 2677).

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

S. 4184. A bill to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America (Rept. No. 2678).

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

S. 3570. A bill to increase the number of visas authorized to be issued to eligible orphans under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2684).

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

H. R. 11489. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 2680).

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

S. 3783. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Navy or his designee to convey a 2,477.43-acre tract of land, aviation and sewer easements, in Tarrant and Wise Counties, Tex., situated about 20 miles northwest of the city of Fort Worth, Tex., to the State of Texas (Rept. No. 2683).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H. R. 5738. A bill to authorize flight instruction during Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2682).

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H. R. 5731. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, with dependents, to occupy inadequate quarters on a rental basis without loss of basic allowance for quarters (Rept. No. 2681).

By Mr. DWORSHAK, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 3957. A bill to amend the act authorizing the exchange and amendment of certain farm units in order to limit the time during which applications may be made under such act (Rept. No. 2685).

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

H. R. 11254. A bill to amend section 104, title 4, United States Code (Rept. No. 2695);

H. R. 11696. A bill to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians, Aleuts, or Eskimos in Alaska (Rept. No. 2696); and

H. J. Res. 643. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation of the need for a geophysical institute in the Territory of Hawaii (Rept. No. 2694).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 4228. A bill to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space (Rept. No. 2687);

H. R. 8265. A bill relating to the use of storage space in the Buford Reservoir for the purpose of providing Gwinnett County, Ga., a regulated water supply (Rept. No. 2689);

H. R. 8940. A bill relating to the use of storage space in the Hulah Reservoir to provide water for the city of Bartlesville, Okla. (Rept. No. 2688);

H. R. 10423. A bill to provide for the conveyance of 18.18 acres of land within the Garza-Little Elm project to the city of Lewisville, Tex., for sewage disposal purposes (Rept. No. 2690); and

H. R. 11861. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946 (Rept. No. 2691).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment:

S. 3445. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a building for the United States Court of Claims, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2692).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

H. R. 7596. A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2693).

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

S. 4247. A bill to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y. (Rept. No. 2699);

H. R. 11969. A bill to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce (Rept. No. 2700); and

S. J. Res. 197. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period from October 22, 1956, to October 27, 1956, as National Transportation Week (Rept. No. 2698).

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES—JOINT REPORT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION (S. REPT. NO. 2686)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I submit a joint report on the resolution (S.

Res. 281) relating to the relations of the Congress and the executive agencies in connection with water resources development, with amendments.

The resolution was referred jointly to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Committee on Public Works. Joint hearings were held at which representatives of the executive agencies and outside witnesses were heard. I submit the report for myself, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], may be added, at their request, as cosponsors.

The original sponsors, in addition to the senior Senator from New Mexico, are the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] who have been most helpful in the consideration of the resolution, as have also the four additional cosponsors, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. HRUSKA of Nebraska, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and Mr. NEUBERGER of Oregon.

When the resolution comes up for consideration, I shall request the opportunity to make a more extended statement setting forth my views on the need for and the desirability of the Senate going on record by adopting Senate Resolution 281.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. THYE:

S. 4251. A bill for the relief of Francis Choyuan Lin and his wife, Wong Su-I Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 4252. A bill for the relief of Harilaos Filippou Ikononou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 4253. A bill for the relief of Sul-an Fung and Shunung Wu Fung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 4254. A bill for the relief of William B. Plumer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 4255. A bill to amend section 403 of title IV of the National Housing Act affecting insurance of savings and loan accounts and to amend section 5 (1) of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, as amended, affecting Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 4256. A bill to authorize the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, United States Senator from the State of California, to accept and wear the award of the Cross of Grand Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix, tendered by the Government of the Kingdom of Greece.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 4257. A bill for the relief of Karl Schopko; and

S. 4258. A bill for the relief of Julia Shwinka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 4259. A bill for the relief of Harry G. Brown and Frances Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4260. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1936 (the Walsh-Healey Act); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 4261. A bill relating to applications under the homestead laws with respect to lands not considered by the Secretary of the Interior as suitable for cultivation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 4262. A bill to include, within the provisions of law providing punishment for killing or assaulting Federal officers on official duty, officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare engaged in enforcing the food and drug or public health laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

FOREIGN TRADE CARGO-FREIGHT RATE SCHEDULE FOR NEW ENGLAND AREA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators GREEN, BRIDGES, AIKEN, SALTONSTALL, FLANDERS, SMITH of Maine, PASTORE, BUSH, PURTELL, PAYNE, and COTTON, all New England Senators, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution which relates to the rail-rate structure in the New England area.

This concurrent resolution, in effect, calls for the discontinuation of the discrimination presently existing in the schedule of rail rates to and from New England. This would be accomplished by permitting the new schedule of rates proposed by 10 northeastern railroads serving the New England area to become effective. It should be noted that the railroads serving the southern Atlantic ports have attempted to preserve the existing differential between northern and southern rates by proposing a reduction in their own schedule. Although we in New England are anxious to have a more reasonable rate schedule, we do not believe that a rate war is the answer and hope that the ICC will take the entire matter under advisement and, on the basis of the information available, authorize rate schedules which are not

discriminatory against any section of the country.

New England has long been interested in the national transportation rate structure for those rates are one of the most important factors bearing upon the economic difficulties that have beset our region of the country. Because of the manufacturing and processing role played by New England and because of its relatively isolated geographic location, the question of rail rates is of even greater importance to us than to most other sections of the country.

Our particular concern at this time is the squeeze in which the North Atlantic ports find themselves as a result of two different pricing systems in operation. The advantage in ocean rates which the North Atlantic ports would normally enjoy because of their location, placing them many miles closer to the European and Canadian ports, is lost by virtue of the fact that ocean cargo rates have been equalized by shippers' conferences. At the same time, our existing rail rate structure, based as it is on the distance to be covered by the carrier, gives to the southern ports the benefit of their geographical location. I am sure that the inequity of this particular situation is obvious. Now that the New England railroads have undertaken to offset the unfair advantage which for many years has been enjoyed by the South Atlantic ports, we in New England want to give every kind of encouragement to those railroads and I believe that the Congress should make it perfectly clear that there should be no discrimination in the matter of transportation rates against any area of the United States.

It is not likely that the Congress will act upon this concurrent resolution prior to the close of this session. By submitting it, however, we want to direct the attention of Congress to this problem and to insure that the staff of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has the opportunity to inquire into the problem during the recess in order that action can be taken promptly at the beginning of the next session if, as we expect, the facts merit such congressional action.

I ask that the concurrent resolution be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 87) was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Whereas the 10 railroads serving the northeastern section of the United States have on June 8, 1956, filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission a new schedule of foreign trade cargo-rail freight rates which would equalize such rates among all the Atlantic coast ports of the United States; and

Whereas since 1935 the ocean freight rates charged for shipments between all Atlantic coast ports and each foreign port have been equalized, regardless of the actual distance traveled, by conferences of shippers acting under the laws of the United States; and

Whereas the amount of foreign trade cargo-rail freight handled by the northeastern ports of the United States has not kept pace with the increase in the amount of such freight experienced by other Atlantic coast ports; and

Whereas it is in the national interest that all of the ports on the Atlantic coast of the United States be treated fairly and be permitted to have an equal opportunity to handle foreign trade cargo-rail freight; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in its decision in *Interstate Commerce Commission v. New York Central Railroad Co.* (342 U. S. 890) has recognized and affirmed the principle that railroads serving ports in the northeastern part of the United States should be permitted to establish rail rates which are competitive with rates to ports in the Southern United States; and

Whereas it is appropriate for Congress to express its views regarding such rates designed to eliminate discrimination against certain ports in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the foreign trade cargo-rail freight rate schedule filed by the 10 railroads serving the northeastern section of the United States, which would eliminate the present discrimination in such rates against the ports in the northeastern section of the United States, is in accord with the national transportation policy as expressed in the Interstate Commerce Act, and should be allowed to become effective in accordance with the provisions of such act.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 83, 84TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, ENTITLED "CRITICAL MATERIALS"

Mr. MALONE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 318), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs 1,550 additional copies of Senate Document No. 83, 84th Congress, First Session, entitled "Critical Materials—Factors Affecting Self-Sufficiency Within Nations of the Western Hemisphere."

FRANCIS CHO-YUAN LIN AND HIS WIFE, WONG SU-I LIN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a private bill for the relief of Francis Cho-Yuan Lin and his wife, Wong Su-I Lin, who are now residing in Hong Kong, China.

I am introducing this bill because I am of the firm conviction that the services of Dr. Lin will be substantially beneficial to the national interest of the United States.

As you know, there is dire shortage of graduate, experienced scientists in this country. Dr. Lin received his doctor of philosophy degree in 1939 at the Pennsylvania State College with a major in chemistry, and subsequently pursued the study of ceramics. In 1946, he left the United States and set up a factory in Hong Kong for the Union Ceramics Industries Co., and has been the engineer and managing director of the company since that time.

The Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. in St. Paul, Minn., is very much in need of men with the technical

background of Dr. Lin for the invention, development and production of their products, which are being used extensively by the highway departments of every State in the United States and by the Federal Government in the manufacture of reflective traffic control devices. He will also be utilized in connection with other ceramic programs of Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., all of which will be beneficial to the national economy and interest of the United States.

The shortage of ceramic experts is presently very acute and is well recognized in Government circles. Therefore, in view of the strong petition made by the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. for the services of Dr. Lin, and because I believe it is not only in the interest of our great State of Minnesota, but in the national interest, I introduce this bill to provide for the entrance of Dr. Lin and his wife, notwithstanding the quota limitations of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

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

The bill (S. 4251) for the relief of Francis Cho-Yuan Lin and his wife, Wong Su-I Lin, introduced by Mr. Thyne, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING AND HOME OWNERS LOAN ACTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 403 of title IV of the National Housing Act affecting insurance of savings and loan accounts and to amend section 5 (i) of Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, as amended, affecting Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum, prepared by me, explaining the purpose of the bill.

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

The bill (S. 4255) to amend section 403 of title IV of the National Housing Act affecting insurance of savings and loan accounts and to amend section 5 (i) of Home Owners Loan Act of 1933, as amended, affecting Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The memorandum presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR MURRAY BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Considerable criticism and concern has been manifested during the past year toward conversion of federally chartered and State-chartered mutual savings and loan associations into permanent stock companies. The manner in which such conversions are consummated and alleged abuses attendant thereto is such that members of the sav-

ings and loan industry, as well as other informed persons and agencies, regard the trend as contrary to the best interests of the public and highly prejudicial to the public esteem now enjoyed by the savings and loan industry.

This criticism and concern has been voiced publicly and privately—in meetings and in the press of the banking and savings and loan industries—in statements and communications of responsible officials of two Federal agencies active in this field—and by public utterances of Members of the United States Senate who have spotlighted the developments in the strongest language, alluding to such conversions as "steals," "grabs" and "legalized larceny."

Some of the critics appear to regard the alleged abuses as accomplished fact. But at any rate if they are not susceptible of legal proof, the allegations surrounding conversions is of sufficient importance to be a matter of deep concern to members of the savings and loan industry. Their present high standing and the public confidence reposed in mutual savings and loan associations has been acquired only through years of dedication to public and community service, to maintenance of high business standards, and to enlightened cooperation with Federal and State legislatures and regulatory agencies.

HOW MAY THESE ABUSES OCCUR?

For an understanding of the allegations that are made with respect to conversion of mutual savings and loan associations into permanent stock type institutions, one must consider the nature of the organizations. In a mutual-type institution, every shareholder is a part owner and has a right to his pro rata share of the association's net worth, including its reserves, surplus and undivided profits. When a mutual association is dissolved, voluntarily or involuntarily, each shareholder is entitled to receive his pro rata share of that net worth. In times like these the value of associations is substantial; usually far in excess of the stated reserves, surplus and undivided profits. Their shareholders or depositors are necessarily dependent upon and must look to the management and directors of their associations to protect their interests and to assure the continued success of their associations. Such management and directors occupy positions of trust—their is a fiduciary relationship to the many mutual shareholders.

During the past 20 years the industry has enjoyed unprecedented success in winning the confidence of the American public. More money has been invested in these institutions than ever before in history, making it possible, to a great extent, to finance the tremendous postwar homebuilding program. The income from these mortgage holdings, the large reservoirs of accumulated capital, the goodwill enjoyed by the association, plus the substantial reserves, surplus, and undivided profits accounts and their future earning power—all have created an asset worth far more than meets the eye.

The allegation is made that management and directors or others on the inside, in derogation of their fiduciary responsibilities, have cast their eyes upon the association's reserves and become interested in acquiring them through the legal device of converting the mutual association, under State law, into a permanent stock company. A conversion of a mutual to a permanent stock organization dissolves the mutual institution and creates a new legal entity. During this conversion the many shareholders of the mutual association are not given their pro rata share of value. In effect, the conversion is invariably a transfer of ownership from the many to the ownership of a select or privileged few—the owners of the permanent stock. These permanent-stock owners control and operate the institution, the business it has built up, and its assets for their sole

benefit. Unless proper safeguards are established, a conversion may enable people who are in the know or on the inside to purchase the permanent stock for a fraction of the values behind it. As one nationally prominent mutual savings and loan association executive recently stated:

"My feeling about the matter is that if the purchasers of permanent stock in the conversion of a mutual association had to pay as much for their stock as these same people feel it to be worth immediately after conversion, this whole trend would be reversed. Certainly this stock should be worth as much the day before conversion as the day after and the price fixed accordingly. The value of the stock should be measured not only by the previously accumulated reserves and surplus funds but also by the future earnings potential."

HEARINGS BEFORE THE SENATE BANKING SUBCOMMITTEE

The problems surrounding conversions and the allegations of abuses in connection with them were discussed in a public hearing on Federal savings and loan branches held by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, May 31, 1955. That record contains a discussion attributed to Chairman Walter W. McAllister, of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, before a panel sponsored by the California Savings and Loan League and reprinted in the league's Journal of April 1955. Mr. McAllister is quoted as saying during the panel discussion:

"The statement is made that a group of people operating mutually and cooperatively build big reserves. Then the management and directors become interested in acquiring those reserves. They convert that institution into a mutual company and then convert the mutual company in accordance with State law into a permanent stock association. People who are on the 'in' buy the stock for \$100 or thereabouts and it has a book value of \$200 or \$300 and up."

The Senate record reveals that the Home Loan Bank Board Chairman felt that the Board was limited with respect to legal authority over conversion of Federal savings and loan associations into State-chartered associations, and subsequent conversion of the State-chartered association to a permanent stock-type institution. It was pointed out to the Senate group that such conversions are permissible; therefore, if a Federal association converts to a State-chartered mutual association and thereafter decides as a State association to reorganize under State law into a permanent stock company, the Board has no control. The Senate record also reveals that the Board had not been in sympathy with some proposed conversions and had worked out procedures to protect mutual shareholders by giving them opportunity to buy their share of the permanent stock issued by the State institution. The potential for abuses in connection with such conversions is clearly recognized. In fact, the California panel discussion referred to above shows that Chairman McAllister said that he, as an individual member of the Board, would not act favorably or unfavorably upon applications for conversion at that particular time and that he believed "from what I hear around that it would have been a rather fertile field of investigation and complaint against the savings and loan business."

Members of the Senate group viewed the allegations in such serious vein that Senator BUSH called for investigation of alleged efforts by managers and directors of some Federal savings and loan associations to convert into permanent stock companies. Senator DOUGLAS alluded to such developments as "legalized larceny." Senator BUSH apparently regarded the allegations sufficiently serious to urge that the Senate not act upon a pending proposal to grant the Home Loan

Bank Board independent status until further information was developed.

VIEWS OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator, in a letter concurred in by the chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 6, pp. 7751-7753), wrote that he was "increasingly disturbed" about questions surrounding such conversions. He made the point that in such conversions there is a transfer of ownership from a body of mutual shareholders to a usually smaller group of permanent stockholders and that in the common case the mutual association usually has at the time of transfer substantial earned surplus, reserves, and undivided profits. The HHFA Administrator said he was firmly convinced that the Federal regulatory and insuring agencies were under a duty to see that the rights of mutual shareholders at time of such conversion were adequately protected and preserved. He concurred that requirements of law were being met in such conversions and that the Board had gone perhaps further than expressly required by law to control them. He was satisfied that legal requirements now existing could not alone be relied upon and recommended remedial legislation by the Congress. Significantly, the HHFA Administrator pointed out that conversions were a rather recent development and might develop into a trend of significant dimensions.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It has been aptly observed that Federal insurance of accounts in savings and loan associations were predicated upon risks inherent in a mutual-type business. Permanent stock-type charters were very rare at the inception of Federal insurance and their existence attracted little attention or concern. However, the enactment of permanent stock-company laws in several States and the current interest in converting mutual associations into permanent stock companies (for unethical and immoral, if not illegal, ends), serves to emphasize that the character of risk that has been assumed by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and its members needs to be reexamined. As pointed out above, conversions are a rather recent development that may develop into a trend of significant dimensions. This points out a course of action that Congress should immediately pursue pending a reexamination of the whole theory and philosophy underlying Federal insurance of savings and loan institution accounts. There is grave doubt, with profound changes being wrought in the basic characteristics of the industry, through conversions, that the Government with propriety should continue to make insurance available to additional permanent stock-type institutions.

It is recommended therefore that Congress amend the law to provide that, in the future, insurance of accounts by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation be granted only to accounts of local, mutual savings and loan associations, and that the insurance of existing mutual associations be canceled within 1 year, if they convert to or are merged with a permanent stock company. Such requirements would impose no inequity or hardship upon an existing savings and loan association or upon an institution with a permanent stock-type of charter which is already insured.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF JUNE 30, 1936 (THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this Congress has not been afforded an opportunity to review existing deficiencies in the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act. In order to lay the groundwork

for a comprehensive review of that act early in the next session, I am today introducing a bill providing suggested language for four changes necessary to make the Walsh-Healey Act a more valuable instrument for the regulation of labor conditions in Government contracts.

The first change, modifying the admittedly vague language of section 1 (b) of the act in order to clarify the original intent of Congress as determined by the Secretary and the courts, gives the Secretary of Labor two clear and specific options for determining the minimum wage under which a Government contract may be granted to a firm. The Secretary could find a prevailing wage either (a) for a single industry on a nationwide or smaller basis or (b) for a group of industries in a particular locality.

The second change seeks to provide the Government, employers and employees with more specific definitions or contexts of the key terms relied upon by them under the operation of the act. These heretofore vague terms include "party responsible," "regular dealer," and "manufacturer," and particularly the phrase "bought in the open market," which may soon lead to litigation. The Government has always assumed the "open market" reference to mean articles which the Government has so purchased; and this was the obvious intent of Congress. But to prevent unnecessary litigation and interpretation greatly reducing the coverage of the law, this intent is spelled out in the bill I am introducing today. The bill also eliminates specific reference to judicial review for the purpose of interpreting terms previously vague but which would be definite under the amendments already mentioned.

Third, this bill provides that no injunction shall be issued against a minimum-wage order until it is finally determined, by the highest court to which an appeal is taken, that the Secretary's order is invalid. Such an amendment preserves all of the rights of contractors to judicial review without destroying the protection for employees which Congress intended to provide by this act. The Emergency Price Control Act of World War II similarly and successfully denied judicial restraints on price orders until final adjudication. Under the present system, judicial review can delay the effectiveness of a wage determination for at least 3 years, at the end of which time it has lost all significance. Thus unfounded litigation is encouraged and the practical effect of the act is rendered void.

Fourth and finally, this bill would encourage periodic reexamination of prevailing wage rates, require the Secretary of Labor to keep abreast of changes in wage and price levels and authorize re-determinations of wage levels necessary to preserve the objectives of the act. Elimination of the time lag between economic changes and the Secretary's decision will be more just to both employers and employees—and, like the other amendments previously mentioned, preserve the original objectives of the Walsh-

Healey Act while improving the administrative machinery necessary to achieve those objectives.

I introduce the bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

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

The bill (S. 4260) to amend the act of June 30, 1936 (the Walsh-Healey Act), introduced by Mr. KENNEDY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROTECTION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending United States Code to provide Federal protection for enforcement officers of the food and drug or public health laws of the United States.

NEW OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES NOT GIVEN FULL PROTECTION

Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, now makes it a crime punishable under Federal law for anyone to kill any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, post-office inspector, officer or employee of the National Park Service, or any of the many other Government officials and employees specified in that section, while engaged in the performance of their official duties.

Section 111 of title 18 also makes it a Federal crime for anyone forcibly to assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate or interfere with any person specified in section 1114 while he is engaged in the performance of his official duties.

However, since officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are not mentioned in section 1114, the protection of neither of these sections is afforded to them under existing Federal law.

INCREASED DANGER FOR EMPLOYEES OF HEW

Increasingly, during recent years, employees of this Department, engaged in the enforcement of the food and drug laws, have been exposed to the risk of assaults and other injuries during the performance of their regular duties.

For example, many perishable foods such as crabmeat, eggs, and fresh vegetables are necessarily shipped by truck and move at night, so as to reach the markets the following morning. To collect official samples and make analyses before the foods are sold, Federal employees must stop trucks at night on the highway. Sometimes, the truckdrivers are uncooperative and, on occasion, belligerent to the point of assaulting the employee attempting to make the inspection.

The danger of personal harm is particularly acute in the investigation of deliberately concealed violations of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Often during investigations, food and drug inspectors operate undercover as truckdrivers in circumstances which subject them to great danger of physical injury or death. Duties of this kind are

increasingly being required of our food and drug inspectors. While the great United States trucking industry provides invaluable cooperation, culprits may, of course, be found at the fringes of almost any industry.

Similarly, Federal employees, carrying out quarantine laws, are necessarily engaged in sometimes dangerous investigatory, inspection or other activities in connection with the enforcement of our public health laws and regulations. For instance, the interstate and foreign quarantine laws are designed to prevent the spread of communicable diseases into this country from abroad or from one State to another. Frequently, it is necessary to deal with uncooperative persons attempting to evade the laws or regulations or otherwise interfere with their enforcement. In these cases, the danger of personal harm is extremely great.

In view of these facts, I believe that the protection now afforded by sections 111 and 1114 of title 18, United States Code, to numerous Federal officers and employees should be extended to officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare engaged in these enforcement activities.

ENACT BILL IN HONOR OF DR. WILEY'S MEMORY

I believe the enactment of this legislation would not only plug a loophole in the existing law, but would contribute greatly to the personal protection—as well as morale—of officers and employees of HEW.

Mr. President, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the pure food and drug law, a law which is the living memorial to a man with a name identical to mine, but to whom I, unfortunately, can claim no relation, Dr. Harvey W. Wiley.

It would be most appropriate, in Dr. Wiley's living memory, to enact additional laws to strengthen the wise foundations which he laid.

The hour is, of course, late in this 84th Congress for action of this nature, but I am hoping that early in 1957 we can carry forward in this great objective.

I present a significant letter from the General Federation of Women's Clubs on one important phase of this problem, adequate poultry inspection.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 4262) to include, within the provisions of law providing punishment for killing or assaulting Federal officers on official duty, officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare engaged in enforcing the food and drug or public-health laws of the United States, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

GENERAL FEDERATION OF
WOMEN'S CLUBS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Since its organization in 1890 the General Federation of Women's Clubs has been vitally interested in legisla-

tion to insure a pure and safe food supply. We have been credited by Dr. Harvey Wiley with prompting the educational program which resulted in the passage of the Pure Food and Drug Act in 1906 and in the intervening years we have consistently worked for amendatory legislation to further the health and welfare standards of our Nation.

The membership of the General Federation is composed of over 875,000 women in all parts of the United States, most of whom are housewives and mothers. They therefore have a very personal interest in the food which they purchase for their families. We are at present greatly concerned that there is no effective inspection of poultry and that consumers face serious danger to health from the sale of unclean, contaminated and diseased poultry. The General Federation does not feel that the present voluntary inspection of poultry is an adequate safeguard to health, and we fully concur with the statement of the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration that not only after-slaughter inspection is needed, but before-slaughter, as well. We believe it is imperative that we have new legislation to provide for the compulsory inspection to guarantee clean and healthy poultry.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs strongly urges that you favorably consider S. 3176, the bill introduced by Senator MURRAY. We believe the bill is an excellent measure to protect the consumer.

Sincerely yours,

GRACE D. NICHOLAS,
Mrs. Stephen J. Nicholas,
Executive Director.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SMATHERS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1256) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1256, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE ACT, RELATING TO SAFEGUARDS AGAINST CERTAIN BANK MERGERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 3911) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks which might lessen competition unduly or tend unduly to create a monopoly in the field of banking. The amendments are designed to tighten up the bill and to protect competition in the field of banking. They would also prevent monopolies in banking.

I ask that the amendments be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF TWO NOMINATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator, and as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to announce that the Senate received today the following nominations:

Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Morocco; and

Christian M. Ravndal, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

Notice is given that the Committee on Foreign Relations expects to consider these nominations before the adjournment of Congress.

SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DISCOVERY OF THE X-RAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, one of mankind's greatest boons and medicine's most useful tools—the X-ray—was discovered 60 years ago by a German physics professor, Wilhelm Conrad Roentgen.

Today, the Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, is marking this anniversary by signing a scroll paying tribute to Professor Roentgen and the X-ray. At the same time, the American College of Radiology is presenting a bronze bust of Professor Roentgen to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The scroll and the bust will be displayed together in a suitable place here in Washington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the scroll printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

RAY OF HOPE

Prof. Wilhelm Conrad Roentgen discovered X-rays and, in doing so, not only made one of the great discoveries of history but also inspired the beginning of a new medical service for all humanity—radiology.

It was 60 years ago that this physics professor, working in his University of Wurzburg laboratory in Germany, first produced a new kind of ray that made visible the bones of his hand. This was man's first glimpse of a living skeleton.

Today, X-ray equipment has advanced from Roentgen's experimental Crooke's tube to huge machines employing millions of volts. The effective use of these machines rests in the hands of medical specialists known as radiologists who direct and control them.

Thanks to Professor Roentgen's discovery, X-rays and other forms of penetrating radiant energy, used for diagnosis and therapy, serve and benefit hundreds of millions of the world's people every year.

It is, therefore, appropriate for us today to honor Professor Roentgen who served science and truth all his life. His service, rendered decades ago, became the foundation of a profession aiding all mankind today.

LEONARD A. SCHEELE, M. D.,
Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service.

STATUS OF VISA APPLICATIONS UNDER THE REFUGEE RELIEF PROGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees. My office has been flooded with calls from various Senators and their

administrative assistants, asking about the number of refugees who still can be admitted to the United States, under the various classifications.

I have a report from the State Department, showing the number of refugees who can be admitted to the United

States from various countries. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

Refugee relief program, status of visa applications, July 13, 1956

	Italy	Greece	Netherlands	Germany	Austria	France	Great Britain	Belgium	Far East	Others	Total
Each individual covered by assurance (cumulative):											
1. Applicants	97,975	32,380	8,151	58,788	20,319	5,823	4,557	4,905	23,906	5,258	262,062
2. Visas issued	58,692	16,868	3,942	22,698	11,555	2,021	1,653	1,764	5,121	2,065	126,359
3. Visas refused	7,881	2,020	220	5,778	2,000	530	564	313	951	339	20,656
4. Canceled action	3,255	438	713	8,945	2,353	1,064	409	773	449	394	18,793
5. Applicants still in process	28,147	13,054	3,276	21,367	4,371	2,208	1,931	2,055	17,385	2,460	96,254
Preprocess (without assurances) applicants (status only):											
In process	8,484	459	3,959	11,586	2,509	280	0	1,183	684	355	29,490
Completed (part of in preprocess)	1,007	211	0	3,705	820	31	0	105	27	101	6,007
Assurances sent to field	17,357	18,236	2,714	29,336	10,048	3,237	2,154	1,737	13,833	5,464	104,166

NOTE.—Assurance figures reflect principal applicants only.

"YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW"

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which handles education matters, among other duties, and as one who has appeared on this program, I wish to compliment the nationally known television program, "Youth Wants To Know," on its new affiliation with the National Education Association. The NEA is well known to all of us in the Senate for its wide range of activities in the field of education.

I ask unanimous consent that a press release telling of this event may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW ANNOUNCES ITS AFFILIATION WITH THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Theodore Granik, founder and producer of Youth Wants To Know, announces with pleasure that the program will hereafter be produced in cooperation with the National Education Association. The new affiliation between the program and the association will serve to heighten existent educational and entertainment aspects of the show. Youth Wants To Know is especially proud to be identified with the National Education Association on the eve of its 100th anniversary.

The association represents more than one million persons in the teaching profession throughout the United States; it has 659,190 teachers on its own rolls, and an additional 470,000 in affiliated State and local associations; its membership is comprised of classroom teachers, principals, supervisors, superintendents, and other active professional educators in the schools and colleges of the United States. The association has pioneered in every field of educational work, and its contributions to the welfare of the United States has been recognized by leaders in all walks of life.

It works closely with such other outstanding organizations as the American Legion, the American Medical Association, the American Library Association, the American Teachers Association, the Magazine Publishers Association, and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. It has annually cosponsored American Education Week, to arouse citizen interest in the well-being and improvement of the American school system. The National Education Association has done important work in re-

search, in developing sound educational policies, in furthering rural education; through its National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, it has striven to advance the professional standards of teachers and to improve the standards of teacher education.

The National Education Association publishes a monthly periodical with a paid circulation of nearly 700,000 copies; in addition, each of the 48 States affiliated publishes a similar periodical, and specialized educational groups within the National Education Association issue publications relating to their group interests. All of these publications will carry news flowing from the affiliation between the National Education Association and NBC's Youth Wants To Know.

The cooperation between Youth Wants To Know and the National Education Association will implement the program's dedication to the advancement of knowledge on national and international affairs among the young people of our country.

Youth Wants To Know was founded in 1951; since that time it has been produced by its founder, Theodore Granik. It is the outstanding television program of its kind for young people and adults, having won almost every national award since its inception.

Youth Wants To Know is telecast each Sunday afternoon, from 3:30 to 4:00 p. m., e. d. t., over the National Broadcasting Co.'s television network.

CONSERVATIONISTS SUPPORT THE HOUSE VERSION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE REORGANIZATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the important issues now before the Congress and, in particular, before a Senate-House conference committee, is the reorganization of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

In my judgment, the House of Representatives' version of this legislation, representing an amended form of S. 3275, is definitely superior to the original version, as was unfortunately approved by the Senate.

The amended version should be approved by the conference committee. This version will protect the interests of America's millions of sports fishermen. The amended version represents a reasonable compromise, in which sports fishermen have conceded just about all

that they could or should, under the circumstances, without compromising principle.

I was pleased to receive from distinguished conservation experts of our nation a great many messages endorsing the amended form of S. 3275.

I had previously pledged to them my support toward this objective. I had done so in the form of a special report which I had sent out to the conservationists of my own and other States.

I am delighted to say that this conservation report received the enthusiastic reaction of our national conservation leaders here in Washington.

This fine group of men, spokesmen for fish and wildlife groups, are among the most vigilant guardians of our outdoor resources. Naturally, I am deeply appreciative of their very splendid expressions.

Too often we, as a nation, have failed to preserve the precious heritage which belongs to all 167 million of us, and to the future generation which will follow.

As an indication of the deep interest of these men and of the civic-minded groups which they represent, I am going to ask unanimous consent that the text of the appeal for amended S. 3275, be printed at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and be followed thereafter by the gracious individual messages which I have received from the conservation leaders.

I should like now to conclude by urging that the Senate Appropriations Committee grant necessary funds to carry out the water pollution control law recently approved by Congress. These funds, particularly \$50 million for vital grants-in-aid to municipalities, for sewerage treatment plants, must be included in the second supplemental funds bill if we are not to lose a whole year of precious time in our battle against the dread pollution menace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from C. R. Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute addressed to all Members of Congress; a press release of the Department of the Interior; a letter addressed to me by Michael Hudoba; a letter from C. R. Gutermuth, addressed to me; a letter from Richard H. Stroud,

executive vice president of the Sport Fishing Institute; and a letter from Ernest F. Swift, executive director of the National Wildlife Federation, may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D. C., July 16, 1956.

IMPORTANT ANNOUNCEMENT ON S. 3275

To All Members of Congress:

The Magnuson bill, S. 3275, as amended and passed by the House on July 7, has the full support of the sportsmen, conservationists, State fish and game directors, and Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton (see attached Interior Department press release dated July 3).

While a few clarifying word changes should be made in the amended Magnuson bill, S. 3275, the following conservation organizations have requested me to make it clear that they will oppose any amendments to this bill that would make any major changes in the organizational pattern of administration that now is provided in amended S. 3275, which is the same as H. R. 11570, dated June 28.

Despite the last-minute claim by one commercial fishing organization that the amended Magnuson bill, S. 3275, would subordinate fisheries, it will do just the opposite. Commercial fisheries would be elevated in the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, but the Service would be kept together as one agency in Interior—which is what the people across the country have been demanding. Without weakening amendments, the amended S. 3275 would give greater recognition to both fish and wildlife by creating an Assistant Secretary for Fisheries and Wildlife. The amended bill would provide immediate relief to the distressed commercial fishing industry, and the vast majority of members of the industry favor its enactment.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Vice President.

(Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, Spencer M. Smith, secretary; Forest Conservation Society of America, Charles H. Stoddard, executive director; International Association of Fish, Game, and Conservation Commissioners, Bruce F. Stiles, president; Izaak Walton League of America, Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director; Midwest Association of Fish, Game, and Conservation Commissioners, Glen D. Palmer, president; National Wildlife Federation, Charles H. Callison, conservation director; Outdoor Writers Association of America, Michael Hudoba, conservation director; Public Affairs Institute, Dewey Anderson, executive director; Sport Fishing Institute, Richard H. Stroud, executive vice president; Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, Thomas L. Kimball, president.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR DEFERS FWS REORGANIZATION PENDING CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton today announced that, because Congress is considering legislation affecting the Fish and Wildlife Service, administrative reorganization of that Service, scheduled to go into effect July 1, had been temporarily deferred, with the President's approval.

The Department has been working out details of the reorganization plan since June 4, when a White House directive spelled out the objectives of the administration's proposal to provide new forms of assistance to the commercial fishing industry and to bolster other services performed by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Secretary Seaton said the Department had decided to postpone completion of the reorganization until Congress has had an opportunity to act on pending legislation designed to accomplish essentially the same things as the administration's program.

The Secretary said H. R. 11570 is generally in accord with the President's program.

"In view of the fact that the Congress is now considering legislation that would, among other things, provide for the reorganization of the Fish and Wildlife Service to include a bureau for wildlife and sport fishing and a bureau of commercial fisheries, it would seem best at this time for the Department to delay effectuating its own reorganization plan beyond the originally contemplated July 1 target date," Seaton said.

"This is a complex problem and it is the President's desire that the Department of the Interior and other interested Federal agencies cooperate to the utmost with the Congress in working out the best possible solution to the problem," he added.

In addition to providing for reorganization of the Fish and Wildlife Service, H. R. 11570, as reported by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, calls for establishment within the Department of the Interior of an Assistant Secretary to have supervision of fisheries and wildlife and a Commission of Fish and Wildlife. Other significant features of the bill are a revolving loan fund and a continuation of the Saltonstall-Kennedy program which would eliminate the present \$3 million limitation on funds for fisheries research and other projects. The act is due to expire next year.

The administration's proposed legislation, submitted to Congress on June 7, provided for a \$10 million revolving loan fund for the maintenance and repair of commercial fishing vessels and for liberalization of the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act.

SPORTS AFIELD,

Washington, D. C., July 13, 1956.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your kind letter and thoughtfulness in sending me a copy of your report to Wisconsin conservationists.

It is a fine report and affirms what those of us working for conservation and sportsmen here in Washington know of your long and persistent interest in conservation.

You are one of the too few Senators who have consistently urged that recreational use of the national forests be firm ed up through legislation assuring adequate funds for fish, wildlife, and recreational facilities in national forests.

One of the most urgent matters in the final days of the session is to get supplemental appropriations for the newly enacted pollution abatement law which can only be done now because of time through the Senate.

I wish to express appreciation for your continuing interest and support of those measures so important to the sportsmen-conservationists during your service in the United States Senate.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely,

MIKE HUDOBA.

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE,
Washington, D. C., July 16, 1956.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thanks for your letter of July 11, and for the enclosed copy of your special report to the Wisconsin conservationists. It is believed that this will be one of the most popular releases that you ever have issued.

We appreciate your continued cooperation and support. It is regretted that we do not have more staunch conservationists like you in the Congress. We certainly are indebted to you for your help over the years.

The internationally famous cartoonist, J. N. "Ding" Darling once said, the worst enemies of fish and game were Democrats and Republicans who acted as Democrats and Republicans, and we need more statesmen who hold steadfast in the public interest.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Vice President.

SPORT FISHING INSTITUTE,
Washington, D. C., July 17, 1956.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Many thanks for your letter of July 11 with a copy of your report to Wisconsin conservationists. I appreciate your thoughtfulness in this regard.

I note your statement opposing domination of sport by commercial fishing interests. As you doubtless know, Sport Fishing Institute has been in the forefront of this battle. I am enclosing a copy of my recent letter to Senator MAGNUSON in which you will doubtless be interested. Any assistance you can give will be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD H. STROUD,
Executive Vice President.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1956.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate your letter of July 11 with the attachment regarding your conservation record, copy of which has gone out to the people of Wisconsin.

I can assure you the federation appreciates your stand on Echo Park Dam, the help that you gave us on writing in the specifications in the soil bank law for consideration of forestry and wildlife, as well as your stand on the many other conservation issues that have come up in Congress over the years.

As a resident of Wisconsin I appreciate all that you have done for that State and the Nation as a whole in conservation.

Very sincerely yours,

ERNEST F. SWIFT,
Executive Director.

AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

MR. PASTORE. Mr. President, on June 29 I obtained unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain agreements for cooperation which had arrived before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

I now ask permission to have printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the agreement which arrived before the Joint Committee on June 29 between the Republic of Germany and the United States; the agreement which arrived before the Joint Committee on July 2 between the Kingdom of Denmark and the United States; and the agreement which arrived before the Joint Committee on July 6 between the Government of Belgium and the United States.

In addition, I also ask permission to have the body of the agreement between the Government of Switzerland and the Government of the United States printed. Inadvertently the agreement with the Netherlands was substituted in the RECORD before.

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

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1956.

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic
Energy, Congress of the United
States

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the amendment, authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

Article I of the amendment would permit the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to have in its custody at any time up to 12 instead of the original 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactors involved.

Article II of the amendment would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The guarantees undertaken by the parties in the agreement for cooperation dated February 13, 1956, will continue and will be applicable to the transactions contemplated by the enclosed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

Chairman.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 29, 1956.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached amendment to the agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," which was signed February 13, 1956. It is also recommended that you authorize the execution of this proposed amendment by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Article I of the amendment would permit the Federal Republic of Germany to have in its custody, at any one time, up to 12 instead of 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous use of the reactors involved. As you know, under the terms of the existing agreement, the Federal Republic of Germany may have 6 kilograms of such material in its custody, plus such additional quantity as is neces-

sary to permit efficient and continuous operation.

The additional material which has been requested by Germany is needed, among other things, to fuel a second swimming pool reactor which Germany proposes to construct as part of its program to develop the peaceful aspects of atomic energy. Germany cannot allocate the necessary U-235 to this facility within the framework of the existing agreement, inasmuch as it plans to allocate the material now available under the existing agreement to other reactors which are considered equally important to its program. Accordingly, the Commission has reviewed the German request and has concluded that the allocation of an additional 6 kilograms under agreement is an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Germany in accordance with the policy which you have established.

Article II of the amendment would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the proposed amendment will be executed by appropriate authorities of Germany and the United States. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the agreement will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 29, 1956.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 28, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed amendment to the "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy" which was signed on February 13, 1956.

The Commission's letter states that article I of the amendment will enable the Federal Republic of Germany to obtain an additional 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium from the United States (making a total of 12 kilograms) for retention in its custody at any one time. Upon an analysis of facts the Commission has determined that this additional material is needed, in part, to fuel a second swimming pool research reactor facility which Germany proposes to construct as part of its program to develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Commission's letter states that the provision of the additional material will represent an important step in advancing the German program.

I also have noted that article II of the amendment would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials for peaceful research purposes.

I have examined the proposed amendment to the agreement and I share in the belief of the Commission that the performance of the agreement will serve to advance the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Germany.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendations of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby

(1) Approve the proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy;

(2) Determine that the performance of the proposed amendment to the agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States; and

(3) Authorize the execution of the proposed amendment to the agreement to the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America (including the United States Atomic Energy Commission) and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, dated February 13, 1956 (hereinafter referred to as the Agreement for Cooperation),

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article IV, paragraph 2, of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended (1) by adding after the phrase "by the Commission" the following: "under this article" and (2) by deleting the words "six (6)" wherever appearing in this paragraph and substituting in lieu of each such deletion the following: "twelve (12)."

ARTICLE II

The following new article is added directly after article V of the Agreement for Cooperation:

"Article V (a)

"Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-233."

ARTICLE III

Article VII, paragraph 1, of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the phrase "uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 leased from the Commission" and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "special nuclear materials received from the Commission."

ARTICLE IV

This amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and German languages, this ----- day of -----, 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

JOHN K. ROULEAU June 28, 1956.

WILLIAM K. MILLER June 28, 1956.

For the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

EDUARD HESS June 23, 1956.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION,

Washington, D. C., June 29, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic
Energy, Congress of the United
States

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy;

2. A letter to the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the amendment, authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

Article II of the amendment would permit the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark to have in its custody at any time up to 12 instead of the original 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactors involved.

Article III of the amendment would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Articles I and IV of the amendment include several new provisions which are designed to clarify the responsibilities that the parties to the agreement have assumed with respect to liability for any information, special nuclear material or fuel elements transferred pursuant to the agreement.

The guaranties undertaken by the parties in the Agreement for Cooperation, dated July 25, 1955, will continue and will be applicable to the transactions contemplated by the enclosed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 26, 1956.

The President,

The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached amendment to the agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark" which was signed on July 25, 1955. It is also recommended that you authorize the execution of this proposed amendment by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Article II of the amendment would permit the Kingdom of Denmark to have in its custody, at any one time, up to 12 instead of 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous use of the reactors involved. As you know, under

the terms of the existing agreement, the Kingdom of Denmark may have 6 kilograms of such material in its custody, plus such additional quantity as is necessary to permit efficient and continuous operation.

The additional material which has been requested by Denmark is needed, among other things, to fuel a zero-power research facility which Denmark proposes to construct as part of its program to develop the peaceful aspects of atomic energy. Denmark cannot allocate the necessary U-235 to this facility within the framework of the existing agreement inasmuch as it plans to employ the 6 kilograms presently available in the agreement for a high-flux research reactor. Accordingly the Commission has reviewed the Danish request and has concluded that the allocation of an additional 6 kilograms under agreement is an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Denmark in accordance with the policy which you have established.

Article III of the amendment would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233 and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

You also will note that articles I and VI of the amendment include some new provisions which are designed to clarify the responsibilities that the parties to the agreement have assumed with respect to liability for any information, special nuclear material or fuel elements transferred pursuant to the agreement.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the proposed amendment will be executed by appropriate authorities of Denmark and the United States. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the agreement will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

Certified to be a true copy:

H. D. BEUSELSDOFF
(For Clark C. Vogel, Acting Director
Division of International Affairs).

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, June 27, 1956.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 26, 1956, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed amendment to the "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark" which was signed on July 25, 1955.

The Commission's letter states that article II of the amendment will enable the Kingdom of Denmark to obtain an additional 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium from the United States (making a total of 12 kilograms) for retention in its custody at any one time. Upon an analysis of facts the Commission has determined that this additional material is needed, in part, to fuel a zero-power research facility which Denmark proposes to construct as part of its program to develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Commission's letter states that the provision of the additional material will represent an important step in advancing the Danish program.

I also have noted that article III of the amendment would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials for peaceful research purposes and that articles I and VI are designed to make the responsibilities of the parties to the agreement more explicit.

I have examined the proposed amendment to the agreement and I share in the belief of the Commission that the performance of the proposed amendment will serve to advance the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Denmark.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby

1. Approve the proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark;

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed amendment to the agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed amendment to the agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION
BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT
OF THE KINGDOM OF DENMARK CONCERNING
CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America (including the United States Atomic Energy Commission) and the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark;

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark, dated July 25, 1955 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation");

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article I of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. Subject to the limitations of article V, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

"1. Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

"2. Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

"3. The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

"B. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application."

ARTICLE II

Article II, paragraph B, of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended (1) by adding after the phrase "by the Commission" the following: "under this Article" and (2) by deleting the words "six (6)" wherever they appear in that paragraph and substituting in lieu of each such deletion the following: "twelve (12)."

ARTICLE III

The following new article is added directly after article III of the Agreement for Cooperation:

"Article III bis

"Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the

peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-233."

ARTICLE IV

1. Article VI, paragraph A, of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by deleting the phrase "uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 leased from the Commission" in the second and third lines and substituting in lieu thereof the phrase "special nuclear materials received from the Commission."

2. The following new paragraph is added to article VI of the Agreement for Cooperation:

"D. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark, the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this Agreement, lease to the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third party liability) for any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction."

ARTICLE V

This amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this amendment.

Done at Washington this 27th day of June 1956 in two original texts.

For the Government of the United States of America:

C. BURKE ELBRICK,
Acting Assistant Secretary of State
for European Affairs.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, United States Atomic
Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark:

HENRIK DE KAUFFMAN,
Ambassador of Denmark.

Certified to be a true copy.

A. BRUCE MERCER,
(For Clark C. Vogel, Acting Director,
Division of International Affairs).

UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 6, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic
Energy, Congress of the United
States

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Belgium;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the amendment, authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

The proposed amendment will broaden the scope of cooperation between Belgium and the United States and, in particular, a number of provisions have been modified or inserted to permit a wider exchange of classified information in areas related to the peaceful development of atomic energy. In addition, the amendment is designed to further recognize the special relationship that exists between the Government of the United States and the Government of Belgium in the field of atomic energy, and it accords Belgium the same advantages which are now being granted concurrently to other countries pursuant to other agreements for cooperation.

Article I of the amendment replaces article III of the existing agreement in its entirety. In particular, the scope of the exchange of classified information has been broadened to permit, as may be agreed, an exchange of information on the methods of producing and utilizing reactor materials and the methods of producing and fabricating reactor components. In addition, the agreement has been amplified to permit an exchange of classified information on the exploration for, treatment, and production of source materials.

Article III of the amendment would, among other things, enable the Commission to make a portion of the U-235 sold under the agreement to Belgium available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium.

In article V of the amendment, the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established. Article V also recognizes the efforts that are now being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic energy programs of a group of nations and, accordingly, provides that such an integrated group may assume the rights and obligations of the Government of Belgium under the agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the United States, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

Article VI of the amendment incorporates a number of prudent safeguards which are designed to strengthen the intention of the parties that material or equipment received from the United States under the agreement only will be used for peaceful purposes.

The guaranties undertaken by the parties in the Agreement for Cooperation will continue and will be applicable to the transactions contemplated by the enclosed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS STRAUSS,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1956.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Belgium, dated June 15, 1955, and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

The proposed amendment will broaden the scope of cooperation between Belgium and the United States and, in particular, a number of provisions have been modified or inserted to permit a wider exchange of classified information in areas related to the peaceful development of atomic energy. In addition, the amendment is designed to further recognize the special relationship that exists between the Government of the United States and the Government of Belgium in the field of atomic energy, and it accords Belgium the same advantages which are now being granted concurrently to other countries pursuant to other Agreements for Cooperation. The amendment also includes some new provisions which relate to procedures for safeguarding materials transferred pursuant to the agreement, the responsibilities that the parties assume with respect to liability for any information or materials they exchange under the agreement, and the relationship of the agreement to the proposed international agency and European efforts to integrate atomic energy activities.

You will note that article I of the amendment replaces article III of the existing agreement in its entirety. In particular, the scope of the exchange of classified information has been broadened to permit, as may be agreed, an exchange of information on the methods of producing and utilizing reactor materials and the methods of producing and fabricating reactor components. In addition, article III of the agreement has been amplified to permit an exchange of classified information on the exploration for, treatment and production of source materials.

Article III of the amendment would, among other things, enable the Commission to make a portion of U-235 sold under the agreement to Belgium available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials-testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium.

In article VII bis, the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established. Article VII bis also recognizes the efforts that are now being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic energy programs of a group of nations and, accordingly, provides that such an integrated group may assume the rights and obligations of the Government of Belgium under the agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the United States, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

You also will note that article VIII bis of the amendment incorporates a number of prudent safeguards which are designed to strengthen the intention of the parties that material or equipment received from the United States under the agreement only will be used for peaceful purposes.

Article XI bis is designed to clarify the responsibilities that the parties have assumed with respect to any liability for information or materials transferred pursuant to the agreement.

The Atomic Energy Commission believes that the proposed amendment will contrib-

ute significantly to the program of cooperation between Belgium and the United States in fields related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and your approval is recommended. Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the proposed amendment will be executed by appropriate authorities of Belgium and the United States. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the agreement will then be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully,

Chairman.

H. D. BEUSELSDORF.

Certified to be a true copy.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, July 5, 1956.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of July 3, 1956, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed amendment to the "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Belgium," dated June 15, 1955.

I have examined the amendment recommended. It calls for a broadening exchange of classified information between Belgium and the United States in fields related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In particular, the amendment would permit an exchange of classified information on the methods of producing and utilizing reactor materials, the methods of fabricating reactor components, and the techniques of exploring for, treating and producing source materials.

Article III of the proposed amendment would, among other things, enable the Commission to make a portion of the U-235 sold to Belgium under the agreement available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials-testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium.

Article VIII bis of the amendment provides for appropriate safeguards against the diversion of materials and equipment for unauthorized uses. The amendment also affirms the interest of the United States and Belgium in the establishment of an International Atomic Energy Agency which would foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and I note that it takes into account efforts that are now being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic energy program of a group of nations.

On the basis of my review I agree with the Commission's determination that the proposed amendment is an important step in fostering cooperation between the United States and Belgium in the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby

(1) Approve the within proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Belgium,

(2) Determine that the performance of the proposed amendment to the agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

(3) Authorize the execution of the proposed amendment to the agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States

Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF BELGIUM

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Belgium;

Desiring to broaden in certain respects the Agreement for Cooperation on the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation") signed between them in Washington on the fifteenth day of June, 1955;

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article III of the agreement for cooperation is deleted and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

"Article III

"With the objective of facilitating the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy, and particularly the development of atomic power, the Government of Belgium and the Commission agree to exchange unclassified information thereon and classified information in the specific fields set forth in this article. The exchange of information provided for in this article will be accomplished through the various means available, including reports, conferences and visits to facilities.

"A. 1. Of the information which is classified, only that relevant to current or projected programs will be exchanged.

"2. The parties will not exchange restricted data under this agreement relating to design or fabrication of atomic weapons or information which, in the opinion of the Commission, is primarily of military significance; and no restricted data concerning the production of special nuclear materials will be exchanged except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor.

"3. This agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately developed and privately owned or has been received from another government.

"4. The Commission will communicate classified information pertaining primarily to any reactor types, such as submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors, the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use, only when, in the opinion of the Commission, these types of reactors warrant peacetime application and as exchange of information on these types of reactors may be mutually agreed.

"B. Subject to the provisions of paragraph A of this article, classified information within the following fields shall be exchanged between the parties:

"1. Reactors:

"(a) General information on design, characteristics, operational techniques and performance of research reactors, and of experimental, demonstration power, or power reactors as is required to permit evaluation and comparison of their potential uses in a research or power-production program.

"(b) Detailed technological information on the design, development, construction, and operation of specific research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors and when in the case of Belgium such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in Belgium, Belgian Congo, or Ruanda-Urundi, or when such reactors are being seriously studied in the Belgian power-development program or are being seriously considered for construction by the Government of Belgium as a

source of power or as an intermediate step in a power-production program.

"(c) Classified information within subparagraphs (a) and (b) hereof shall be exchanged when it falls within one or the other of the following areas:

"(1) Specifications and methods of producing reactor materials: Final form specifications including composition, shape, size, and special handling techniques of reactor materials (including uranium, heavy water, pile grade graphite, and zirconium); and, as may be agreed, the methods of producing and utilizing reactor materials exclusive of information on the separation of isotopes.

"(2) Properties of reactor materials: Physical, chemical, metallurgical, nuclear and mechanical properties of reactor materials including fuel, moderator and coolant and the effects of the reactor's operating conditions on the properties of these materials.

"(3) Reactor components: The design and performance specifications of reactor components and, as may be agreed, the methods of producing and fabricating reactor components.

"(4) Reactor physics technology: This area includes theory of and pertinent data relating to neutron bombardment reactions, neutron cross sections, criticality calculations, reactor kinetics and shielding.

"(5) Reactor engineering technology: This area includes considerations pertinent to the overall design and optimization of the reactor and theory and data relating to such problems as reactor stress and heat transfer analysis.

"(6) Environmental safety considerations: This area includes considerations relating to normal reactor radiations and possible accidental hazards and the effect of these on equipment and personnel and appropriate methods of waste disposal and decontamination.

"(d) Subject to the provisions of paragraph B. 1. (b) of this article the Commission will receive selected security-cleared personnel from Belgium to work with and participate in the construction of the PWR reactor at Shippingport, Pa., and such other reactors as may be agreed.

"2. Uranium and thorium:

"Geology, exploration techniques, chemistry and technology of extracting uranium and thorium from their ores and concentrates; the chemistry, production technology and techniques of purification and fabrication of uranium and thorium compounds and metals including design, construction and operation of plants."

ARTICLE II

Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended as follows:

1. The title to article IV is deleted and the following substituted therefor. "Article IV—Research Materials and Research Facilities."

2. The letter "A" is placed before the present paragraph and the following new paragraph is added:

"B. Subject to the provisions of article III, and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor materials testing facilities of the parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available, when such facilities are not commercially available. It is understood that neither party will be able to permit access by personnel of the other party to facilities which are primarily of military significance."

ARTICLE III

Paragraphs A and B of article VII of the Agreement for Cooperation are amended to read as follows:

"A. The Commission will sell to Belgium under such terms and conditions as may be

agreed such quantities of uranium of normal isotopic composition as Belgium may require, and to the extent practical in such form as Belgium may request, during the period of this agreement for use in research and power reactors located in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, subject to the availability of supply and the needs of the United States program.

"B. 1. The Commission will sell to the Government of Belgium under such terms and conditions as may be agreed such quantities of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 as Belgium may require during the period of this agreement for use in research and power reactors located in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, subject to any limitations in connection with quantities of such material available for such distribution by the Commission during any year, and subject to the limitation that the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 of weapon quality in the possession of Belgium by reason of transfer under this agreement shall not, in the opinion of the Commission, be of military significance. It is agreed, except as hereafter provided, that the uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 which the Commission will sell to Belgium under this article will be limited to uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235. The Commission may upon request and in its discretion make a portion of the material sold under this paragraph available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials-testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium. It is understood and agreed that although Belgium will distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 to authorized users in Belgium, the Belgian Congo, and Ruanda-Urundi, the Government of Belgium will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 which is purchased from the Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to uranium enriched in the isotope U-235.

"2. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear materials received from the United States of America require reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may otherwise be agreed, that the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing.

ARTICLE IV

Article IX of the Agreement for Cooperation is deleted and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

"A. With respect to any invention or discovery employing information classified when communicated in accordance with article III and made or conceived as a result of such communication during the period of this agreement, the Government of the United States of America with respect to invention or discovery rights owned by it, and the Government of Belgium with respect to any invention or discovery owned by it or made or conceived by persons under its jurisdiction:

"(a) Agree to transfer and assign or cause to be transferred or assigned to the other all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in the country of that other, subject to a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for the governmental purposes of the transferring party and for purposes of mutual defense;

"(b) shall, upon request of the other, grant or cause to be granted to the other a

royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for its governmental purposes in the country of the transferring party or third countries, including use in the production of materials in such countries for sale to the requesting party by a contractor of such party;

"(c) agree that each party may otherwise deal with any invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own country or third countries as it may desire, but in no event shall either party discriminate against citizens of the country of the other in respect of granting any license under the patents owned by it in its own or third countries;

"(d) waive any and all claims against the other for compensation, royalty or award as respects any such invention or discovery, patent application or patent and releases the other with respect to any such claim.

"B. 1. No patent application with respect to any classified invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated under this agreement may be filed by either party or any person in the country of the other party except in accordance with agreed conditions and procedures.

"2. No patent application with respect to any such classified invention or discovery may be filed in any country not a party to this agreement except as may be agreed and subject to article XI.

"3. Appropriate secrecy or prohibition orders shall be issued for purpose of giving effect to this paragraph."

ARTICLE V

The following new article is added directly after article VII of the agreement for cooperation:

"Article VII bis

"A. The Government of Belgium and the Government of the United States of America affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In the event such an international agency is created:

"1. The parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this Agreement for Cooperation. In particular, the parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the international agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards, including those relating to health and safety standards, required by the international agency in connection with similar assistance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the international agency.

"2. In the event the parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided in paragraph A of this article, either party may by notification terminate this agreement, except that such termination shall not apply to the provisions of article VII.E.1 and 2. In the event this agreement is so terminated, the Government of Belgium shall return to the Commission all source and special nuclear materials received pursuant to this agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction and in such event the Commission shall, as may be agreed, return to the Government of Belgium any amount of uranium ore or concentrate equivalent to the amount of uranium ore or concentrate delivered to the Commission as a result of the exercise of its option pursuant to article VII.E.3.

"B. It is recognized that efforts are being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic energy programs of a group of nations. If the Government of Belgium becomes a member of such an integrated group and if an Agreement for Cooperation on atomic energy is made between the group of nations and the Government of the United

States of America, the latter would be prepared if so requested by the Government of Belgium to arrange for the integrated group to assume the rights and obligations of the Government of Belgium under this agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the Government of the United States of America, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement."

ARTICLE VI

The following new article is added directly after article VII of the agreement for cooperation:

"Article VIII bis

"The Government of Belgium and the Government of the United States of America emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of Belgium pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

"A. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the parties as provided in article VII bis, by safeguards of the proposed international atomic energy agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

"(1) With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any

"(i) reactor and

"(ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards,

which are to be made available to the Government of Belgium or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission;

"(2) With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of Belgium or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source of special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available:

"(i) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission,

"(ii) reactors,

"(iii) any other equipment or device designated by the Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this subparagraph A2 will apply.

"(a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such materials; and

"(b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of Belgium or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guaranties set forth in article XI;

"(3) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in Belgium and which is not purchased by the Commission or transferred to another country pursuant to article VII, paragraph C, of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the parties;

"(4) To designate, after consultation with the Government of Belgium, personnel who,

accompanied, if either party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of Belgium, shall have access in Belgium to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph A2 of this article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

"(5) In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article or the guaranties set forth in article XI and the failure of the Government of Belgium to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article;

"(6) To consult with the Government of Belgium in the matter of health and safety.

"B. The Government of Belgium undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article."

ARTICLE VII

The following new article is inserted directly after article XI of the Agreement for Cooperation:

"Article XI bis

"The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications), material, equipment, or device, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy and completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, or device for any particular use or application."

ARTICLE VIII

Article XII of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended by adding the following new definitions:

"J. 'Source material' means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Government of Belgium or the Commission to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the Government of Belgium or the Commission may determine from time to time.

"K. 'Parties' means the Government of Belgium and the Government of the United States of America, including the United States Atomic Energy Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. 'Party' means one of the above 'parties.'"

ARTICLE IX

This amendment, which shall be regarded as an integral part of the Agreement for Cooperation shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such amendment.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this amendment to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington in duplicate the day of _____, 1956, in the English and French languages, but in any case in which divergence between the two versions results in different interpretations the English version shall be given preference.

For the Government of the United States of America:

July 3, 1956:

CLARK C. VOGEL,
Atomic Energy Commission.

July 3, 1956:

PHILIP J. FARLEY,
Department of State.

For the Government of Belgium:

July 3, 1956:

LOUIS GROVEN,
Embassy of Belgium.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF SWITZERLAND

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas to further the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of Switzerland and the Government of the United States of America have entered into an Agreement for Cooperation relating to the sale and purchase of a research reactor, the exchange of information relating thereto, and the lease of special nuclear material; and

Whereas the Government of Switzerland and the Government of the United States of America are desirous of entering into a further agreement for cooperation relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy with regard to medical therapy, the exchange of information relating to the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy, including civilian nuclear power, and for research and development programs looking toward the realization of peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the Government of Switzerland and the Government of the United States of America are desirous of cooperating with each other to obtain the above objectives;

The parties therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years. Either party, however, may subsequent to the end of the fifth year that this agreement is in force, upon 6 months' prior written notice given to the other party, terminate this agreement.

ARTICLE II

A. Subject to the provisions of this agreement, the availability of personnel and material, and the applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements in force in their respective countries, the parties shall cooperate with each other in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

B. The disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of this agreement.

C. The exchange of restricted data under this agreement shall be subject to the following limitations:

(1) Restricted data which in the opinion of the United States Commission is primarily of military significance shall not be exchanged.

(2) Restricted data concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor shall not be exchanged.

(3) It shall extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs.

(4) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military uses. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining primarily to such reactors will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant peacetime application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed. Information on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged. Likewise, restricted data pertaining primarily to any future reactor types the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors

warrant civil application and exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed; and restricted data on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged.

D. This agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately developed and privately owned or has been received from another government.

E. It is agreed that the United States Commission will not transfer any materials and will not transfer or permit the export of any materials or equipment and devices if such materials or equipment and devices are, in the opinion of the United States Commission, primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE III

A. Subject to the provisions of article II, classified information in the specific fields set out below and unclassified information shall be exchanged between the United States Commission and the Government of Switzerland with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating to such uses and problems of health and safety connected therewith. The exchange of information provided for in this article shall be accomplished through the various means available, including reports, conferences, and visits to facilities.

B. The parties agree to exchange the following classified information, including restricted data:

(1) General information on the design and characteristics of experimental, demonstration power, or power reactors as is required to permit an evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power production program.

(2) Technological information, as may be agreed, on specific experimental, demonstration power or power reactors and when, in the case of Switzerland, such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in Switzerland or when such information is required in the development, construction and operation of specific reactors which Switzerland intends to construct as part of a current experimental, demonstration power or power program in Switzerland.

(3) Classified information within subparagraphs (1) and (2) hereof shall be exchanged within the following fields:

(a) Specifications for reactor materials: Final form specifications including the composition, shape, size and special handling techniques of reactor materials including uranium, heavy water, reactor grade graphite, and zirconium.

(b) Properties of reactor materials: Physical, chemical, metallurgical, nuclear and mechanical properties of reactor materials including fuel, moderator and coolant and the effects of the reactor's operating conditions on the properties of these materials.

(c) Reactor components: The design and performance specifications of reactor components, but not including the methods of production and fabrication.

(d) Reactor physics technology: This area includes theory of and pertinent data relating to neutron bombardment reactions, neutron cross sections, criticality calculations, reactor kinetics and shielding.

(e) Reactor engineering technology: This area includes considerations pertinent to the over-all design and optimization of the reactor and theory of and data relating to such problems as reactor stress and heat transfer analysis.

(f) Environmental safety considerations: This area includes considerations relating to normal reactor radiations and possible accidental hazards and the effect of such on equipment and personnel and appropriate methods of waste disposal and decontamination.

ARTICLE IV

A. Research materials:

Materials of interest in connection with the subjects of agreed exchanges of information as provided in article III and under the provisions set forth in article II, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall transfers under this article of quantities of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of Switzerland be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-233.

B. Research facilities:

Subject to the provisions of article II and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor material testing facilities of the parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available, when such facilities are not commercially available. It is understood that the United States Commission will not be able to permit access to facilities which are primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE V

With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III and subject to the provisions of article II, equipment and devices may be transferred from one party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed. It is recognized that such transfer will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE VI

A. It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Switzerland may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, in the fields referred to in paragraph B of this article, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States or the Government of Switzerland will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the other government and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the other government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, provided that any classified information shall fall within the fields specified in paragraph B and subject to:

(1) The provisions of paragraph E of article II;

(2) Applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements;

(3) Approval of the party to the jurisdiction of which the person making the arrangement is subject if the materials or services are classified or if the furnishing of such materials or services require the communication of classified information.

B. To the extent necessary in carrying out the arrangements made under paragraph A of this article, classified information subject in each case to the provisions of article II may be communicated by the person furnishing the material or services to the party or person to whom such material or service is furnished, as follows:

(1) the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III;

(2) technological information within the categories of information set forth in article III (B) (3) on specific experimental, demonstration power or power reactors and when, in the case of Switzerland, such information

is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in Switzerland or when such information is required in the construction and operation of specific reactors which the Government of Switzerland or authorized persons under its jurisdiction intend to construct as part of a current experimental, demonstration power or power program in Switzerland.

ARTICLE VII

A. During the period of this agreement, the United States Commission will sell to the Government of Switzerland uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium. This net amount shall be the quantity of contained U-235 in uranium sold to the Government of Switzerland less the quantity of contained U-235 in recoverable uranium resold to the United States or transferred to any other nation or international organization with the approval of the United States in accordance with this agreement. This material may not be enriched above 20 percent U-235 except as hereinafter provided. Such material will be sold subject to the terms and conditions of this article and the other provisions of this agreement as and when required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, and experimental, demonstration power and power reactors which the Government of Switzerland in consultation with the United States Commission decides to construct or authorize private organizations to construct in Switzerland and as required in experiments related thereto. The United States Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium.

B. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred by the United States Commission under this article and in custody of the Government of Switzerland shall not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project which the Government of Switzerland or persons under its jurisdiction decides to construct as provided herein, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the United States Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Switzerland or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the United States Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the material so transferred.

C. Each sale of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 shall be subject to the agreement of the parties as to the schedule of deliveries, the form of material to be delivered, charges therefor and the amount of material to be delivered consistent with the quantity limitations established in paragraph B. It is understood and agreed that although the Government of Switzerland will distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 to authorized users in Switzerland, the Government of Switzerland will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 which is purchased from the United States Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title in the United States to uranium enriched in the isotope U-235.

D. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear materials received from the United States of America require reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the United States Commission in either United States Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the United States Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, ex-

cept as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the United States Commission or the facilities acceptable to the United States Commission for reprocessing.

E. With respect to any special nuclear material produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States which are in excess of Switzerland's need for such materials in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or international organizations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

ARTICLE VIII

As may be necessary and as may be mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, and under the limitations set forth in article II, and under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the parties for lease, or sale and purchase, of quantities of material, including heavy water and natural uranium, but not including special nuclear materials, greater than those required for research, when such materials are not available commercially.

ARTICLE IX

A. With respect to any invention or discovery employing information classified when communicated in accordance with article III and made or conceived as a result of such communication during the period of this agreement, the Government of the United States of America with respect to invention or discovery rights owned by it, and the Government of Switzerland with respect to any invention or discovery owned by it or made or conceived by persons under its jurisdiction:

(1) Agree to transfer and assign or cause to be transferred or assigned to the other all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in the country of that other, subject to a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for the governmental purposes of the transferring party;

(2) Shall, upon request of the other, grant or cause to be granted to the other a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for its governmental purposes in the country of the transferring party or third countries, including use in the production of materials in such countries for sale to the requesting party by a contractor of such party;

(3) Agree that each party may otherwise deal with any invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own country or third countries as it may desire, but in no event shall either party discriminate against citizens of the country of the other in respect of granting any license under the patents owned by it in its own or third countries;

(4) Waive any and all claims against the other for compensation, royalty, or award as respects any such invention or discovery, patent application, or patent and releases the other with respect to any such claim.

B. (1) No patent application with respect to any classified invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated under this agreement may be filed by either party or any person in the country of the other party except in accordance with agreed conditions and procedures.

(2) No patent application with respect to any such classified invention or discovery may be filed in any country not a party to this agreement except as may be agreed and subject to article XIII.

(3) Appropriate secrecy or prohibition orders shall be issued for the purpose of giving effect to this paragraph.

ARTICLE X

A. The criteria of security classification established by the United States Commission shall be applicable to all information and material, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement. The United States Commission will keep the Government of Switzerland informed concerning these criteria and any modifications thereof, and the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the practical application of these criteria.

B. It is agreed that all information and material, including equipment and devices, which warrant a classification in accordance with paragraph A of this article shall be safeguarded in accordance with applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America by the United States Commission and the Government at Switzerland.

C. It is agreed that the recipient party of any material, including equipment and devices, and of any classified information under this agreement shall not further disseminate such information or transfer such material, including equipment and devices, to any other country without the written consent of the originating country. It is further agreed that neither party to this agreement will transfer to any other country equipment or device, the transfer of which would involve the disclosure of any classified information received from the other party, without the written consent of such other party.

ARTICLE XI

The Government of Switzerland and the Government of the United States of America affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In the event such an international agency is created:

(1) The parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this agreement for cooperation. In particular, the parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the international agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards, including those relating to health and safety standards, required by the international agency in connection with similar assistance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the international agency.

(2) In the event the parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided in paragraph A of this article, either party may by notification terminate this agreement. In the event this agreement is so terminated, the Government of Switzerland shall return to the United States Commission all unused source and special nuclear materials which were received pursuant to this agreement.

ARTICLE XII

The Government of Switzerland and the Government of the United States of America emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of Switzerland pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

A. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplemented, by agreement of the parties as provided in article XI, by safeguards of the proposed International Atomic Energy Agency, the Government of the United States of

America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

(1) With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any

(i) reactor and
(ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the United States Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards, which are to be made available to the Government of Switzerland or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: Source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission;

(2) With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of Switzerland or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available:

(i) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission,
(ii) reactors,
(iii) any other equipment or device designated by the United States Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this subparagraph A. 2 will apply,

(a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in insuring accountability for such materials; and
(b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of Switzerland or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guarantees set forth in article XIII.

(3) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the United States Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph A. 2 of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in Switzerland and which is not purchased pursuant to article VII, paragraph E. (a) of this agreement, transferred pursuant to article VII, paragraph E. (b) of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the parties;

(4) To designate, after consultation with the Government of Switzerland, personnel who, accompanied, if either party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of Switzerland, shall have access in Switzerland to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph A. 2 of this article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

(5) In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article or the guarantees set forth in article XIII and the failure of the Government of Switzerland to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph A. 2 of this article;

(6) To consult with the Government of Switzerland in the matter of health and safety.

B. The Government of Switzerland undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article.

ARTICLE XIII

A. The Government of Switzerland guarantees that:

(1) The security safeguards and standards prescribed by applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America by the United States Commission and the Government of Switzerland will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

(2) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Switzerland or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this agreement will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

(3) No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of Switzerland or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Switzerland, except as the United States Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation, and then only if the transfer of the material or restricted data is within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the other nation.

B. The Government of the United States of America guarantees that:

(1) The security safeguards and standards prescribed by applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America by the United States Commission and the Government of Switzerland will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

(2) No equipment and devices transferred to the Government of the United States or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this agreement will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

(3) No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the United States of America or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of America, except as the Government of Switzerland may agree to such a transfer to another nation.

ARTICLE XIV

The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications), material, equipment, or devices, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, or device for any particular use or applications.

ARTICLE XV

For the purposes of this agreement:

A. "United States Commission" or "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

B. "Parties" means the Government of Switzerland and the Government of the United States of America, including the United States Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. "party" means one of the above "parties."

C. "Atomic weapons" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and

divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

D. "Byproduct material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

E. "Classified" means a security designation of "confidential" or higher applied, under the laws and regulations of either the Government of Switzerland or the Government of the United States of America, to any data, information, materials, services, or any other matter, and includes "restricted data."

G. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation but does not include the parties to this agreement.

H. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium or thorium.

I. "Restricted data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapon; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of restricted data by the appropriate authority.

J. "Source material" means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Government of Switzerland or the Commission to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the Government of Switzerland or the Commission may determine from time to time.

K. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Government of Switzerland or the Commission determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington in duplicate this — day of —, 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

For the Government of Switzerland:

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE OVER THE PANAMA CANAL AT BALBOA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2673, H. R. 9801.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9801) to authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the proposed legislation is requested by the administration, in conformity with agreements between the United States and the Republic of Panama. The President of the United States is very anxious to have action taken on the bill before he departs for Panama this evening. The bill has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a copy of the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the report (No. 2628) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9801) to authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z., having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

H. R. 9801 is designed to discharge the obligation incurred by the United States under the terms of point 4 of the general relations agreement entered into with the Republic of Panama on May 18, 1942, to construct a tunnel under or a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z.

The bill designates a high-level bridge as more desirable than a tunnel (estimated cost of bridge \$20 million, as against \$38 million for a tunnel) provides that the construction, maintenance, and operation of any such bridge and the approaches thereto should be administered by the Panama Canal Company; and that the expenses of construction, maintenance, and operation of such bridge and the approaches thereto should be treated as extraordinary expenses incurred through a directive based on national policy and not related to the operations of the Panama Canal Company.

Section 2 of the bill authorizes and directs the Panama Canal Company to construct, or to cause to be constructed, and to maintain and operate a high-level bridge, including approaches, over the Panama Canal, at Balboa, C. Z.

Section 3 authorizes the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

The commitment to build the bridge or tunnel at Balboa was made in connection with the agreement entered into in 1942 by this country as part of the consideration for the grant by Panama of the use of defense sites within that country during World War II. Delay in implementing this agreement, the Department of State has reported, has occasioned charges of bad faith and has become a source of friction with the Republic of Panama, even though the committee has received assurances from a reliable source that the present ferry and swing bridge are adequate to handle any foreseeable future passenger and automobile traffic. The matter was taken up again, at the instance of Panama, in discussions leading to the treaty with the Republic of Panama approved by the United States Senate in July 1955. During those discussions this Government agreed to seek the required authorizing legislation and appropriations for construction of the bridge.

Enactment of this bill would seem to be desirable, therefore, as a means of improving relations between this country and the Republic of Panama.

The Panama Canal Company, in its report on the bill emphasized—

"It is considered important that a declaration such as that contained in section I be included in the proposed legislation since the construction of the proposed bridge is not necessary to the operations of the Company but, rather, is the result of national policy considerations involving general relations with Panama."

The General Accounting Office report, opposes treatment of costs of the bridge, and so forth, as extraordinary expenses not related to the operations of the canal, and recommends that all costs of maintenance, operation, and depreciation, be recovered through tolls.

This committee feels, however, that the bill should be enacted in its present form. The official reports are appended.

There are no changes in existing law.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 9, 1956.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I refer to your letter of July 5, 1956, in which you requested the views and recommendations of the Department relative to H. R. 9801, a bill to authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z., which upon passage in the House of Representatives has been referred to your committee in the Senate.

The reference bill would authorize the carrying out of a commitment originally undertaken by this Government in 1942 as part of the consideration for the grant by Panama of the use of defense sites within her jurisdiction in World War II. The delay by this Government in acting upon this undertaking in the postwar years, however justifiable, has subjected this Government to charges of bad faith and the matter became a source of friction in relations with Panama. Therefore, in the memorandum of understandings reached, signed with Panama in January 1955, this Government agreed to seek the necessary authorizing legislation and appropriations for the construction of the bridge referred to in the 1942 undertaking.

It is the view of the Department that the carrying out of this commitment will remove a long-standing irritant in our relations with Panama and will contribute significantly to the improvement and strengthening of these relations. The Department accordingly recommends prompt and favorable action by the Senate on H. R. 9801.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State.)

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY, July 9, 1956.
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I have your request for a report on H. R. 9801, a bill to authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z.

The general relations agreement between the United States and Panama effected by an exchange of notes signed at Washington on May 18, 1942 (Executive Agreement Series 452, 59 Stat. 1289), contained a number of commitments on the part of the United States, most of which have been fulfilled. The agreement was related to, and was, in effect, the counterpart of, an agreement covering the lease of defense sites signed at Panama on the same date (Executive Agreement Series 359, 57 Stat. 1232). Provision for the carrying out of certain of the com-

mitments was made by a joint resolution approved May 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 74).

Point 4 of the 1942 agreement concerning the construction of a tunnel or bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z., is one of the few remaining commitments which have not yet been fulfilled. Point 4 of the 1942 agreement reads as follows:

"4. The construction of a tunnel or bridge to allow transit under or over the canal at Balboa.—The Government of the United States is well aware of the importance to the Government and the people of Panama of constant and rapid communication across the Panama Canal at Balboa and is willing to agree to the construction of a tunnel under or a bridge over the canal at that point, when the present emergency has ended. Pending the carrying out of this project, the Government of the United States will give urgent attention, consistent with the exigencies of the present emergency, to improving the present ferry service."

Item 5 of the memorandum of understandings reached, accompanying the recently ratified 1955 treaty with Panama, assures Panama that legislative authorization and the necessary appropriations will be sought for the construction of a bridge at Balboa referred to in point 4 of the general relations agreement of 1942.

H. R. 9801 would authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a high-level bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z., in accordance with the 1942 and 1955 agreements.

The cost of such a bridge is estimated at \$20 million and is recommended as compared to a tunnel under the canal which would cost an estimated \$38 million. The planning and execution of the project would, of course, be covered in the annual budget programs of the company.

Section 1 of H. R. 9801 would provide that the expenses of construction, maintenance, and operation of the bridge and approaches thereto should be treated as extraordinary expenses of the Panama Canal Company incurred through a directive based on national policy and not related to the operations of the Company. This language relates to the provisions in the Panama Canal Company Act (pars. (b) and (d) of section 246 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code (62 Stat. 1076, 64 Stat. 1041)) which have the effect of excluding the amount of such expenditures from the net direct (interest-bearing) investment of the United States in the Panama Canal Company.

It is considered important that a declaration such as that contained in section 1 be included in the proposed legislation since the construction of the proposed bridge is not necessary to the operations of the Company but, rather, is the result of national policy considerations involving general relations with Panama.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report but that it recommends that the committee consider amending the bill to provide for recovery by the Panama Canal Company, through tolls or other charges, of the costs of operation and maintenance, including depreciation, of the proposed bridge.

Sincerely,

W. M. WHITMAN, *Secretary.*

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 9, 1956.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and
Foreign Commerce,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of July 5, 1956, acknowledged July 6, requests our comments upon H. R. 9801 which provides for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a high-level bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa by the Panama Canal Company.

At the present time the Canal Zone Government has jurisdiction over and responsibility for roads, streets, and highways in the Canal Zone. It is our view that the bridge authorized by H. R. 9801 should be constructed and maintained by the Canal Zone Government rather than by the Panama Canal Company.

Under the bill the expenses of construction, maintenance, and operation of the proposed bridge and its approaches would be treated as extraordinary expenses incurred through a directive based upon national policy and not related to the operation of the Panama Canal Company. We disagree with such a concept. The net costs of operation and maintenance of the existing ferry system are recovered through tolls collected from vessels utilizing the canal. We are of the view that the canal enterprise should be self-sustaining. The need for the bridge is a direct result of the construction of the canal bisecting the Republic of Panama and should involve no burden upon the United States taxpayers. This would be accomplished if the bridge were to be constructed and maintained by the Canal Zone Government because the Company is required to reimburse the Treasury annually for the net cost of Canal Zone Government, including depreciation. Thus the Panama Canal Company would recover through tolls and other charges all expenses relating to the new bridge.

We also recommend that the act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 388, 2 Canal Zone Code 341), be repealed as of the date the high-level bridge is placed in operation. That bridge will eliminate the need for and expenses of operation of the present ferry service and probably will eliminate the need for the continued operation of Mirofiores swing bridge. The Panama Canal Company operating reports indicate that the cost of operating this swing bridge together with the operating costs of the ferry system amount to approximately \$700,000 annually.

We assume that the Bureau of Public Roads has or will be requested to furnish your committee with its recommendations concerning the proposed bridge and the desirability and feasibility of integrating that bridge and its approaches into the Inter-American Highway System.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

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

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 542 TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2679, Senate Resolution 73.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 73) as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 542) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner" now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient

to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD excerpts from the committee report.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (No. 2634) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to refer S. 542, a bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner, to the Court of Claims for findings of fact and conclusions thereon sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

S. 542 authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a claim to the Trust Association of H. Kempner, of Galveston, Tex., in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for reimbursement for losses sustained by the claimant as the result of the sale of cotton by assignors of the trust association to certain mills in Germany during the years 1923 and 1924.

Senate Resolution 73 would refer S. 542 and the accompanying papers to the Court of Claims for findings of fact and conclusions thereon sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, due to the claimant from the United States.

In view of the long pendency of this matter before the Congress, and the dispute concerning the facts giving rise to the claim, the committee believes it would be advisable to refer the matter to a forum much better equipped than is the Congress to sift through the conflicting statements and make appropriate recommendations. These recommendations would then be presented to the Congress and, if the claim is determined to be valid in any amount, legislation could be introduced authorizing payment in the amount determined to be due the claimant.

On certain of these claims, the claim amounts mentioned in your letter of December 27 are 3 to 4 percent in excess of the amounts reflected by our records. This applies to the claims against Hornschuch, Kempton, Laurenz, Leutze, and Stadtbach. We assume that this discrepancy is due to a difference in the computation of interest or otherwise, but incline to the view that we should stand upon the amounts set forth in the presentation made to the United States Senate in connection with the earlier bill which we think are approximately correct, unless there is sound reason for altering the amounts therein claimed. We have, however, checked our records again in connection with these claims, and submit herein the results thereof.

Reviewing these claims in detail, as suggested by you, the following appears from our records:

1. Bayerlein: As stated by you, our claim was for \$110,025.87, with interest from June 30, 1929. Judgment was obtained in the lower court for \$100,830, with interest from September 11, 1931, at 7 percent. On appeal by Bayerlein during the Hitler regime, the higher court (Oberlandes-Gericht) upheld the appeal and reversed the decision of the lower court.

2. Forchheim: Our claim was for \$71,471.69, with interest from June 30, 1929. On appeal

to the higher court, judgment was obtained for the full amount of the claim, which was later compromised for RM201,000, which amount was paid to the Deutsche Bank, and though promised me by Dr. Schacht the exportation of the dollars at the gold rate was denied.

3. Hornschuch: According to our records our claim was for \$13,802.03, rather than \$14,287.78, stated by you. As stated by you, litigation herein resulted in dismissal of this suit in the German courts on a technicality.

4. Kempten: Our records show this claim as being for \$117,591.48, instead of \$121,728.27. The Spinner claimed forged signatures, but no cooperation was obtainable from civil or criminal authorities.

5. Kolbermoor: Our claim was for \$163,309.44, with interest from June 30, 1929, at 7 percent. After rejection by the lower court, the Supreme Court (Peichsgericht) found in our favor and remanded the case for determination of certain negligible features. Before decision by the Supreme Court on a subsequent appeal, Kolbermoor compromised the case, and paid RM290,000, the equivalent of \$112,375—the compromise basis—at the gold rate of exchange to the Deutsche Bank, under agreement from the Control Office for Foreign Exchange, to transfer RM190,000 into dollars and transfer same to the credit of H. Kempner in the United States at the rate of RM10,000 per month, based on the gold rate of exchange. A total of \$46,962.65, being the equivalent of RM120,000, was actually transferred to the United States for our credit at an average rate of 39.13, before remittances were stopped. The balance of RM170,000 remaining on deposit with the Deutsche Bank.

6. Kuchen: Our claims were for \$39,142.91, with 7 percent interest from June 30, 1929. Suits were commenced, but a compromise was arranged on the basis of \$12,489, which was to be paid into the Deutsche Bank in the form of RM31,698.01. Actual payments to the Deutsche Bank by Kuchen were only RM31,323.26, which was to be transferred to the United States in dollars at the gold mark rate in monthly installments of RM10,000. This RM31,323.26 ultimately was transferred into dollars—even though the Kolbermoor transfer was not complete—and realized \$11,445.

7. Kulmbacher: Our claim was for \$223,937.12, with 7 percent interest from June 30, 1929. Judgment was entered in the higher court for \$211,579.47, and Kulmbacher's appeal to the Supreme Court was dismissed. Kulmbacher paid into the Deutsche Bank RM927,007.36, but no part of this amount was transferred into dollars or to the United States for our credit.

8. Laurenz: Our records show our claim was for \$18,703.39, instead of the \$19,432.02 mentioned by you. As in the Kempten case, the Spinner claimed forged signatures, and no cooperation was obtainable from German civil or criminal authorities, and no legal action taken.

9. Leutze: Our records show our claim was \$98,462.29, in place of the \$101,743.94 mentioned by you. Though suit was filed herein, Leutze arranged a compromise, and in pursuance thereof paid RM215,000 to the Deutsche Bank to our credit. No portion of this sum was converted into dollars or transferred to the United States for our credit.

10. Schoen: Our claim was for \$253,206.55, with interest at 7 percent from June 30, 1929. Apparently due to lack of understanding of the nature of the futures transactions by the lawyers or the courts, the suits were rejected by the trial court and appeal refused.

11. Stadtbach: Our records show this claim to have been for \$127,619.80, rather than your figure of \$132,222.30, with interest at 7 percent from June 30, 1929. The trial court rendered judgment in our favor for

\$5,763.50; on appeal, this amount was raised to \$8,911.25, and interest from August 1, 1924. In addition, another suit resulted in a judgment for RM7,836.69, with 4 percent interest from July 29, 1938. However, Stadtbach only paid into the Deutsche Bank a total of RM18,247.58 for our account.

The amount of our claim against this Spinner was reduced by the claim of Stadtbach that orders had been given to our agent which he did not transmit to us. On account of the death of our agent we were unable to disprove this claim.

These various judgments, compromises, and payments resulted in the payment to the Deutsche Bank of—

Forchheim.....	RM201,000.00
Kolbermoor.....	290,000.00
Kuchen.....	31,323.26
Kulmbacher.....	927,007.36
Leutze.....	215,000.00
Stadtbach.....	18,247.58
Total.....	1,682,578.20
Refunds of bonds and the like produced.....	45,546.69

Or a total of..... 1,728,124.89

The actual dollar transfers to us were:

Dollars transferred:	
Kolbermoor.....	\$46,962.65
Kuchen.....	11,445.00
Total.....	58,407.65

Marks converted:

Kolbermoor.....	RM120,000.00
Kuchen.....	31,323.26

Total marks converted into dollar transfers..... 151,323.26

Total marks not converted..... 1,576,801.63

In a desperate effort to finally realize something out of these unconverted marks, a portion was used as a very low exchange and barter rate of 4 to 5 cents per mark for ocean freights, barter transactions, and sales at a very low rate of exchange as follows:

Ocean freight on shipments....	RM18,595.68
Barter transactions.....	319,243.35
Sold.....	750,000.00
Total.....	1,087,839.03

Leaving on deposit with the Deutsche Bank.... 488,962.00

In this calculation, certain credits of interest by the Deutsche Bank have been ignored, as well as, contra, traveling expenses of firm members paid out of such accounts while in Germany. These respective amounts were similar and were treated as offsetting one another.

In this connection, we have received advice from the Disconto Bank, Bremen, which succeeded to the Deutsche Bank accounts, that the former balances have now been revalued in deutschemarks, under which we now have a credit with the Disconto Bank of DM23,637.40 in blocked account, and a similar sum of DM23,637.40 in free account.

In presenting this data and figures it can be seen that we did not voluntarily or willingly invest funds in Germany for the sake of profit as others were doing before the war. We were practically forced by the Nazi regime out of the picture by a united and concerted effort and combination of the spinners to avoid payment resulting in a denial of justice even though as I have stated to you in person on many occasions that Dr. Schacht, then Minister of Finance and President of the Reichsbank, had promised preferential treatment and conversion of the marks into dollars at the gold mark rate. Dr. Schacht had stated to me also at that time that he could do nothing until judgments

were rendered, and that I could expect little justice from the courts as then constituted. You also know that the State Department under several of our Ambassadors in Berlin were thoroughly cognizant of these claims and used every effort to be of assistance to us.

Yours truly,

D. D. KEMPNER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution (S. Res. 73) was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE SAN ANGELO FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2651, S. 3728.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3728) to provide for the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, S. 3728 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct the San Angelo Federal reclamation project on the Concho River, a tributary of the Colorado River of Texas. The project is located in Tom Green County, in central Texas, about 200 miles northwest of Austin and San Antonio, and about the same distance southwest of Fort Worth.

It is a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to explain this project to the Senate, since it represents a substantial step forward in the reclamation program, which has contributed so much to the development of the West and to the economic stability of the country as a whole.

Texas has been a reclamation State for half a century. Its members of the Senate and the House of Representatives have consistently supported the reclamation program, both as to authorizations of new projects in the other 16 reclamation States and in securing programs for the planning, construction, and operation of reclamation developments.

Although contributing this support and having actually and potentially an extensive irrigable area, as well as potentially vast irrigable lands, the State of Texas has shared very little in authorizations and appropriations under the reclamation program. Therefore, Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to explain the San Angelo project, which has been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

I call attention to report No. 2608 accompanying the bill—which gives a detailed explanation of the project and the authorization.

Attached to this document is a report on the San Angelo project by the Acting

Commissioner of Reclamation, dated June 29, 1956, approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Frederick A. Seaton, a former member of this body. This is unquestionably a favorable report on the physical, hydrological, and financial aspects of the San Angelo project.

Also attached to the report is a letter dated July 16, 1956, from the Honorable Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, which reiterates the favorable findings in the previous report approved by the Secretary. This report also gives considerable detail which emphasizes the favorable aspects of the proposed development. Assistant Secretary, Aandahl's letter states, and I quote:

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there will be no objection to the submission of this report.

The people of the city of San Angelo, which will repay more than 50 percent of the cost, voted 7 to 1 in favor of the project. The city of San Angelo, through a water service corporation, will repay not only the costs allocated to the municipal water supply, but will also pay interest on this allocation. The municipal water users will also pay a substantial part of the irrigation costs beyond the ability of the water users to repay. The irrigators have indicated their willingness to pay something like \$10 an acre for water service and this is recognized as a repayment.

I point with particular pride to the fact that the benefit-cost ratio of the San Angelo project, any way it is figured, ranks with or is above the average of any reclamation project that has been authorized during my service in the Senate. Over a 100-year period, the benefit-cost ratio is 2.44 to 1, and over a 50-year period, the benefit-cost ratio is 2.26 to 1. The precedents for the substantial allocations to municipal water include projects like the Santa Barbara or Cachuma in California, the Lewiston Orchards project in Idaho, and the Provo River project in Utah, which supplies supplemental municipal water for the city of Salt Lake without any interest charge.

The San Angelo project will control flash floods on the Concho River which have wreaked great damage in the past. The district engineer, of the Corps of Engineers estimates the annual benefits at nearly \$400,000. Under the method used by the Bureau of Reclamation for computing cost allocations to flood control, the figure of \$10,500,000 or \$10,740,000 allocated to this nonreimbursable purpose is exceedingly conservative.

Ample precedent also exists for the allocation of \$3,440,000 to fish and wildlife purposes. Both fish and wildlife and recreation potentials of the Concho are clearly of national significance.

With my colleague from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who cosponsored S. 3728, I express my appreciation to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which gave thorough consideration to the San Angelo project before recommending its authorization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the

question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the San Angelo Federal reclamation project, Texas, for the principal purposes of furnishing water for the irrigation of approximately 10,000 acres of land in Tom Green County and municipal, domestic, and industrial use, controlling floods, providing recreation and fish and wildlife benefits, and controlling silt. The principal engineering features of said project shall be a dam and reservoir at or near the Twin Buttes site, outlet works at the existing Nasworthy Dam, and necessary canals, drains, and related works.

Sec. 2. (a) In constructing, operating, and maintaining the San Angelo project, the Secretary shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except as is otherwise provided in this act.

(b) Actual construction of the project shall not be commenced, and no construction contract therefor shall be awarded, until a contract or contracts complying with the provisions of this act have been entered into for payment of those portions of the construction cost of the project which are allocated to irrigation and to municipal, domestic, and industrial water.

(c) In furnishing water for irrigation and for municipal, domestic, and industrial uses from the project, the Secretary shall charge rates with the object of returning to the United States over a period of not more than 40 years, exclusive of any development period for irrigation, all of the costs incurred by it in constructing, operating, and maintaining the project which the Secretary finds to be properly allocable to the purposes aforesaid and of interest on the unamortized balance of the portion of the construction cost which is allocated to municipal, domestic, and industrial water. Said interest shall be at the average rate, which rate shall be certified by the Secretary of the Treasury, paid by the United States on its marketable long-term securities outstanding on the date of this act. When all of the said costs allocable to said purpose incurred by the United States in constructing, operating, and maintaining the project, together with the said interest on the said unamortized balance, have been returned to the United States, the contracting organization or organizations which have thus reimbursed the United States shall have a permanent right to use that portion of the storage space and the project thus allocable to said uses.

(d) Any contract entered into under section 9, subsection (d), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1193, 43 U. S. C. 485h (d)) for payment of those portions of the costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining the project which are allocated to irrigation and assigned to be paid by the contracting organization may provide for repayment of the portion of the construction cost of the project assigned to any project contract unit or, if the contract unit be divided into two or more irrigation blocks, to any such block over the period specified in said section 9, subsection (d), or as near thereto as is consistent with the adoption and operation of a variable payment formula which, being based on full repayment within said period under normal conditions, permits variance in the required annual payments in the light of economic factors pertinent to the ability of the irrigators to pay.

(e) Contracts relating to municipal, domestic, and industrial water supply may be entered into without regard to the last sentence of section 9, subsection (c), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and such

contracts may recognize the relative priorities of domestic, municipal, industrial, and irrigational uses.

(f) Upon request of a contracting organization, the Secretary may at any time and shall after payment of the reimbursable costs of the project has been completed transfer to the requesting organization, or to another organization designated by it and satisfactory to him, the care, operation, and maintenance of any project works which serve the requesting organization and do not serve any other contracting organization. The care, operation, and maintenance of project works which serve two or more contracting organizations may or shall, as the case may be, be transferred in like circumstances to an organization satisfactory to all of said organizations and to the Secretary. Any transfer made pursuant to the authority of this section shall be upon terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary, and the works transferred shall be operated and maintained without further expense to the United States. If the transferred works serve a flood control or fish and wildlife function, they shall be operated and maintained in accordance with regulations with respect thereto prescribed by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior, respectively, and upon failure so to operate or maintain them they shall, upon demand, be returned immediately to the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 3. The Secretary is authorized to construct minimum basic recreational facilities at the Twin Buttes reservoir and to operate and maintain or arrange for the operation and maintenance of the same. The costs of constructing, operating, and maintaining such facilities, and like costs of the San Angelo project allocated to flood control and to the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife shall, except as is otherwise provided in this act, be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the reclamation laws. The Secretary shall upon conclusion of a suitable agreement with a qualified agency and subject to such conditions as may be set forth in the repayment contracts, permit said agency to construct, operate, and maintain additional public recreational facilities and parks in connection with the project to the extent determined by the Secretary to be consistent with its primary purposes and subject to terms and conditions satisfactory to him.

Sec. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the works authorized by this act \$30 million plus such additional amounts, if any, as may be required by reason of changes in the costs of construction of the types involved in the San Angelo project as shown by engineering indices. There are also authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be required for the operation and maintenance of said works.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which S. 3728 was passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

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

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nominations under the heading "New Reports" on the Executive Calendar.

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

The nominations will be stated.

ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Kermit H. Hansen, of Iowa, to be Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Regular Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Regular Air Force be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nominations.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE PRESIDENT TO INVITE STATES AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES TO PARTICIPATE IN UNITED STATES WORLD TRADE FAIR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask

unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2654, Senate Joint Resolution 194. There are on the calendar 5 or 6 non-controversial measures coming from the Foreign Relations Committee, and if any statement is desired in connection with them the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] will be glad to make it.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 194) authorizing the President to invite the States and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 194) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized, by proclamation or in such other manner as he may deem proper, to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair, to be held at the Coliseum, New York City, N. Y., from April 14 to April 27, 1957, inclusive, and in the Oklahoma Semicentennial Celebration to be held in various communities in the State of Oklahoma from January 1 to December 31, 1957, inclusive, especially during America's New Frontiers Exposition in Oklahoma City, June 14 through July 7, 1957, inclusive, for the purpose of exhibiting textiles, upholstery fabrics, clothing, fashions, furs, footwear, haberdashery, and clothing accessories; furniture, home furnishings and interior decorations, carpets and floor coverings, lamps and lighting fixtures; china, glassware, ceramics, leather goods, luggage and travel requisites, handicrafts, gifts, and fancy goods, jewelry, gold and silverware, flatware, cutlery, clocks, and watches, perfumery, cosmetics and toilet articles, smokers requisites, works of art and religious articles; hardware, housewares, home electrical appliances, sewing machines, lawn, garden and light agricultural equipment, sporting goods, camping equipment, sports marine equipment and boats, bicycles and motorcycles, binoculars, photographic and cinema equipment and accessories, toys, musical instruments, radio and television equipment and electro-acoustical equipment; foodstuffs, confections, beverages and tobacco; office equipment, business machines, typewriters, stationery, printing materials, art materials, advertising materials and specialties, books and publications; building materials and supplies, mill and factory supplies, electronic equipment, scientific instruments, precision tools, small power tools, plumbing, electrical equipment and motors, automotive accessories and parts; and basic materials; steel, aluminum, copper, brass, plastics, chemicals, rubber, petroleum products, etc.; and the promotion of travel, tourism, and transportation; and for the purpose of bringing together buyers and sellers for the promotion of foreign and domestic trade and commerce in such products and services

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to Senate Joint Resolution 194 and that the vote by which it was passed be reconsidered, so that House Joint Resolution 604 may be substituted for Senate Joint Resolution 194.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 604) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 604) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I now move that Senate Joint Resolution 194 be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

PARTICIPATION IN THE AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDHOOD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2656, Senate Joint Resolution 195.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 195) to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the American International Institution for the Protection of Childhood, and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

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

There being no objection, the resolution (S. J. Res. 195) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Public Resolution 31 approved May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. 487), as revised by section 1 (a) of Public Law 806, approved September 21, 1950 (64 Stat. 902), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That in order to meet the obligations of the United States as a member of the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State such sums, not to exceed \$25,000 per annum, as may be necessary for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Institute, as apportioned in accordance with the statutes of the Institute."

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2657, Senate Joint Resolution 183.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A 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.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 183) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

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 11th 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.

The preamble was agreed to.

PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2659, S. 3858.

THE PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

THE CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 3858) to amend the act of June 28, 1935, authorizing participation in the Interparliamentary Union.

THE PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act of June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 425), as amended (22 U. S. C. 276), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That an appropriation of \$33,000 annually is hereby authorized, \$18,000 of which shall be for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration; and \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, such appropriation to be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the President and the Executive Secretary of the American group."

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NIAGARA FRONTIER PORT AUTHORITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate pro-

ceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2660, Senate Joint Resolution 145.

THE PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

THE CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) granting the consent of Congress to the State of New York to negotiate and enter into an agreement or compact with the Dominion of Canada for the establishment of the Niagara Frontier Port Authority with power to take over, maintain, and operate the present highway bridge over the Niagara River between the city of Buffalo, N. Y., and the city of Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada.

THE PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "Dominion" and insert "Government", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress hereby consents to the negotiation and entering into a compact or agreement between the State of New York and the Government of Canada providing for (1) the establishment of the Niagara Frontier Port Authority substantially in accordance with the provisions of chapter 870 of the laws of 1955 of the State of New York as amended or supplemented; (2) the transfer of the operation, control, and maintenance of the present highway bridge (the Peace Bridge) over the Niagara River between the city of Buffalo, N. Y., and the city of Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada, to the Niagara Frontier Port Authority; (3) the transfer of all of the property, rights, powers, and duties of the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority acquired by such authority under the compact consented to by the Congress in Public Resolution 22 of the 73d Congress, approved May 3, 1934 (48 Stat. 662), to the Niagara Frontier Port Authority; and (4) the consolidation of the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority with the Niagara Frontier Port Authority and the termination of the corporate existence of the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Authority.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this joint resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the State of New York to negotiate and enter into an agreement or compact with the Government of Canada for the establishment of the Niagara Frontier Port Authority with power to take over, maintain, and operate the present highway bridge over the Niagara River between the city of Buffalo, N. Y., and the city of Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 145, granting the consent of Congress to the State of New York to negotiate and enter into an agreement or compact with the Dominion of Canada for the establishment of the Niagara Fort Erie Port Authority with power to take over, main-

tain, and operate the present highway bridge over the Niagara River between the city of Buffalo, N. Y., and the city of Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada.

The House has passed House Joint Resolution 549, an identical resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 145 be reconsidered, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 549.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Without objection, the vote by which the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 145 is reconsidered; and the chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from the House of Representatives.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 549) granting the consent of Congress to the State of New York to negotiate and enter into an agreement or compact with the Government of Canada for the establishment of the Niagara Frontier Port Authority with power to take over, maintain, and operate the present highway bridge over the Niagara River between the city of Buffalo, N. Y., and the city of Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada, was read twice by its title.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House joint resolution.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 549) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 145 be indefinitely postponed.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 145 is indefinitely postponed.

EXPENSES OF THE PAN-AMERICAN GAMES, CLEVELAND, OHIO, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 2661, Senate Joint Resolution 186.

THE PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) authorizing an appropriation for expenses of the Pan-American games, to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959.

THE PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the figures "\$5,000,000", to strike out "to the Secretary of State to be expended at his discretion" and insert "for III Pan American Games (1959)". The said appropriation shall be available, and in line 9, after the numerals "1959", to insert "and shall be expended in the discretion of the organization sponsoring said games, subject to such audit as may

be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$5,000,000 for III Pan American games (1959). The said appropriation shall be available for the purpose of promoting and insuring the success of the Pan American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959 and shall be expended in the discretion of the organization sponsoring said games, subject to such audit as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, July 23, immediately after the close of morning business, there be a call from the beginning, of measures on the calendar, to which there is no objection.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that as soon as there is a ye and nay vote on the Hoffman nomination, the Senate will resume the consideration of the executive pay bill, the unfinished business. It is hoped we may be able to pass that bill early in the day, and then proceed to the consideration of the mutual security appropriation bill.

NOMINATION OF PAUL G. HOFFMAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Paul G. Hoffman to be a representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, a very important matter is being considered by the Subcommittee on Investigations. I have been requested by both the chairman and the next ranking Republican Member to be present at the meeting.

While there was unanimous consent that I might have the floor this morning, I think I am obligated to return to the Investigations Subcommittee and work with them on the matter which is now under consideration. So, notwithstanding the unanimous consent agreement, I yield the floor.

I may say to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, who now occupies the Chair as the President pro tempore, that I was very happy to read in the newspapers this morning of the wonderful tribute which he received last night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thanks the Senator from Wisconsin.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Paul G. Hoffman to be a representative of the United States of America to the 11th Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations?

It is the Chair's understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] waived his rights to the floor, which he had.

The yeas and nays have been ordered on this question, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Chair if the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to say just a few words about Mr. Hoffman before the vote is taken.

I have known Mr. Hoffman for a long period of years. I have no personal feeling against him. My personal associations with him over the years have always been pleasant. However, he is now being proposed as a delegate to the United Nations, representing my country. That post, in these critical times, is a very vital one and a very important one from the point of view of my country. I think, therefore, that I have, and I think that every American citizen and every Senator has, the right to expect that there would be selected from the great reservoir of manpower and womanpower—or perhaps it would be better stated if I said humanpower—in the United States a person who is a non-controversial figure, one who has not made statements that are open to double interpretation, as a delegate to the United Nations in whom people could have complete confidence.

During the last few years, some of Mr. Hoffman's statements and actions, for example, as an official of The Fund for the Republic, have led me to wonder what he would do on some of the great questions vital to the United States which may come before the United Nations. In a recent speech he made statements in which he refers to a new procedure by which a group of Americans having no judicial status may pass judgment on the loyalties of fellow citizens and termed them "a new form of Ku Klux Klanism." This is an indictment of our congressional and executive system of investigating persons who have questionable loyalty to the United States, or are possible security risks. I deplore this attitude on the part of a person who is proposed for this important post.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to go into details on which I could elaborate. My objections are not based on any personal like or dislike, but are based purely on my lack of confidence in a man who is to represent my country in a vital, critical period in world history. As a result of his own record, as a result of his own statements in the last few years I have a grave question about his fitness to represent my country in the post for which he is nominated. Therefore, when the roll is called, I shall cast my vote against the confirmation of Paul Hoffman as a delegate to the United Nations.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thought I had heard just about everything in the way of strange debate. I listened yesterday to the debate on the confirmation of Paul Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman has been recognized nationally and internationally as a truly great industrialist, as an able representative, both at home and abroad, of our democratic, free-enterprise capitalistic system, headed the great Studebaker Corp., was chairman of the fine progressive Committee on Economic Development, of which one of the leaders was our own colleague the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]; proved to be right about an expanding American economy based on our capitalistic system; and yet I heard statements made that this man was in some way or somehow now charged as being too pink or too leftist or too much of a dupe for communism to be trusted to represent these great United States in the United Nations.

One Senator who spoke against Mr. Hoffman seemed to associate him with the Stockholm peace petition, which he charged led to the conference of the Big Four at the summit. I did not know there was any Stockholm Peace Pact organization, but I do know the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, first advanced the idea of a conference at the summit; and I certainly know no Member of the Senate would believe that the Senator from Georgia was friendly in any way or degree toward communism. Certainly, President Eisenhower's decision to go to the conference at the summit would not mean the President was duped by Communist propaganda, such as the remarks I heard yesterday on the floor would infer, if one would have carried them to their final analysis. Mr. Hoffman led our country in the development of the Marshall plan, which resulted in destroying the Communist opportunities to take, without a struggle, the cockpit of Western European civilization, by building up and strengthening the capitalistic resources of Western Europe. It caused the Communists to have their greatest reverse in history. Certainly, therefore, it is difficult to understand why anyone should follow Fulton Lewis or anybody else who would cast reflection or doubt of loyalty in any degree upon a truly great American.

I cannot understand what we are coming to when the confirmation of the man who is considered as being most responsible for President Eisenhower's decision to run for the Presidency of the

United States is fought because of radio or television speeches which happened to be made by some commentator.

It seems to me that we are approaching a point of being ridiculous when the spreading of rumors, the spreading of doubt, the spreading of fear against good Americans—in this case, against a man whose whole record dignifies him as being one of the most outstanding advocates of democracy, liberty, freedom, capitalism, and all the other things we associate with the American way of life—can result in the making of charges on this floor that the one whose nomination is under consideration is virtually a fellow traveler and/or a dupe of Communist propaganda.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for confirmation of the nomination of Paul Hoffman, because I know his record. I know of the successful fight he has made against communism—the successful fight he has made to defeat it in the true American way, namely, to relieve the conditions of hunger, chaos, unemployment which create communism.

Certainly, the only thing I know of, which could be used as the basis of a charge to be leveled against Mr. Hoffman, is the fact that he believes, as I believe, in freedom of speech under the Constitution of the United States. When the Founding Fathers declared that the United States should have freedom of speech, they meant that Americans would tolerate the views of those with whose positions they might disagree.

Certainly, Mr. President, we do not expect to hear our particular ideas echoed by everyone, if we truly believe in freedom of speech. That great guaranty—which guarantees to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], and to Fulton Lewis the right of freedom of speech—also guarantees to Paul Hoffman the right of freedom of speech.

When the belief in the right of freedom of speech in the United States would be used as the basis of an effort to destroy a man—because, Mr. President, that is what the Senate would do if it were to put a veto, so to speak, on President Eisenhower's nomination of Paul Hoffman; that would destroy him; it would convict him of being a fellow traveler—I, for one, do not intend to forsake the Constitution and the guaranties it gives us in connection with our basic freedoms, regardless of whether they involve high government policy or low government policy.

Certainly no Member of the Senate should use his disagreement with Hoffman's views as a means of destroying and defeating a man who has been chosen by the President of the United States to represent the United States of America in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I sit in this Chamber honored to represent, in part, the State of California in the Senate of the United States. During the years that I have had the honor of serving here, I have endeavored, as an American, to be of assistance to the President of the United States, particularly

in the field of foreign policy and in connection with the defense measures which he has recommended for the people of the United States.

I do not think any Member of the Senate has a greater friend in his fellow colleague from his State than I do, representing California, in the friendship I have, and which I cherish, for my California colleague, who has been honored by the Republican Members of the Senate as their leader, and who has been honored by the people of California again and again and again. I know that Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle are particularly proud to have been able unanimously to confirm the nomination of the Senator from California, WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, as one of the United States delegates to the General Assembly of the United Nations. I am particularly proud because even those who, on occasion, may disagree with BILL KNOWLAND, know him as one of unquestioned integrity, great ability, and solid patriotism, one who is highly qualified to represent the people of the United States in the deliberations of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I look across the aisle to where a very able and outstanding Democratic Senator from Minnesota has his seat. There have been occasions on which I have disagreed—and violently—with the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], but no one questions his patriotism or his Americanism, nor, indeed, his ability.

He will bring to the delegation to the United Nations his own considered judgment, acting, I am sure, in accordance with the best interests of the Government of the United States, under American foreign policy of the President of the United States.

The Senate has unanimously confirmed all the nominations to the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations except one. We are now about to vote upon the nomination by President Eisenhower of Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, of California. The nomination of Mr. Hoffman was unanimously approved by the Foreign Relations Committee.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I feel somewhat recreant for not having said anything as yet about my colleagues who have been honored by being appointed to perform this very important duty. I wish to associate myself with the fine things which my friend from California has said about the distinguished minority leader. I have never known a more honorable or better man. He is a man of fine character and generous instincts—the kind of man I would like to have as trustee for my daughters. I have great admiration for him.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is one of the ablest Members of this body. He is one of the finest speakers in the land. He has a social consciousness which will enable him to make a great contribution to all freedom-loving people throughout the world.

I think the President is to be commended, and the Foreign Relations Com-

mittee is to be commended, for having men of this character and quality representing our Nation. So long as we have men of this type serving in these important positions, I shall have no fear.

I commend the Senator from California for the statements he has made. I only regret that I had not spoken earlier.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend very much.

We are about to vote on the nomination of Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, of California, to be a member of the American delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations. As is their right, certain Members of the Senate have stood on this floor and objected to that nomination. As is their right, some have objected vigorously and violently. I do not know Mr. Hoffman very well. His views and mine do not coincide on many public questions.

I do know that he was nominated by the President of the United States who, incidentally, has been unjustly and venomously abused on too many occasions by some Americans which, I suppose, is their right.

I do know that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is composed of magnificent Americans who come from both sides of the aisle. Let me read the list of members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which unanimously approved this nomination.

First, the chairman is the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], known affectionately as Mr. Senate.

On the Democratic side of the aisle there are THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, of Rhode Island; J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama; HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana; WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon; and RUSSELL B. LONG, of Louisiana.

On this side of the aisle the members are: ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin; H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey; BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa; WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota; WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California; GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont; and HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana.

From that committee, after a hearing, there came the unanimous endorsement of this nomination. Like most other Members of the Senate, I have received communications denouncing the nomination of Mr. Hoffman.

From the very beginning, as I say, I have attempted to assist this administration. I go back to the early days of 1953, when one of the first recommendations by the President of the United States to represent this Nation in a country abroad was objected to by some of my brethren. I stood up and voted for confirmation of the nomination of Ambassador Bohlen to Russia. I believe the services he has performed for this Government have been of a high order.

Talk is cheap. It is easy to denounce patriotic Americans. It has been done on too many occasions. Denunciation has been made against the President of the United States, without justification. Denunciation has been made against the

Chief Justice of the United States, without justification. Members on the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle have been called "unwitting hand-maidens of communism." It is easy to say such things. It is easy to make such "shotgun" charges. Speaking for myself, I place my faith in the President of the United States. I place my faith in the judgment of my colleagues upon the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who unanimously recommended that the Senate approve this nomination after a full hearing.

On that basis I stand ready to vote in favor of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Paul Hoffman to be a member of the delegation of the United States of America to the General Assembly of the United Nations, which delegation includes our devoted and patriotic friends, our colleagues from California, BILL KNOWLAND, and HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to identify myself with the fine remarks made by the Senator from California with regard to this delegation, and especially the remarks about our colleagues in the Senate.

I am supporting the nomination of Mr. Hoffman, which is now before us, because of my intimate association with him in the early years of the formulation of the Marshall plan, and my familiarity with the effective work which he did at that time.

I spoke yesterday on the subject of Mr. Hoffman's nomination. Today I wish to add for the RECORD a memorandum, which I have had prepared, entitled "A Brief Outline of the Career of Paul G. Hoffman." Attached thereto is a list of the names of members of the original board of trustees of the Committee for Economic Development elected September 4, 1942; also a list of the members of the board of trustees as of May 1956. That work was one of the many distinguished accomplishments of Mr. Hoffman.

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

A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE CAREER OF PAUL G. HOFFMAN

Mr. Hoffman was born in Chicago in 1891, the son of George and Eleanor Hoffman. He attended the University of Chicago before entering the automobile business as a salesman for the Studebaker Corp. in Los Angeles in 1911. After becoming sales manager he purchased the Los Angeles retail branch in 1919.

Mr. Hoffman has received 34 honorary degrees from universities and colleges, including Rose Polytechnic Institute, Valparaiso University, Indiana University, and the University of Notre Dame—all in Indiana.

He was recipient of the American Education Award in 1948.

In 1915 he married the former Dorothy Brown. The Hoffmans have 7 children—5 boys and 2 girls.

Mr. Hoffman is a veteran of World War I, having served as a first lieutenant in the United States Army. All five of his sons are veterans of World War II.

With respect to the Hoffman Specialty Co., manufacturers of brass fittings, this business was organized by Paul Hoffman's father in Waterbury, Conn. Paul Hoffman moved the company to Indianapolis in 1942. The company is undergoing a further expansion and

has just completed a \$800,000 plant in Indianapolis.

Business and public service experience in addition to the material previously supplied includes service as director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago from 1942 to 1949; member of the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce, honorary chairman of United China Relief, trustee of the University of Chicago and Kenyon College, and counselor of the National Industrial Conference Board.

Mr. Hoffman is the author of *Seven Roads to Safety and Peace Can Be Won*.

Mr. Paul G. Hoffman's career might well be divided in three parts; namely, business, civic, and government.

On the business side his principal activity, going back to 1919, has been with the Studebaker Corp. He began as a distributor, rose to become vice president in charge of sales, and when the company was reorganized after the depression, he became its president. His business ability is recorded in the cold statistics of rising sales and rising profits during his tenure as president of the corporation. In 12 years volume rose from \$69 million to \$384 million while profits after taxes rose from \$2.2 million to \$19.1 million. On a smaller scale he reorganized the Hoffman Specialty Co., a family business in Indianapolis, and in 10 years sales and profits more than quadrupled.

He has engaged in other business activities and today is a director of Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., New York Life Insurance Co., Time, Inc., and United Air Lines.

Mr. Hoffman's earliest civic activities grew directly out of his business concern with automotive transportation. While still a distributor in California he was appointed president of the Los Angeles Traffic Commission which framed a new traffic ordinance which came to be regarded as a model municipal ordinance. He organized a major highway committee, which made a privately financed survey and developed a \$300 million program for a modernized street and highway system which was adopted as the official city plan.

Later he helped organize the Automotive Safety Foundation and served for 13 years as its chairman. This foundation organized and coordinated a safety campaign which was a major factor in the saving of an estimated 500,000 lives, the prevention of 17 million injuries, and the loss of \$36 billion over the past 20 years.

In 1943 Mr. Hoffman helped organize the Committee for Economic Development and served as its chairman for 5 years. The educational work done by this committee in the business world is credited with a major contribution to our smooth transition from wartime to peace-time production, the maintenance of high employment, and the prevention of serious economic dislocations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as part of my remarks at this point the original Board of Trustees of the Economic Development Corporation and its present trustees as of May 1956.

One will note from this list, of course, that it covers many of the most outstanding men of America.

In later years, Mr. Hoffman's service to education and the furtherance of the general welfare is represented by his tenure as president of the Ford Foundation from 1951 to 1953.

The most prominent aspect of Mr. Hoffman's Government career, however, came with his service as administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration.

ORIGINAL BOARD OF TRUSTEES, COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELECTED SEPTEMBER 4, 1942

James F. Bell, chairman of the board, General Mills, Minneapolis, Minn.

William Benton, chairman of the board, Encyclopaedia Britannica, New York City.

W. L. Clayton, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.

Chester C. Davis, president, Federal Reserve Bank, St. Louis, Mo.

Ralph E. Flanders, president, Jones & Lamson, Springfield, Vt.

M. B. Folsom, treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y.

Clarence Francis, president, General Foods, New York City.

Paul G. Hoffman, president, Studebaker Corp., South Bend, Ind.

Charles R. Hook, president, American Rolling Mills, Middletown, Ohio.

Reagan Houston, merchant, San Antonio, Tex.

Eric A. Johnston, president, United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

Harrison Jones, president, Coca Cola Co., Atlanta, Ga.

Charles F. Kettering, General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Thomas B. McCabe, president, Scott Paper Co., Chester, Pa.

Reuben B. Robertson, president, Champion Paper Co., Canton, N. C.

John Stuart, president, Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, Ill.

CED BOARD OF TRUSTEES AS OF MAY 1956

J. D. Zellerbach, chairman; president, Crown Zellerbach Corp., San Francisco, Calif.

Gardner Cowles, Vice Chairman; president, Des Moines Register & Tribune and Cowles Magazines, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Thomas B. McCabe, Vice Chairman; president, Scott Paper Co., Chester, Pa.

J. Cameron Thompson, Vice Chairman; chairman of the board, Northwest Bancorporation, Minneapolis, Minn.

Frazar B. Wilde, Vice Chairman; president, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

Thomas Roy Jones, Treasurer; president, Daystrom, Inc., Elizabeth, N. J.

James L. Allen, senior partner and chairman, executive committee, Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Chicago, Ill.

William M. Allen, president, Boeing Airplane Co., Seattle, Wash.

Stanley C. Allyn, president, the National Cash Register Co., Dayton, Ohio.

Frank Altschul, New York, N. Y.

F. J. Andre, president, Congoleum-Nairn, Inc., Kearney, N. J.

George S. Armstrong, president, George S. Armstrong & Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.

Jervis J. Babb, chairman of the board, Lever Brothers Co., New York, N. Y.

William Balderston, chairman, Philco Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.

John W. Barriger, III, vice president, Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad Co., Chicago, Ill.

S. Clark Beise, president, Bank of America, San Francisco, Calif.

Frank N. Belgrano, Jr., president and chairman of the board, Transamerica Corp., San Francisco, Calif.

Elliott V. Bell, chairman, executive committee, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.

William Benton, chairman of the board, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Sarah G. Blanding, president, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

Joseph L. Block, president, Inland Steel Co., Chicago, Ill.

Marvin Bower, partner, McKinsey & Co., New York, N. Y.

W. Harold Brenton, president, Brenton Bros., Inc., Des Moines, Iowa.

Henry P. Bristol, chairman of the board, Bristol-Myers Co., New York, N. Y.

James F. Brownlee, partner, J. H. Whitney & Co., New York, N. Y.

Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.

Thomas D. Cabot, president, Godfrey L. Cabot, Inc., Boston, Mass.

Everett Needham Case, president, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.

Frank A. Christensen, chairman of the boards, American Fore Insurance Group, New York, N. Y.

Walker L. Cisler, president, the Detroit Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.

Paul F. Clark, president, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.

W. L. Clayton, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.

M. W. Clement, Philadelphia, Pa.

Erle Cocke, chairman, executive committee, the Fulton National Bank, Atlanta, Ga.

John S. Coleman, president, Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich.

S. Bayard Colgate, honorary chairman of the board, Colgate-Palmolive Co., New York, N. Y.

John L. Collyer, chairman of the board, the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.

S. Sloan Colt, chairman of the board, Bankers Trust Co., New York, N. Y.

James B. Conant, United States Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn, Germany.

George H. Coppers, president, National Biscuit Co., New York, N. Y.

H. H. Corey, chairman, Geo. A. Hormel & Co., Austin, Minn.

Charles R. Cox, president, Kennecott Copper Corp., New York, N. Y.

Jay E. Crane, vice president, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), New York, N. Y.

F. C. Crawford, chairman of the board, Thompson Products, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

Donald K. David, chairman, executive committee, the Ford Foundation, New York, N. Y.

Paul L. Davies, president, Food Machinery & Chemical Corp., San Jose, Calif.

R. R. Deupree, chairman of the board, the Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.

John S. Dickey, president, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.

George S. Dinwiddie, president, New Orleans Public Service, Inc., New Orleans, La.

Morris Edwards, vice president, Thomas E. Wood, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Fred J. Emmerich, president, Allied Chemical & Dye Corp., New York, N. Y.

Mark F. Ethridge, publisher, the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times, Louisville, Ky.

Benjamin F. Fairless, chairman, executive advisory committee, United States Steel Corp., New York, N. Y.

Edmund Fitzgerald, president, the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

RALPH E. FLANDERS, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Percival E. Foerderer, Philadelphia, Pa.

William C. Foster, executive vice president, Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., Baltimore, Md.

John M. Fox, president, Minute Maid Corp., New York, N. Y.

Clarence Francis, General Foods Corp., New York, N. Y.

Alfred C. Fuller, chairman of the board, the Fuller Brush Co., Hartford, Conn.

Walter D. Fuller, chairman of the board, the Curtis Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

George M. Gadsby, chairman of the board, Utah Power & Light Co., Salt Lake City, Utah.

Clark R. Gamble, president, Brown Shoe Co., St. Louis, Mo.

Paul S. Gerot, president, Pillsbury Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.

Philip L. Graham, president and publisher, the Washington Post and Times Herald, Washington, D. C.

Gordon Gray, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C.

George L. Harrison, New York Life Insurance Co., New York, N. Y.

H. J. Heinz II, president, H. J. Heinz Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Robert Heller, president, Robert Heller & Associates, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the board, Studebaker-Packard Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.

John Jay Hopkins, president and chairman, General Dynamics Corp., New York, N. Y.

Amory Houghton, chairman of the board, Corning Glass Works, Corning, N. Y.

T. V. Houser, chairman of the board, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, Ill.

George H. Johnson, president, Gisholt Machine Co., Madison, Wis.

Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., Washington, D. C.

Henry R. Johnston, New York, N. Y.

William H. Joyce, Jr., president and chairman of the board, Joyce, Inc., Pasadena, Calif.

Ernest Kanzler, vice chairman of the board, Universal C. I. T. Credit Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Henry P. Kendall, chairman of the board, The Kendall Co., Boston, Mass.

Meyer Kestnbaum, president, Hart Schaffner & Marx, Chicago, Ill.

Sigurd S. Larmon, president, Young & Rubicam, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Roy E. Larsen, president, Time, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Fred Lazarus, Jr., president, Federated Department Stores, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Ralph Lazarus, executive vice president, Federated Department Stores, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Leroy A. Lincoln, chairman of the board, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York, N. Y.

Elmer L. Lindseth, president, the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

George H. Love, president, Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

J. Spencer Love, chairman of the board, Burlington Industries, Inc., Greensboro, N. C.

Robert A. Lovett, partner, Brown Bros. Harriman & Co., New York, N. Y.

Franklin J. Lundberg, chairman of the board, Jewel Tea Co., Inc., Chicago, Ill.

Fowler McCormick, Chicago, Ill.

Ralph McGill, editor, the Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga.

Stanley Marcus, president, Neiman-Marcus Co., Dallas, Tex.

J. A. Martino, president, National Lead Co., New York, N. Y.

Fred Maytag II, president, the Maytag Co., Newton, Iowa.

Eugene Meyer, the Washington Post and Times Herald, Washington, D. C.

Don G. Mitchell, chairman of the board, Sylvania Electric Products, Inc., New York, N. Y.

George L. Morrison, chairman of the board and president, General Baking Co., New York, N. Y.

C. Hamilton Moses, chairman of the board, Arkansas Power & Light Co., Little Rock, Ark.

Malcolm Muir, president, Newsweek, New York, N. Y.

L. B. Neumiller, chairman of the board, Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill.

W. A. Patterson, president, United Air Lines, Chicago, Ill.

Morris B. Pendleton, president, Plomb Tool Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

Howard C. Petersen, president, Fidelity-Philadelphia Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

T. S. Petersen, president, Standard Oil Company of California, San Francisco, Calif.

Malcolm Pirnie, Malcolm Pirnie Engineers, New York, N. Y.

M. J. Rathbone, president, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), New York, N. Y.

Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co., New York, N. Y.

Walter Rothschild, chairman of the board, Abraham & Straus, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Beardsley Ruml, New York, N. Y.

E. C. Sammons, president, the United States National Bank of Portland, Portland, Ore.

Harry Scherman, chairman of the board, Book-of-the-Month Club, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Carroll M. Shanks, president, the Prudential Insurance Company of America, Newark, N. J.

Dorothy Shaver, president, Lord & Taylor, New York, N. Y.

Harper Sibley, Sibley Farms, Inc., Rochester, N. Y.

Ellis D. Slater, president, Frankfort Distilleries, Inc., New York, N. Y.

J. E. Slater, president, American Export Lines, Inc., New York, N. Y.

George F. Smith, president, Johnson & Johnson, New Brunswick, N. J.

S. Abbot Smith, president, Thomas Strahan Co., Chelsea, Mass.

H. Christian Sonne, New York, N. Y.

Joseph P. Spang, Jr., chairman of the board, Gillette Co., Boston, Mass.

Kenneth A. Spencer, president, Spencer Chemical Co., Kansas City, Mo.

Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., New York, N. Y.

John P. Stevens, Jr., chairman of the board, J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.

William C. Stolk, president, American Can Co., New York, N. Y.

Anna Lord Strauss, New York, N. Y.

John Stuart, chairman of the board, the Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, Ill.

Frank L. Sulzberger, chairman of the board, Enterprise Paint Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill.

J. M. Symes, president, the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Wayne C. Taylor, Heathsville, Va.

Alan H. Temple, executive vice president, the First National City Bank of New York, New York, N. Y.

H. C. Turner, Jr., president, Turner Construction Co., New York, N. Y.

Maxwell M. Upson, chairman of the board, Raymond Concrete Pile Co., New York, N. Y.

Alan Valentine, Washington, D. C.

L. A. Van Bomel, chairman of the board, National Dairy Products Corp., New York, N. Y.

Arthur B. Van Buskirk, vice president, T. Mellon & Sons, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president, International Business Machines Corp., New York, N. Y.

James E. Webb, director, Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc., Oklahoma City, Okla.

George Whitney, J. P. Morgan & Co., New York, N. Y.

Walter Williams, Under Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

Charles E. Wilson, chairman, executive committee, W. R. Grace & Co., New York, N. Y.

Theodore O. Yntema, vice president, finance, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

James W. Young, senior consultant, J. Walter Thompson Co., New York, N. Y.

Harry W. Zinsmaster, president, Zinsmaster Baking Co., Duluth, Minn.

John S. Zinsser, vice chairman of the board, Merck & Co., Rahway, N. J.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I intend to vote to confirm the nomination of Paul G. Hoffman. I have known Paul G. Hoffman for quite a number of years. I became acquainted with him when he was serving as chairman of the Committee for Economic Development. He served the United States well in that capacity, and helped to formulate a very strong, progressive, and healthy business economy for the United States in the postwar era.

Paul G. Hoffman and his associates did much to help establish a strong economy, and to avoid the pitfalls of depression which we witnessed in past decades following all major wars.

Paul G. Hoffman served abroad as the administrator of the Marshall plan. He was a credit to the United States in that capacity. His actions in the United States during the years since he resigned as administrator of the European post have been above reproach. He has done an able job as a business administrator, and as one of the Nation's leading business experts.

Mr. President, I do not believe we would do justice to the administration if we were to reject the nomination of Paul G. Hoffman. I commend the President for having selected him as a delegate to represent the United States at the United Nations.

Therefore I shall vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I desire to state that I intend to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Paul G. Hoffman to be a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations. This is a question in which the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, as well as the Committee on Foreign Relations, are far better informed than I ever could hope to be, and I shall certainly abide by their judgment in this realm of international relations.

Mr. President, although I do not have any additional expert information to contribute to the debate, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished minority leader.

Is it the opinion of the distinguished leader of the minority that the speeches made yesterday on the floor in opposition to the nomination of Paul G. Hoffman reflect in any way upon the integrity of the President of the United States?

I should like to ask that question of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Oregon will have to judge that. I was not in the Senate Chamber to hear all the speeches. I made my own position clear, that I intended to support the nomination of Mr. Hoffman.

I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which heard the testimony. I read into the RECORD a letter which Mr. Hoffman had addressed to me. I did not hear all the speeches. I have not had an opportunity to read all that was said on the subject. Therefore, I am not in a position to answer categorically the question asked by the Senator from Oregon. Any Senator is within his rights on the floor of the Senate to express his views. All of us, on both sides of the aisle, do not necessarily have to agree, and do not always agree, with the views expressed on either side of the aisle.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished minority leader. I should like to explain to him and to other Members of the Senate why I asked the question.

I was much disturbed, on July 18, when the able minority leader twice said on the floor that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], who now occupies the chair, had made a speech which cast reflection upon the integrity of the President of the United States. If I am not mistaken, that was the fourth or fifth time the able minority

leader had charged that various Democratic Members of the Senate at one time or other had made speeches which reflected upon the integrity of the President of the United States. Of course, the able minority leader was completely within his prerogative and right to say it.

However, I submit it is a rather serious thing to have the spokesman of the President of the United States in the Senate to say that another Senator has cast a reflection upon the integrity of the President of the United States.

I am a junior Senator, but in the relatively short time I have been a Member of the Senate, I have heard Members on the other side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, make speeches in which they have declared, for example, that the President of the United States wished to send our jet airplanes, paid for by American taxpayers, and made with the skill of American workers, to a country which is, in effect, an enemy of the United States.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to make a correction, if I may. I am sure the Senator does not intend to say that the minority leader is the spokesman of the President. If I understand the precedents of the Senate, the minority leader is the spokesman of the minority, not of the President. He is the Senate minority leader, not the President's spokesman.

Unfortunately, many people seem to think that the minority leader in the Senate is now the spokesman for the President. I believe that is entirely untrue, and I sincerely hope the minority leader does not agree with what the Senator from Oregon has said on that point.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall be very happy to accept the correction. I will revise my statement to say that it is a serious thing when the leader in the Senate of the party of the President of the United States indicates that another Senator, whether it be the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] or any other Senator, has cast doubt upon the integrity of the President of the United States.

For example, it was said yesterday—and entirely within the prerogative of the Senator who said it—that the nominee of the President of the United States for this important position in our international affairs is the head of an organization whose "influence operates to defend Communists, to ridicule or hamstring congressional committees investigating communism, and to confuse the American people about the meaning of their fundamental constitutional principles."

It was said further:

We are voting to approve or disapprove, as a representative of the United States, a man who has been clearly identified over many years with the softening and corruption of public opinion in the United States and the undermining of its power to meet the Communist danger.

I could read more quotations of a similar nature, but I shall not do so.

The point I am seeking to make is that it is a serious thing when a Senator is charged with casting doubt upon the integrity of the President of the United States. I desire to place in proper perspective the accusations that have been made against Senators on this side of the aisle. I desire to point to some statements which have been made on the other side of the aisle about nominees for appointment by the President to the highest positions in the country, and that no charges were made, to my knowledge, by the minority leader or anyone else that they were casting doubt upon the integrity of the President of the United States.

I was disturbed the other evening when the charge was made against a very fine and outstanding and humanitarian Democratic Senator. Therefore, I wished to place the accusations in their proper perspective.

I intend to vote to confirm the nomination of Paul G. Hoffman, a nomination sent to the Senate by the President of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I intend to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the watershed protection bill which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] tell me can be disposed of in 5 minutes.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2626, H. R. 8750.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8750) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666) is amended as follows:

(a) Amend the second and third sentences of section 2 to read as follows: "Works of improvement—any undertaking for—

"(1) flood prevention (including structural and land treatment measures) or

"(2) the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water

in watershed or subwatershed areas not exceeding 250,000 acres and not including any single structure which provides more than 5,000 acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity, and more than 25,000 acre-feet of total capacity. No appropriation shall be made for any plan for works of improvement the total cost of which is estimated to be in excess of \$250,000, or which includes any structure which provides more than 2,500 acre-feet of total capacity unless such plan

has been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, respectively."

(b) Amend section 3 by striking out clause (2), and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) to prepare plans and estimates required for adequate engineering evaluation;

"(3) to make allocations of costs to the various purposes to show the basis of such allocations and to determine whether benefits exceed costs;"

and by renumbering clauses (3) and (4) as (4) and (5) respectively.

(c) Amend clause (2) of section 4 to read as follows:

"(2) assume (A) such proportionate share, as is determined by the Secretary to be equitable in consideration of the direct identifiable benefits, of the costs of installing any works of improvement, involving Federal assistance, which is applicable to the agricultural phases of the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water, and (B) all of the cost of installing any portion of such works applicable to other purposes except that any part of the construction cost (including engineering costs) applicable to flood prevention and features relating thereto shall be borne by the Federal Government and paid for by the Secretary out of funds appropriated for the purposes of this act;"

(d) Add after the word "landowners" in clause (4) in section 4, the words "or water users."

(e) Strike out the word "and" at the end of clause (4) in section 4; strike out the period at the end of clause (5) and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and after clause (5) insert a new clause as follows:

"(6) submit a plan of repayment satisfactory to the Secretary for any loan or advancement made under the provisions of section 8."

(f) Amend section 5 to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. At such time as the Secretary and the interested local organization have agreed on a plan for works of improvement, and the Secretary has determined that the benefits exceed the costs, and the local organization has met the requirements for participation in carrying out the works of improvement as set forth in section 4, the local organization shall assume responsibility for securing engineering services, including the design, preparation of specifications, awarding of contracts, and supervision of construction, in connection with such works of improvement, and in order to properly carry out such services shall retain or employ a professional engineer or engineers satisfactory to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall reimburse the local organization for the cost of the services of such engineer or engineers as is properly chargeable to such works of improvement, except that if the Secretary determines that competent engineering services are not available he may contract for a competent engineer to provide such services or arrange for employees of the Federal Government to provide such services: *Provided*, That at the request of the local organization the Secretary may advance such amounts as may be necessary to pay for such services, but such advances with respect to any works of improvement shall not exceed 5 per centum of the estimated total cost of such works: *Provided further*, That, except as to the installation of works of improvement on Federal lands, the Secretary shall not construct or enter into any contract for the construction of any structure unless there is no local organization authorized by State law to undertake such construction or to enter into such contract, and in no event after July 1, 1956: *Provided*, That in participating in the

installation of such works of improvement the Secretary, as far as practicable and consistent with his responsibilities for administering the overall national agricultural program, shall utilize the authority conferred upon him by the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That whenever the estimated Federal contribution to the construction cost of works of improvement in any watershed or subwatershed area shall exceed \$250,000 or the works of improvement include any structure having a total capacity in excess of 2,500 acre-feet, the Secretary shall transmit a copy of the plan and the justification therefor to the Congress through the President: *Provided further*, That any such plan involving an estimated Federal contribution to construction costs in excess of \$250,000 or containing any structure having a total capacity in excess of 2,500 acre-feet (a) which includes reclamation or irrigation works or which affects public or other lands or wildlife under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, or (b) which includes Federal assistance for floodwater detention structures, shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Army, respectively, for his views and recommendations at least 30 days prior to transmission of the plan to the Congress through the President. The views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Army, if received by the Secretary of Agriculture prior to the expiration of the above 30-day period, shall accompany the plan transmitted by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Congress through the President: *Provided further*, That, prior to any Federal participation in the works of improvement under this act, the President shall issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary or desirable to carry out the purposes of this act, and to assure the coordination of the work authorized under this act and related work of other agencies including the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army."

(g) After section 7 insert the following two new sections and renumber subsequent sections of the act to conform:

"SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized to make loans or advancements to local organizations to finance the local share of costs of carrying out works of improvement provided for in this act. Such loans or advancements shall be made under contracts or agreements which will provide, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate, for the repayment thereof in not more than 50 years from the date when the principal benefits of the works of improvement first become available, with interest at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, payable by the Treasury upon its marketable public obligations outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year in which the loan or advancement is made, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for 15 years from date of issue. With respect to any single plan for works of improvement, the amount of any such loan or advancement shall not exceed \$5 million.

"SEC. 9. The provisions of this act shall be applicable to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable to all works of improvement and plans for such works under the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Any plans for works of improvement with respect to which the Secretary of Agriculture was authorized prior to the date of this act to participate in the installation of works of improvement in accordance with such plan, or any plan for works of improvement which has received prior to the date of this act the approval of congressional committees, as required by such act, need not be submitted to the congressional committees as required by the

Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act as amended by this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, am I to understand that the watershed bill has been called up at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Texas asking that the Senate consider the bill at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The bill is before the Senate. The Senator from Oklahoma will make a brief statement on the bill, and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] wishes to offer some amendments to the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it intended that the Senate shall act on the bill at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, if that course is agreeable to the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe that the consideration of this subject should be taken from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and turned over to another committee. I wish to register my opposition to such action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Vermont will have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not anticipate that the bill would come up quite so soon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is trying to anticipate as much as he can. The minority leader agreed that the bill might be considered at this time. He said there were three Members on his side of the aisle who desired to be notified when the bill was called up.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to take about 5 minutes to make a general statement in opposition to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Vermont certainly will have that opportunity. Does the Senator care to make his statement now? If so, I shall be glad to yield the floor to him.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say that the conservation of the soil and the upstream water resources of the United States is a matter which properly concerns agriculture more than any other phase of our economy.

Two years ago Congress enacted legislation providing for small watershed developments which would afford some flood control and water conservation for the upstream farming areas of the country, and encourage reforestation and other sound conservation practices.

I regret very much that in this Congress this type of legislation has been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs instead of to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I believe that is taking the matter from a committee in which it properly belongs.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. BARRETT. It was not referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. AIKEN. Instead, the matters relating to the subject have been referred to a committee which has had little to do with the Watershed Act and watershed developments. I have not had an opportunity to study the bill very carefully.

I understand it virtually does away with the engineering staff of the Soil Conservation Service and requires farmers to hire private engineers not only in the construction of dams in the same watershed projects, but also for the ordinary work carried on in connection with farming, such as drainage, terracing, and so forth. It eliminates a great deal of the engineering assistance which they have received from the Soil Conservation Service, and I believe it is ill-advised to take the matter up at this time. I think, if it is enacted, it will do a great deal of harm to the upstream conservation movement. I believe the measure should never have been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and should not have been taken away from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If it is passed and signed by the President it could mean a lessening of a great deal of the conservation work which has been promoted and encouraged during the past 2 years.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I merely wish to support the position taken by the Senator from Vermont. The bill should have gone to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If it is passed, it will be a disservice to the soil-conservation program, which has accomplished a great deal of good in the past.

Mr. AIKEN. Bringing up the bill at this time has taken me by surprise. It is a matter which affects every farmer in the United States. It is a matter which could reverse the established policy of the administration to conserve soil and water resources in the upstream reaches of river systems, and it could mean reverting, again, to the big-dam system on the lower reaches of rivers where dams frequently do more harm than good, particularly as regards the people who live above them. It would be a calamity to enact this measure into law at this time as it is now written.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Committee on Public Works, to which the bill was referred, reported it favorably with an amendment and recommended that the bill, as amended, be passed.

In this connection, for the committee, I send forward a perfecting amendment and ask that it be stated.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, lines 15 and 16, it is proposed, in lieu of the words "for works of improvement, the total cost of which is estimated to be", to insert the words "involving the estimated Federal contribution to construction costs."

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Oklahoma will explain the amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to make the paragraph conform to the remainder of the bill as it has been amended. In the bill there was a requirement for submission to congressional committees when the amount of the cost of the plan exceeded a certain amount, which was \$250,000. It was our purpose to provide throughout the bill that the project should be submitted to the committees of the Congress if the Federal contribution to the plan exceeded \$250,000, not if the total cost of the plan exceeded \$250,000. All this perfecting amendment does is to make the provision on page 4, lines 15 and 16, conform to the provisions in other parts of the bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, may I inquire whether all Senators received a copy of the bill and the report? I think it is very unusual to consider a bill with amendments which have not been printed and distributed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that it was submitted not only to the members of the committee on the other side of the aisle, but also to the distinguished minority leader, and by him discussed with other Senators.

It was our understanding that every phase of the bill had been taken up with Members on both sides of the aisle. Certainly, if the Senator wishes a copy he may have it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that this bill has been on the calendar since the 16th of July. It is contained in the bound volumes which Senators have under their desks, together with the report and the amendments. I later had received notice through the regular procedure that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] were very much interested in the bill and wished to be notified when it was called up. When the majority leader made inquiry of the minority leader I told him that I had received notification by the Senators from Delaware, Nebraska, and Wyoming, and I sent word to all three that the bill was going to be called up for consideration.

So, I do not think the procedure was any different from the usual procedure. Before we approved the bill for consideration we checked with the ranking Republican Member.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not recall having been consulted at all on the bill. I am very much opposed to anything detrimental to the work in conservation which has been done in the last 2 years.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that the bill was reported by the Committee on Public Works. I checked the bill with the ranking Republican of that committee, as I always check with the ranking Republican in the case of a bill from any other committee.

Mr. AIKEN. But is not the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry concerned with this matter at all?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Vermont was within his rights at any time to ask that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Agriculture Committee to be completely ignored, and is a veto power to be given to the Corps of Army Engineers with respect to every little brook or stream in the United States?

We ought to have at least 2 or 3 hours in which to read the report and the bill before being asked to vote on it. But if it is desired to go ahead and pass the bill, then let it be passed, and let the Senate take the consequences. I think such precipitate action is unfair.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Vermont has had the bill and the report on his desk for 4 days. The bill does not propose to do the things about which the Senator has expressed his fears.

I know of the distinguished leadership which the Senator from Vermont has given in connection with the development of upstream flood control. I say to him that the expansion provided in the bill will fortify such control within the local soil conservation districts, in accordance with the principle he has so long, so carefully, and so ably advocated.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I have a copy of a letter which was addressed to the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, chairman of the Public Works Committee, and signed by John C. Lynn, legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation. In his letter to the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Lynn says:

As we interpret the language in section 2 (lines 14-21), no appropriations could be made for works of improvement where the total cost is estimated to be in excess of \$250,000 or which includes structures providing more than 2,500 acre-feet of total capacity, until the plan has been approved by resolutions adopted by both the Senate and House Committee on Public Works. Likewise, our interpretation of section 5, lines 18-25 is to the effect that whenever the estimated Federal contribution to the construction cost of works of improvement exceeds \$250,000 or includes any structures with a total capacity in excess of 2,500 acre-feet, the Secretary is required to transmit a copy of the plan and the justification to the Congress through the President.

My concern is as to whether the objections and the questions raised by the American Farm Bureau Federation are being corrected by the amendments which the Senator from Oklahoma has offered and by the amendments which are now being proposed by various Senators who are on the floor.

I most certainly have not had an opportunity to study the bill. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and I are the three ranking Republican members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I shall not be a party to destroying any part of the soil-conservation work of this Nation which has been so ably carried on under the Department of Agriculture for the past several decades. That is why I raise the

question with the Senator from Oklahoma at this time.

Mr. KERR. May I see the communication to which the Senator from Minnesota has addressed himself?

Mr. THYE. Indeed; I hand it to the Senator.

Mr. KERR. In my brief experience in Congress, I saw, for the first time, something during the hearings on the bill which I had never expected to see and had never seen before; that is, the representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Farmers' Union, and the National Grange all appeared before the committee and were unanimous in their endorsement and approval of the bill as reported by the committee.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] was there throughout most of the hearings, as was the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] was in attendance during a part of the hearings.

I may say to my good friend from Minnesota that I had never before seen that situation develop, and had never expected to see it. But the three great organizations were in entire accord, harmony, and agreement in their request for the action which the committee took.

Mr. THYE. May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if the farm organizations were all in accord with the proposal that the jurisdiction be taken from the Department of Agriculture and placed in the Department of the Interior?

Mr. KERR. Jurisdiction would not go to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. THYE. But reports must be made to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. KERR. As to the first question asked by the Senator, with reference to the total cost, which was estimated to be in excess of \$250,000, that amendment was to correct an amendment which the Senator from Oklahoma offered a while ago and which was adopted. It related to a typographical error. In one place the reference was to the total cost of \$250,000; in another place the reference was to the total Federal contribution.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide the criteria to the committees of Congress the matter of the Federal contribution, not the total cost.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. The Senator from Vermont suggested a moment ago that the works under the bill would be administered by the Corps of Army Engineers. The Senator from Minnesota said they would be administered by the Department of the Interior. Is it not correct that the works under the bill will be administered by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. KERR. Yes; and by the local soil conservation districts.

Mr. THYE. However, they must report back to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. KERR. No, not at all.

Mr. THYE. Then what we are endeavoring to do is to enact legislation with which members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are not fa-

miliar, and without a thorough explanation of what the bill proposes.

Mr. KERR. There are Senators present who, in the event of the inability of the Senator from Oklahoma to do so, can explain to the Senator from Minnesota any part of the bill he wishes to have explained.

I now desire to yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in whom I feel certain the Senator from Minnesota has some degree of confidence.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not wish the RECORD to show that, by any stretch of the imagination, I do not have confidence in the Senator from Oklahoma, because I do.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope we may come to a vote on the bill. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] indicated that he wished to speak on it for 5 minutes.

The bill was cleared by the policy groups on both sides of the aisle before it was scheduled. If there had been a request that it be held up, that certainly would have been done.

The Senator from Oklahoma was called from a meeting of a committee of conference which is acting on very important administration legislation.

I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I would be the last person to do anything which would interfere with the work of the soil conservation districts.

Mr. Donald Williams, Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, comes from South Dakota. I have great confidence in him. I have discussed the bill with Mr. Williams. I think the bill is satisfactory to him or will be with the change of the word "shall" to "may" in connection with the employment of private engineers.

Yesterday afternoon I had a telegram from Tony Krebs, who is a director of the Association of Soil Conservation Districts in my State. He raised only one question. It went to whether the engineers must be private engineers, or merely might be. He wanted the provision to be discretionary. The bill is being amended to make it discretionary. This was the precise point which I had raised in discussing the matter with other members of the committee. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] has prepared an appropriate amendment to do exactly that. To the best of my knowledge, that meets with the desires of the soil conservation districts and the Soil Conservation Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are 96 potential leaders in the Senate. I could not attempt to confer with all of them. I have conferred with at least 5 or 6 distinguished Members of the minority about the bill.

First, I have never been able to find anyone who is more reliable in the scheduling of matters for consideration and more reliable to consult with than the minority leader. After he had consulted with his staff and the other persons with whom he desired to consult, I announced, as it appears in the RECORD of July 18, 1956, at page 13256, that Calendar No. 2626, H. R. 8750, to amend the Watershed

Protection and Flood Prevention Act, had been already cleared by the leadership on both sides of the aisle, that it would be scheduled for consideration, and would be called up at a mutually convenient time. That was done on the 18th of July. I refer Senators to that page of the RECORD.

I may have announced the bill 2 or 3 more times. I tried to do so, so that every Senator might be on notice. The bill is on every Senator's desk.

This morning we have scheduled for consideration the nomination of Paul Hoffman. Following the completion of action on the nomination, it is expected that the executive pay bill will be considered. That is a bill in which the administration is vitally interested. Then there is in conference the customs simplification bill, in which the administration is also very vitally interested.

Since the watershed protection bill was one of the bills scheduled, I tried to arrange for its consideration at a time when the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who is also a member of the Committee on Finance, could be on the floor.

I conferred with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I hope we may be able to take action on the bill. I have no doubt that the Senate will pass it when it does act on it.

If we must, we can postpone the consideration of much proposed legislation which the Republican administration feels is very important and very necessary, and keep the Senator from Oklahoma occupied discussing the subject generally; but it will be found, when it is all over, that ample notice has been given.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a point of clarification?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. A few minutes ago I referred to the fact that the bill required the projects to be approved by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the House and the Senate. I should have said the Committees on Public Works rather than the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I believe the Senator from South Dakota has the floor. I should like to ask him—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have the floor, and I yielded 1 minute to the Senator. I understand the bill contains a provision similar to the administration's provision in the bill to construct buildings all over the country. It permits them to come before certain committees of the Congress and report to them. When the administration bill providing for the construction of post office buildings was up for consideration, there was a provision that the Public Works Committees should be informed of the sites on which it was expected to locate the buildings. This is a similar provision.

Mr. AIKEN. If the purpose is to limit the size of the projects, then I think the sponsors of the bill may be on good ground. I think the size of the projects should be limited by legislation rather

than by asking committees to approve this project and that project, about which they know little. Otherwise, we shall get in the same trouble as we are when the Soil Conservation Service asks for a project, and the Army engineers come forward and intimate that if that project is put into effect, everybody down river will be drowned sooner or later. A committee is not in a position to determine which one of the agencies is correct. The Senator from South Dakota said that Mr. Donald Williams, head of the Soil Conservation Service, approved the bill. That was news to me, but I shall accept the Senator's statement that the conservation groups approve of the bill.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yesterday I received a communication from Mr. Lawrence W. Rittenoure, of Kansas, director of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts. He indicated that he was in favor of the bill if the employment of professional engineers were made discretionary and not mandatory. I assured him it would be discretionary under the amendment which has been prepared by the Senator from Nebraska.

As to reference of projects to congressional committees, the initiative still rests with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is only after the projects reach a certain size that there is any referral to the Public Works Committee. The purpose there is to avoid overlapping and possible conflict with larger public works projects.

All projects under the act will still be initiated by the soil conservation districts and be recommended by the appropriate State committees and be reviewed by the congressional committees on agriculture. Only those where the Federal share of the cost exceeds \$250,000 or where the storage exceeds 2,500 acre-feet will be also referred to the Public Works Committees. This is spelled out in the language at page 4 of the bill. I believe these provisions meet the questions which the Senators have asked.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I to understand that the proposed legislation does not interfere with watershed projects where the Government participation is under \$250,000 or there are no dams impounding over 2,500 acre-feet? It does not interfere with any project holding back 2,500 acre-feet or under?

Mr. KERR. It does not interfere with any projects for storage holding less than 2,500 acre-feet.

Mr. AIKEN. It is only the larger projects which would be referred to the Public Works Committees. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. In regard to the hiring of engineers let us make this clear for the RECORD—

Mr. KERR. I should like the Senator from Nebraska to answer that ques-

tion, because it is his amendment that we are asking the Senate to accept.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the intention of the proposed legislation to require farmers whose work is included in the local participation to hire private engineers for grading the land or draining the land or terracing the land, or work of that kind?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, an amendment will be proposed which will not require any local organization to hire private engineers except as to those projects which will contain either municipal or industrial water uses above 5,000 acre feet. So that all the work which has been heretofore done under the Watershed Act of 1954 will continue just as it is, with the exception that each local organization will be given the discretion to hire outside engineers, if it wants to.

Mr. AIKEN. The farmer or landowner will have available the advice of the Soil Conservation Service?

Mr. HRUSKA. Not only the farmer, but the local organization. Under agreement with the Secretary of Agriculture, there will still be available the participation of the Soil Conservation Service by way of technical help and engineers, just as heretofore.

Mr. KERR. If they employ private engineering help, it must be with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and at his expense.

Mr. HRUSKA. The letter referred to by the Senator from Minnesota from the American Farm Bureau Federation contained objections which are being completely obviated, with one exception, and that is as to the portion referring to section 9, page 4 of the bill, which refers to projects of a certain size being referred to the Committees on Public Works rather than the Agriculture Committees. As the House bill does not contain such a provision, the question will have to be settled in conference between the two Houses.

Mr. AIKEN. If the bill is amended in accordance with the statement of the Senator from Nebraska, it will make it very much more palatable; and with the assurance that the small watershed programs which do not exceed the limits which are set forth in previous legislation are not affected, I would have no serious objection to this bill. I for one shall be very glad to get rid of the responsibility of determining whether large dams—and we have one before us now which I think will cover parts of both Oklahoma and Texas—are safe dam or not.

However, up to now I had no knowledge of the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Nebraska and my opposition was based on the original text of the bill.

If amended as proposed by the Senator from Nebraska, I will have no objection to its passage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understood the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Nebraska had worked out agreements before the bill was scheduled for consideration, and that the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Delaware had a meeting of minds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that some of those interested in soil conservation in my State likewise had some concern over the question of the engineers. I have discussed with him the text of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska. I also discussed it with the Senator from Oklahoma. Based on the assurances they gave me previously, and which they have repeated now, the people in my State connected with the soil conservation work are in agreement with the bill as it will be amended. We are assured that their interests are fully protected.

In connection with another question which I discussed with the Senator from Oklahoma, perhaps we can also clarify this to their satisfaction. The same people wanted to make sure that the work of drainage as well as other types of flood prevention, would be taken care of on an equal basis.

Mr. KERR. As a part of flood-control structures?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall read the language which appears in the House report on a similar bill and ask this question: Am I correct that the committee in charge of this bill agree on this same interpretation? We ask this to be sure that the type of drainage in our area is fully covered on an equal basis of other flood-control projects referred to in this bill.

It is the intention of the committee that the term "flood prevention" shall be construed to mean not only land treatment and structures, such as detention reservoirs, but also drainage channels and related improvements to remove excess water caused by precipitation or overflow on flatlands.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Am I correct that the intention of the bill is the same as that spelled out in the House report?

Mr. KERR. It is.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With that understanding and with the acceptance of the amendments of the Senator from Nebraska, which will clarify the question about the engineers, I am in complete agreement with the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have action on the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, to the committee amendment I submit the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 6, in line 19, after the word "services", it is proposed to strike out "shall" and to insert "in such projects as to such structures therein providing for municipal or industrial water supplies, the local organization shall, and in such projects not providing

for municipal or industrial water supplies, the local organization may."

In line 22, after the word "cost", it is proposed to strike out "of" and to insert "it may incur for."

And on page 7, in line 3, after the word "organization", it is proposed to insert "which retains or employs a professional engineer or engineers as aforesaid."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, my amendments to the committee amendment are for the purpose of clearing up the matter of the employment of engineers on watershed projects.

The practice heretofore obtaining will continue to obtain, to wit, the local organizations may resort to the personnel of the soil conservation districts for their engineering services, both in the planning stage and in the construction stage. When, however, the purpose of any of these structures goes beyond flood prevention, and includes the storage of water for municipal or for industrial purposes, then it will be required of the local organization that it retain private engineers for the purpose of the construction thereof, not for the purpose of the original planning.

That is the purpose of my amendments to the committee amendment. They also provide that when outside engineers are employed, the entire services of the engineers shall be paid for as a part of the Federal contribution; and, in addition, there shall be an advance of 5 percent for that purpose to the local organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments of the Senator from Nebraska to the committee amendment will be considered en bloc.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What percentage of the engineers' services will be paid?

Mr. HRUSKA. The entire engineering services are a part of the Federal contribution. But when the local organization contracts for outside engineering services, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, on application, to advance to the local organization 5 percent of the estimated construction cost, in order to enable the local organization to get going before it obtains funds of its own.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] to the committee amendment.

The amendments to the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement with reference to the general purposes of the bill, and also the purposes of my amendments.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

The purpose of H. R. 8750 is to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention

Act which became law in 1954 (Public Law 566, 83d Cong.).

The objectives of the act are to enable local units of government to carry out those soil and water management measures of a community nature which cannot be accomplished by individual landowners or water users. It makes provision for help of Federal departmental programs of educational, technical, and financial nature.

The areas covered by its scope lie between the land treatment measures by individual landowners and the major projects on our Nation's main streams as carried out by the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation.

The act deals with one of the Department of Agriculture basic, and one of its most important, programs.

The place and importance of the watershed program is readily seen by considering the first 23 months record of the 1954 act. Between August 4, 1954 (when Public Law 566 became law), and July 3, 1956, the following occurred:

Forty-eight States designated State agencies or made other appropriate arrangements to handle review and approval of applications for assistance as made by local organizations.

Twenty-five States enacted 45 separate pieces of legislation to help implement this law.

Five hundred and forty-one State-approved applications for assistance were received by the Soil Conservation Service.

Several hundred additional applications are being formulated or are now before State agencies for review.

Twenty-four plans had been completed and submitted to Congress. Thirteen projects had been placed in operation. Five of these plans which required resolutions of approval by the Congress, had been reviewed and approved by the Senate and House Committees. Four additional plans were completed and in process of transmittal to the Congress and four more plans were under review by other Federal agencies.

It is estimated that more than 50 additional plans will be ready for submission to the next Congress when it convenes in January, 1957.

H. R. 8750 AMENDMENTS

Amendments to the 1954 act would include the following:

1. The act would, as recommended, permit inclusion in watershed plans works of improvements not only for flood prevention, irrigation, and drainage, but also for non-agricultural purposes such as municipal and industrial water supplies, and streamflow regulation.

2. Total capacity of any single structure that may be included in a watershed plan is increased from 5,000 acre-feet to 25,000 acre-feet, but a restriction would be retained in the law for a 5,000 acre-foot flood detention capacity. This would permit use of storage space in the structures for municipal and industrial water supplies over and above the 5,000 acre-feet.

3. The Federal Government would bear the entire construction cost of work of improvement insofar as flood prevention is concerned; local organizations would bear a proportionate share of the costs of improvements for irrigation, drainage, and other agricultural water management, and local organizations would bear all of the costs of improvements other than flood prevention, irrigation, drainage, and agricultural water management. Provision is made for the financing of such costs to the local organizations.

4. The local organizations would be permitted to employ outside engineers if they chose to do so, in order to assist in the matter of design, preparation of specifications, awarding of contracts, and supervision of construction. As to structures which include storage facilities for water or for municipal

or industrial water uses, the local organization would be required to employ outside engineers. Whenever outside engineers would be retained, the cost of engineering would be a part of the Federal contribution. Provision is made for advancement of engineering costs in the amount equal to 5 percent of the estimated cost of construction.

5. Procedures of review by other agencies and for congressional approval are simplified and shortened.

6. The benefits of the amendments made by H. R. 8750 would be extended to the projects heretofore authorized under Public Law 566.

COST SHARING

One of the basic changes in the act as amended has to do with the contribution by the local organization toward the cost of building the works of improvement, or the structures. Under Public Law 566, the local organization would acquire without cost to the Federal Government land, easements, and rights-of-way, and agreed also to operate and maintain the works of improvement. In addition, the local organization would assume a part of the costs of installing any structures in accordance with determination by the Secretary of Agriculture who would consider the anticipated benefits from such improvements. This local contribution will be omitted in the act as amended.

There were some who disagreed with the wisdom of such omission. They argued that public acceptance of this program has been on the basis of local undertakings with assistance from the Federal Government rather than projects planned and built by the Federal Government itself.

There has been willingness of local communities to assume development and management responsibilities including financial contributions for the cost of the structures. The requirements to participate in this cost is wholesome and sound, it is said. In fact, success of the program is said to depend on acceptance by local communities for initiation of the project and for direct participation in its costs. The people must first believe and be convinced in their own judgment that projects are of benefit to themselves and their communities. One of the very best tests in this regard lies in their willingness to assume the costs for those benefits which are direct and which are identifiable with particular beneficiaries. This was the foundation for Public Law 566 as originally enacted.

As administered, it has proved to be equitable and fair. Of the first 30 projects approved by the Department of Agriculture, we find the following breakdown as to costs and contributions. The first item is this:

Gross cost of structures.....	\$21,993,000
Cash cost of construction.....	13,825,000
Paid by local organizations.....	2,453,000

The amount contributed in cash by the local organizations amounted to about 17 percent of the construction costs in cash of those structures. A breakdown of the entire local contributions would consist of the following: Cash, as indicated above, \$2,453,000; land, easements, and rights-of-way, estimated present worth of maintenance and operation and miscellaneous costs, \$4,610,000, which is about 32 percent of the gross cost of the structure.

It will be seen from the above figures that the cash contribution of local organizations has been only about 10 percent of the gross cost of the structures.

Those who contended for elimination of cash contribution toward cost of structures, however, cited the lack of uniformity with flood-control projects which are initiated and constructed by the Corps of Engineers. The statute in that connection does not require any cash contribution from the landowners within such an area. It has been argued, therefore, that the people living

within flood projects which would be administered by the Department of Agriculture under Public Law 566 should likewise be exempted from any such cash contribution. However, in the hearings before the Senate Public Works Committee, there was testimony from the Department of the Army that since 1954 when the watershed act was passed, the Corps of Engineers has required contributions from the benefited landowners when flood-prevention projects were planned and approved. In fact, of the local flood-protection projects acted on favorably by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors from May 1954 to April 1956, local contributions totaling 23 percent of the gross cost were required. This compares favorably with 27 percent required by the Department of Agriculture on the 30 projects referred to above, when the computation is made on a comparable basis with that which was used in computing the 23 percent for the Corps of Engineers. While the Department of Agriculture computation shows 32 percent for local contribution, it included a capitalization of the costs of operation and maintenance for a period of 50 years, a factor which was not included in the 27 percent as computed on those same 30 projects by the Corps of Engineers.

In other words, by administrative action, the Corps of Engineers also strove for uniformity by requiring local contributions.

The national administration was in favor of the continuance of that principle as sound. It pointed out that the same was accepted in good grace and with great willingness by localities; it had a tendency to make the programs more efficient and successful because localities would be much more certain of their ground before venturing on such projects if they knew that they themselves had a direct stake in its success. Further, such local contributions for direct and identifiable benefits is in keeping with the spirits of the act, to wit: That such undertakings be local in character with only assistance from the Federal Government, rather than being projects which will be predominantly planned and built by the United States.

Notwithstanding all of these reasons and the position of the administration thereon, the committee conformed with the House version of the amendment, and eliminated the cash contribution of local organizations to the cost of works of improvement or structures.

ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT

Engineering and technical services for the watershed act are in two general classes:

First, those services including such investigations and surveys as may be necessary to prepare plans for works of improvement, and to make such studies as may be necessary to determine the physical and economic soundness thereof, including a determination as to ratio of benefits to costs.

Second, design, preparation of specifications, awarding of contracts, and supervision of construction in connection with works of improvement, after the contract between the Department of Agriculture and the local organization had been made.

Under Public Law 566 as originally enacted, both classes of these services were rendered by the technicians and engineers in the Soil Conservation Service.

The Senate committee originally decided that since the permissible size of the structures was greatly increased (from 5,000 acre-feet to a limit of 25,000 acre-feet) it would be desirable that the local organization employ professional engineers for the second class of activity described above.

After the bill was reported out on this basis, however, it was pointed out that very likely the number of larger structures would form only a small percentage of all the structures in the plans contemplated. There seemed to be no objection to requiring out-

side professional engineers on those larger projects, which included storage capacity for municipal or industrial water uses. However, it was strongly felt that as to the other structures which are purely flood preventive in character and the likes of which have been envisioned by Public Law 566 as originally enacted, the technical and professional engineering services of Soil Conservation Service personnel should continue to be used.

AMENDMENT REGARDING ENGINEERS

Accordingly, an amendment was proposed which made it permissible for local organizations to employ outside engineers for any of the projects they chose. However, such outside engineers would be required only on those projects and as to structures therein which provided for storage of municipal or industrial supplies of water. This was deemed satisfactory inasmuch as if such structures were planned and built by any municipality, it necessarily would be required to employ competent professional engineering talent.

The amendments to Public Law 566 provide that the entire cost of engineering services is borne as a part of the Federal contribution. Where local organizations would employ outside engineers by choice or by the requirements set out above, advancements would be made to them to pay for such services, in an amount equal to 5 percent of the estimated cost of construction.

While I prepared and proposed the amendment for engineering services which dealt with this aspect, I want to acknowledge the assistance and cooperation of those who served with me on the committee, and particularly Senator KERR, of Oklahoma, and Senator CASE, of South Dakota. The latter, who had a great deal of experience in this field, was especially helpful in this regard.

It is felt that by and large the amendments proposed in H. R. 8750 will be helpful to the watershed program. Perhaps other amendments may be indicated as we gather more experience and as time passes on. The very fine progress made in the first 2 years of the law shows bright hope for continued advancement which will be greatly accelerated by the adoption of amendments contained in the pending bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed to the committee amendment, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

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

The bill was read the third time.

MR. FREAR. Mr. President, I heard the colloquy between the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] regarding the drainage aspects of the bill, as they might affect the State of Delaware. I should like to associate myself with the questions asked by my senior colleague from Delaware, and I should also like to take advantage of the answers given by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], as they affect the State of Delaware.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 8750) was passed.

MR. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which

House bill 8750 was passed be reconsidered.

MR. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MR. KERR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment to House bill 8750, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KERR, Mr. GORE, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. HRUSKA the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PAUL G. HOFFMAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Paul G. Hoffman to be representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

MR. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President—

MR. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, does the distinguished Senator from New Jersey desire to speak on the Hoffman nomination?

MR. CASE of New Jersey. I do.

MR. JOHNSON of Texas. For how long?

MR. CASE of New Jersey. Approximately 2 minutes.

MR. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have talked to Senators on this side of the aisle, and I understand that no other Senator desires to discuss the nomination.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time the distinguished Senator from New Jersey may speak for 5 minutes; that at the conclusion of his remarks, there be a quorum call; that when the quorum call is either concluded or the request for it withdrawn, the Senate immediately proceed to vote on the Hoffman nomination.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the President has nominated a distinguished group of citizens to serve as United States representatives or alternate representatives of the United States to the 11th General Assembly of the United Nations. The Foreign Relations Committee has unanimously approved the nominations.

I do not have the privilege of knowing all of the nominees personally. But, in addition to our own esteemed colleagues—and I warmly subscribe to the tributes which have been paid them here today—there are several with whom I am personally acquainted, and for whom I have the highest regard. Among them is Paul G. Hoffman.

I do not think anyone can know Paul Hoffman and not be impressed by his

deep devotion to the United States and all it stands for. He is a man who for many years has given generously of his time and efforts to public endeavors. His long and distinguished service in various capacities, both within and outside the Government, is too well known to labor here. Let me just point out that as head of the Economic Cooperation Administration, he headed a program which is one of the Nation's most effective weapons against communism. The sincerity of his attachment to American traditions is beyond question, to my mind. Those of us who have worked with him, as I have, know him to be a man of great largeness of spirit, a warmhearted man who has always responded generously to the call for public or civic service. He has been chosen for high public office by two Presidents of the United States. As a member of the United States delegation, he will, I am confident, serve once again with distinction and high honor.

Mr. RUSSELL subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement in respect to my position on the nomination of Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, to be a representative of this country to the United Nations. I do this in view of the fact that I did not vote on the nomination; I was called off the floor just before the vote was had. I had hoped to make this statement, in explanation of my position, just prior to the taking of the vote.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I do not question the patriotism or the integrity of Mr. Hoffman. I know of nothing that would cause me to believe that he was a Communist or that he had Communist sympathies.

However, Mr. President, I do say that Mr. Hoffman, as the administrator of the first foreign-aid program this country adopted, in my opinion set a pattern of waste and extravagance that has cost the American taxpayers millions of dollars, because we have never been able to get that program back on a strictly business basis.

He was a prodigal spender. Some of the projects which were undertaken, and the contributions this Government made to them, are almost beyond imagination. I greatly fear that as a representative of this country to the United Nations he will pursue a similar course and commit this country to almost any conceivable expenditure that may be proposed by the United Nations.

I take some comfort in the knowledge that the distinguished Senator from California, the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] will likewise be a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. The Senator from California is a realistic man, a tough-minded man, a patriotic man, and a two-fisted fighter. I hope and trust that the fact that he is there will protect the interests of this country.

As I have stated, I could not have voted to approve the nomination of Mr. Hoffman, not because I question his patriotism or loyalty, but merely because, from such knowledge as I have of his administration of the first foreign aid program, I am caused to doubt his capacity to

represent the United States in that important international organization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered, I now 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. JENNER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that just prior to the vote on the Hoffman nomination there be inserted in the RECORD an excerpt from page 7 of the February 1949 issue of the International Free Trade Union News, published by the Free Trade Union Committee of the American Federation of Labor.

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

NO ERP AID TO CHINESE QUISLINGS

The following statement concerning American aid to China was issued on December 14, 1948, by the Free Trade Union Committee of the American Federation of Labor:

"The Free Trade Union Committee of the AFL views with consternation the declaration of Paul G. Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator, that American aid to China will continue if and when the present Nationalist Government is replaced by a so-called coalition government in which Communists are included.

"If this declaration were to become the policy of our Government, the highest ideals and best interests of our Nation and the very security of the American people would be gravely jeopardized. We know of no immediate single act by our Government which would so seriously endanger our international peace.

"The civilized, freedom-loving world has had tragic experience aplenty with the policy of including Communists in so-called coalition governments. In Poland, when the self-styled Lublin (Communist) government was merged with the legitimate Polish Government in exile, we only paved the way for the Communists to take over full control of Poland, to drive the Polish people into the Soviet orbit and to destroy every vestige of Polish national independence and liberty.

"Mr. Hoffman's proposal, if translated into American policy, would turn China over to the Cominform and its masters in Moscow. If applied, this proposal would also mean, sooner rather than later, the loss of South-eastern Asia which is a treasure house of natural resources indispensable to the worldwide reconstruction and economic betterment of the peoples of Asia and all other continents. This loss would be a disastrous blow to the economic welfare of the American people and therefore to the entire European recovery program with which Mr. Hoffman is so directly associated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Paul G. Hoffman to be a representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL],

the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—64

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Allott	Hill	Morse
Anderson	Holland	Murray
Beall	Humphrey,	Neely
Bennett	Minn.	Neuberger
Bible	Humphreys,	O'Mahoney
Bush	Ky.	Pastore
Capehart	Ives	Payne
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chavez	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Clements	Kerr	Scott
Cotton	Knowland	Smathers
Douglas	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Duff	Laird	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Lehman	Sparkman
Flanders	Long	Stennis
Fulbright	Mansfield	Symington
George	Martin, Iowa	Thye
Gore	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Hayden	McNamara	Wiley
Hennings	Millikin	Williams

NAYS—22

Barrett	Eastland	McCarthy
Bricker	Frear	McClellan
Bridges	Goldwater	Mundt
Butler	Hruska	Schoeppel
Byrd	Jenner	Wofford
Curtis	Johnston, S. C.	Young
Dirksen	Langer	
Dworshak	Malone	

NOT VOTING—10

Bender	Green	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Welker
Daniel	Magnuson	
Ervin	Potter	

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmations on yesterday and today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmations.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, 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 House to the bill (S. 849) to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, cystic fibrosis, and muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3073) to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

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 House to the bill (S. 3149) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant free or reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

- S. 277. An act for the relief of Jean Pfeiffer;
- S. 1627. An act for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov;
- S. 1708. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest M. Kersey;
- S. 1893. An act for the relief of Harold D. Robison;
- S. 2846. An act for the relief of Don-chean Chu;
- S. 3150. An act for the relief of Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Herman;
- S. 3473. An act for the relief of Kurt Johan Faro;
- S. 3579. An act for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure;
- S. 3705. An act to require periodic survey by the Secretary of Commerce of national shipbuilding capability;
- H. R. 2603. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to prescribe the area within which officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia may reside;
- H. R. 4993. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 5853. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907;

H. R. 7089. An act to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7723. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Phelps County, Mo., to the Chamber of Commerce of Rolla, Mo.;

H. R. 8149. An act to amend the first sentence of paragraph (a) of section 756 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition (paragraph (a) of section 5 of the act of April 1, 1942, ch. 207, 56 Stat. 193), relating to the transfer of actions from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 9742. An act to provide for the protection of the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge, Georgia, against damage from fire and drought;

H. R. 9842. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases;

H. R. 10010. An act for the relief of Roy Click; and

H. R. 11077. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, and for other purposes.

BANKING STUDY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, earlier this week I joined with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] in introducing Senate Resolution 313, to provide for a study to ascertain what, if any, changes should be made in the Federal laws to improve our banking and credit facilities. The need for such a study is emphasized by the fact that there has been no comprehensive review of the banking statutes since the enactment of the Banking Act of 1935. In the past 20 years there has been a tremendous expansion in our economy and a corresponding increase in the number of new credit and financial agencies. During this period constructive banking legislation has been enacted, but these statutes have been handled on a piecemeal basis without reference to relationship of the financial and credit structure in general.

The introduction of Senate Resolution 313 has served to call attention to the need for a study of this nature. However, since we are now in the closing days of this session, it would not be possible to have the resolution passed by the Senate prior to adjournment. Therefore, the study will proceed under the authority of Senate Resolution 155, which was passed by the Senate last February. This resolution provides full authority and ample funds to carry out the inquiry until Congress reconvenes next January.

I have authorized the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] to conduct this study on behalf of the Banking and Currency Committee. Thus, all members of the committee will be given an opportunity to participate in this important undertaking. I am very much interested in the inquiry, and I shall, as chairman of the committee, give the Senator from Virginia my full cooperation.

Mr. Donald L. Rogers, counsel to the committee, has been assigned to handle the staff work on this project. We ex-

pect, of course, to have the full cooperation of the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in regard to aspects of the study which fall within their respective jurisdictions. We also intend to select a relatively small but highly competent advisory committee to assist us in evaluating the various recommendations that are presented and in preparing the final report of the study.

After the adjournment of Congress, the staff, with the help of the interested Federal agencies, will assemble the necessary background information and a general outline of the subjects to be covered. It is expected that later this fall public hearings will be held in Washington and in the financial centers such as New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and Atlanta.

We believe that the study can make an important contribution toward improving the financial and credit facilities of our country by bringing the Federal statutes up to date. We shall welcome the views and recommendations of all individuals and organizations.

CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH RESEARCH FACILITIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 849) to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, cystic fibrosis, and muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of July 19, 1956, pp. 13570-13571, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand from the Senator from Alabama that the report is signed by all the conferees.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. The conference report is signed by all the conferees. This conference report constitutes the passage of another important health measure, authorizing appropriations for the construction of research facilities in an effort to find the cause and cure or prevention of crippling and killing diseases.

Mr. President, we are approaching the closing days of the session. Soon the 84th Congress will be another chapter

in history—another milestone in the progress of our country.

It is difficult in the course of day-by-day debate to maintain a proper perspective on what has been done and what is being done. The problems of the moment loom large and the problems and the solutions of yesterday fade into limbo.

In a sense, this is a healthy attitude. If we were content to rest upon our laurels, progress would come to a halt. If we were satisfied with the achievements of the past, there would be no gains in the present and no prospect of gains in the future.

But it is not resting upon our laurels to summarize the activities of the Congress—to place in perspective the splendid achievements.

Of these achievements, some of the brightest and most enduring are the great strides that have been made in the field of health legislation. This can truly be called a Congress with a heart—a Congress that demonstrated effectively its deep concern for the physical and mental well-being of Americans.

Recently, I undertook to summarize some of the activities of the Senate in the field of health. The results of the study, I believe, are heartening to all those who regard the battle against pain and disease as one which must be prosecuted vigorously.

The record can make all of us proud.

We have faced up to the constantly increasing threat of air and water pollution.

We have provided for fair and equitable distribution of the Salk polio vaccine.

We have moved to place new weapons into the hands of the men who stand in the frontlines of the struggle against all those diseases that kill and cripple mankind.

We have expanded the programs that bring hope to the lame, the halt, and the blind.

We provided the largest appropriation in history for the Children's Bureau and for services to crippled children.

We have made it possible to act effectively in the too-long neglected field of mental illness.

We have provided improved medical research for our veterans' hospitals.

And none of these achievements brought the long hand of the Government into the private practice of medicine. The traditional and healthy relationship of doctor and patient was not disturbed.

I would like to summarize for my colleagues and for the people the truly impressive record.

WE MUST KNOW THE FACTS

It may come as a surprise to many of our people to know that our researchers and our technicians in the field of medicine have been forced to grope in the dark for many years. They simply did not have some of the most basic facts and figures upon which they could base an intelligent attack against the ills of mankind.

We do not know—for sure—how many of our people suffer from which ailments. We do not know—for sure—the cost in

lives, in time lost to industry, in suffering to families, of the various diseases.

The last statistics were collected in 1936 and they were invalid by 1937. Since then, all of our plans have been based on estimates and guesses. Those estimates and guesses have been good. But they are no substitute for accurate, precise knowledge.

This Congress has tackled that problem. It has passed legislation to establish the mechanism for a continuing Survey of Sickness. We will not only gather the facts but we will keep them up to date.

Had we done nothing else, this would have been one of the most important steps taken in many years.

HOPE FOR THE HANDICAPPED

However, this Congress realized that absence of precise knowledge was not an excuse for failure to act. The first field which I am going to review is that of rehabilitation for the physically handicapped.

This Congress voted an increase of \$5 million in the funds that are used to restore to useful, productive, and happy lives those who have been handicapped by disease or injury. In addition, we extended the program through which such organizations as the Goodwill Industries, Cerebral Palsy Associations, and organizations for the blind have been able to provide training and job opportunities for the stricken.

The Senate also moved to help sightless children—wherever they may be receiving their education—to have the special books and recordings and other materials which they need. For many, this could mean the difference between a life of rich achievement and a life of idle despair.

The problems of our mentally retarded children—nearly 1½ million—were not forgotten. This Senate launched a program to help train teachers who can direct these children into useful paths of life rather than leave them in classrooms where they will learn little and hold back the progress of others.

CARE OF THE SICK

The Senate made important strides in meeting the grave shortage in hospital beds and trained personnel. We voted to extend the hospital construction program of the Hill-Burton act for another 2 years and to appropriate \$125 million for its operation next year. We provided funds to set in motion the program authorized in the act to make available to all the fruits of our 10 years of experience and knowledge gained in the building and operation of hospitals and health facilities.

We inaugurated a program to provide badly needed teachers of nursing and hospital nurse supervisors. We also initiated a 5-year program for the vocational education of practical nurses. This latter program will not only prove a great boon to our hospitals and sadly overworked nurses but will also come as a great relief to those victims of chronic illness in need of nursing care not now available to them.

PROTECTING THE PUBLIC'S HEALTH

The 84th Congress took important steps to protect the community from the

new hazards to health that have been created by modern technology.

First, we passed a water pollution bill. It provides \$50 million a year for 10 years to help the States maintain the purity of their water supplies. It launches a 5-year research program into water pollution. And it strengthens enforcement procedures against those who would pollute our streams and lakes.

Second, we voted a decided increase in research funds for the Public Health Service to seek out the cause and control of air pollution. This was welcome news to some of our great cities where "smog" has ceased to be a somewhat grim jest and has become an actual menace.

Third, the Senate initiated a new program for advanced training in public health work. This means that our officials and public health workers will have at their disposal the knowledge needed to protect all Americans from new health menaces, such as the disposal of radioactive wastes.

THE DIRECT ASSAULT

The high point of the activities of the 84th Congress in the field of health, however, was the direct assault on the great killers and cripples of mankind.

There are many diseases and ailments about which we know very little. Our very lack of knowledge adds to the dread with which they are regarded.

I need cite only a few—cancer, heart ailments, cerebral palsy, arthritis, and mental illness. These words represent stark tragedy in American homes and among American families.

In the 84th Congress, committees of both branches called in the greatest men of medicine in these fields. They were questioned at length about what could be done, what should be done, and what might be done.

The verdict was unanimous. Three things were needed.

First, funds for research workers.

Second, the provision of more laboratories and research facilities to relieve the serious shortage of research facilities.

Third, the provision of a reservoir of scientific knowledge upon which the research workers could draw.

Let me give you just one example of the many steps which Congress took in this direction.

There is no more tragic or serious illness afflicting humanity than mental sickness. One out of every two hospital beds in this country is occupied by a victim of a mental ailment. The taxpayers lay out directly more than \$1,850,000,000 a year to cope with the problem.

The cost is increasing at an estimated rate of \$100 million a year. No electronic adding machine could possibly calculate the cost in ruined lives and heartbreak.

Congress authorized a 3-year study of the problem and authorized an appropriation of \$1¼ million. The Senate also voted to provide money for experiments in new ways of managing our mental institutions and more effective means of mobilizing our trained experts.

Finally, the 84th Congress authorized the greatest and most imaginative research program ever conceived into the causes and cures of mental illness. It almost doubled the money recommended by the Budget Bureau for this vital inquiry—from \$18 million to more than \$35 million.

This story can be repeated in practically every major field of disease—in

cancer, heart ailments, arthritis, tuberculosis, and many others. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table summarizing the health appropriations of this Congress.

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

Health items—Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Item	Fiscal year 1956		Fiscal year 1957	
	Estimates	Appropriations	Estimates	Appropriations
National Heart Institute.....	\$17,278,000	\$18,978,000	\$22,106,000	\$33,396,000
National Cancer Institute.....	22,238,000	24,828,000	32,437,000	48,432,000
Mental Health Institute.....	17,501,000	17,751,000	21,749,000	35,197,000
Tuberculosis.....	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,375,000	6,625,000
Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases.....	8,740,000	10,740,000	13,345,000	15,885,000
Venerable Disease Control.....	3,000,000	3,500,000	3,640,000	4,140,000
Communicable Diseases.....	4,400,000	5,250,000	5,210,000	5,210,000
Dental Health Institute.....	2,136,000	2,136,000	2,971,000	6,026,000
Neurology and Blindness.....	8,111,000	9,861,000	12,196,000	18,650,000
Microbiology activities.....	6,645,000	7,580,000	9,799,000	13,209,000
Total 10 items.....	96,499,000	106,624,000	129,828,000	186,860,000

DENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. HILL. All of our health problems do not have the dramatic impact of cancer, polio, or heart disease. Nevertheless, there are some forms of illness which take a frightful toll.

It has been estimated that 98 percent of our people suffer from dental disease at some time in their lives. This does not make headlines but it does make for misery, for loss of efficiency and for strain on the family budget.

This Congress more than doubled the administration's request for research funds into dental disease. This was not an arbitrary action but represented the best thinking of outstanding experts, including representatives of the American Dental Association, on funds that could be profitably used in research.

In addition, the 84th Congress voted funds to construct the National Institute of Dental Research which will take its place beside the other great institutes of health at Bethesda.

A RESERVOIR OF KNOWLEDGE

I do not want to leave this part of my remarks without calling attention to an act of incalculable value. It was the vote by the Senate to create the National Library of Medicine—the greatest reservoir of scientific knowledge in the world.

Under this project, our men of science—the men who create the “magic bullets” against the ailments of mankind—would have the medical knowledge of the ages at their fingertips. They would have access to the results of experiments performed hundreds of miles away—and it will be up to date. America's men of medical science, working wherever they may choose and as the creative individuals they are, will function as a great scientific team welded together by a constant interchange of knowledge, ideas, and inspiration. Time will prove that in authorizing the construction of our National Library of Medicine, the Senate has advanced the health of the American people by decades.

HOPE FOR OUR CHILDREN

This discussion would not be complete without a reference to one of the most important steps in the medical field in many decades. It is the discovery and development of the Salk polio vaccine—the culmination of years of research.

Every parent has felt the breath of terror that accompanies the word “polio.” Every parent has prayed for a God-given shield that will protect our children from this scourge.

The announcement of the polio vaccine was greeted as a deliverance from fear. And this Congress moved to make the rejoicing a reality. We made it possible for every State in the Union to guarantee that no child need do without the protection regardless of economic circumstances.

For this, America's parents sleep more easily at night.

THAT MEN MAY LIVE

Mr. President, I have made these remarks not out of a spirit of boasting, but out of a quiet pride for this Congress.

The measures and the acts that I have discussed today rarely made headlines. Most of them wound up as an incidental reference in a column of figures attached to a wire service story.

But we are not here to create headlines and spend all of our time in controversy. We have been elected to serve the American people—to so conduct ourselves that men and women and children may live better and more secure lives.

The work that we have done on arthritis may not stir the emotions of those who constantly search for supercharged “issues.” But it will bring comfort to millions afflicted by this crippling and little understood disease.

The steps we have taken to rehabilitate the handicapped may not bring cheering throngs into the streets. But they open up new vistas and opportunity to those who were heretofore condemned to a drab, monotonous life as a burden upon their families.

The action we have taken for those who suffer from mental illness may not

command columns of newspaper space. But it holds forth the promise of salvaging the most precious of all natural resources—the human mind.

This has been quiet work, unspectacular work. But I view it—as do my colleagues—with a sense of satisfaction that is abiding and will never fade.

This has been a Congress that thought about the people and tried to do something for them. I do not mean people in the mass—an abstract bundle of votes but human beings who were suffering and in need.

This Congress did not fail them and in history it can well go down as the Congress with a heart.

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

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE PAY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 7619) to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment strikes out all after the enacting clause and inserts a complete substitute. In such cases, under the precedents of the Senate, the substitute is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, and is subject to amendment in two degrees.

An amendment to the original text would have precedence over an amendment to the substitute.

Amendments to the original text or to the committee substitute will have precedence over a vote on the substitute itself.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY IN STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2566, Senate Resolution 303.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 303) increasing the limit of expenditures for conducting a study by the Committee on the Judiciary of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I agreed not to call up the resolution without giving notice to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

I see that both those Senators are now on the floor, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is prepared to answer any questions.

I yield the floor, Mr. President, so that the Senator from Louisiana may receive recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out to the Senate that when we consider the resolution which supplied \$55,000 earlier this year to the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I was under the impression that the final report would be made and that that would be the end of this already prolonged investigation. As a matter of fact, yesterday I again consulted the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to refresh my memory and to find the colloquy between myself and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], which indicates that the amount which was provided would be ample to continue the investigations proposed at that time, and also to prepare the final report.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that when the distinguished Senator from Tennessee stated that so far as he was concerned the amount of \$55,000 would be sufficient, there was objection voiced by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who said he would not feel himself bound by the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

I have here a letter addressed to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] signed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to the effect that the investigations which were contemplated when the \$55,000 were provided were completed, that the reports upon them were made, and that there is remaining from the \$55,000 appropriation the sum of \$24,000.

Now it turns out, as in all other cases, that there is a little investigation which must be made in Wisconsin, and also one in Missouri, which will require more money.

I call the attention of Senators to the fact that when the original resolution to authorize an investigation of juvenile delinquency was considered in 1953, the distinguished former Senator from New Jersey, Mr. Hendrickson—who proposed the investigation—indicated it would not continue ad infinitum, as it now appears will be the case. At that time, the Senate provided a specific amount in order to conduct the juvenile-delinquency investigation. The record shows that Senator Hendrickson said he hoped to complete the investigation with the \$75,000 which was made available for that purpose. But what has happened in the meantime? The year following, Mr. Hendrickson came before the Senate and asked for \$175,000 more with which to make reports.

Then the subject matter was taken over by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. He began to hold hearings.

Up to the present the Senate has spent for an investigation which was not to have cost more than \$75,000, the sum of \$433,000 of the taxpayers' money. What have we got out of it? Reports on top of reports, studies on top of studies, merely to bring attention to the problem.

Mr. President, I contend that we have had enough investigations of juvenile delinquency. Now is the time for us to act; not to merely continue investigating the problem. It is a matter which should be settled more or less on a local level with full cooperation from the States. The problem will never be solved merely by continuing to bring it to the attention of the people.

I express the hope that the Senate will reject the resolution to continue this work. In my humble judgment, the \$24,000 remaining is sufficient. The \$30,000 which is requested would be used merely to keep a few employees at work and to conduct hearings in two places, as I understand; namely, in Wisconsin and in Missouri. I believe that the amount of money which still remains would be ample to do the necessary work which remains.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this point in the RECORD, first, the colloquy which occurred between the former Senator from New Jersey, Mr. Hendrickson, and myself when a similar resolution was first considered in 1953; and, second, the colloquy between the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and myself when he made his plea this year—that is, at this session—for the \$55,000 which was to have completed the study.

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

[FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JUNE 1, 1953]

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 89, Calendar No. 314.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 89) to study juvenile delinquency in the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, and subsequently from the Committee on Rules and Administration with additional amendments. The amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary were, on page 2, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpoenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpoenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

"A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony."

In line 25, to change the section number from "2" to "3", and on page 3, line 4, to change the section number from "3" to "4." The amendments were agreed to.

The additional amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, on page 2, line 3, after the word "violating", to insert "Federal"; on page 3, line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "March 1" and insert "January 31", and in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$44,000", so as to make the resolution read:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to (1) determining the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors, (2) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws, (3) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (4) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

"SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpoenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

"A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

"SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1954.

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$44,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

The additional amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I shall gladly explain this resolution. It authorizes a study of juvenile delinquency, its causes, and contributing factors, throughout the country by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. The purpose of the study is to suggest in a report to be submitted to the Senate not later than January 31, 1954, such legislation as may be found to be appropriate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could the Senator inform us as to whether any such investigation has been conducted in the past?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. There is none pending at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was any such investigation ever made in the past by this body?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us what will be the scope of the investigation?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It will be primarily to furnish leadership in this field so as to stimulate some activity in the States. In my own State of New Jersey, for example, since the introduction of this resolution, the agency having jurisdiction of this subject has offered to the Senate the services of one of the best criminologists in the country to aid in the investigation. I think we can save a portion of the committee-approved appropriation because of the voluntary aid we shall receive from the States and from the Department of Justice and other agencies of the Federal Government. I look for cooperation all along the line.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's view that the appointing of a subcommittee to investigate the subject will cause the States to follow suit and to assist in the project?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I feel very definitely that that is the case, Mr. President. I also feel that we have the responsibility of taking some leadership in this field.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the purpose of the proposed subcommittee to hold hearings, or simply to gather statistics?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. To hold some hearings; a limited number of hearings. Of course, the subcommittee has not as yet been created. I cannot tell what the subcommittee may do; but, assuming that I may be honored with membership on the subcommittee, I certainly would want to hold hearings. The initial hearings would be attended by appropriate representatives of the Department of Justice and appropriate representatives of the States whose participation may be desired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator not say that the investigation would deal primarily with the gathering of statistics?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No, Mr. President. Statistics will be an important factor, but I think we shall receive some very informative material which will enable us to develop a program at the national level which will aid the States in developing their own individual programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice on page 4 of the report that a proposed budget was made up. Is that on a yearly basis?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No. It runs from the time of the adoption of the resolution to January 31, 1954. The Committee on Rules and Administration amended the original resolution which provided for an appropriation of \$50,000. The amount was reduced to \$44,000.

Mr. President, it is my hope that if I may have the privilege of serving on the subcommittee, we shall not use all of the \$44,000, because I think we shall receive aid from agencies of the States and from agencies of the Federal Government, which will make unnecessary the employment of all the contemplated personnel.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I will say to my distinguished friend from New Jersey that I shall be the most surprised man in the United States if such a thing shall occur, because, as a rule, every dollar appropriated is expended.

The Senator assures us that the amount of money being sought will be used for the employment of the persons indicated on page 4 of the report, up to January 31, 1954.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator give us any assurance that the subcommittee will complete its work on or before January 31, 1954?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I can give assurance, with the understanding, of course, that I shall be a member of the subcommittee—if I have the good fortune to be a member of it—that I shall insist that we complete our work by the time mentioned.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator will recall that some time ago, when we were considering resolutions providing money for the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, it was pointed out that that committee leads all other committees in the amount of money used for investigation purposes, and my recollection is that the amount was in excess of half a million dollars.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am aware of that fact, and I share the feeling of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana with respect to such expenditures. If the Senator will look over my record while serving on the Committee on Rules and Administration, he will find that I insisted again and again on cuts in such appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since the Senator from New Jersey is the author of this resolution I have no doubt that he will be appointed a member of the subcommittee. I hope so; and I hope he will come to the Senate next year without a request for more funds.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I sincerely hope that I shall be able to come before the Senate and report exactly the result which the Senator from Louisiana wishes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the session this afternoon the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 89. At the time of the adoption of the resolution I had intended to make a formal statement on that measure. However, the resolution was adopted as a result of colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and myself.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my formal statement on the resolution be printed in the RECORD at an appropriate place, in connection with that colloquy.

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

"STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

"I rise today in support of Senate Resolution 89, authorizing a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency.

"It was back on March 4 when I first addressed the Senate concerning this study of one of the grave problems facing this Nation of ours today.

"On March 4, the same day upon which I made my brief remarks, I introduced Senate Resolution 89, directing the Committee on the Judiciary or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make this inquiry to determine the nationwide extent and character of juvenile delinquency, its causes and contributing factors.

"The resolution, in part, calls for a review of present Federal statutes dealing with youthful offenders, correctional action taken with respect to youthful delinquents by Federal courts, and a study of the extent to which juveniles are violating narcotics laws.

"When I first discussed before this body the thoroughly disgraceful story of the rotten roots that are gradually tearing at the sturdy trunk of our most priceless heritage—our youth—I recall having referred to juvenile delinquency as the fifth horseman of doom.

"Since that time, through the medium of our daily newspapers, which are depicting a true and ever more grisly tale of increasing incidence of child crime, we who are concerned with this momentous problem have

heard the rising crescendo of hoofbeats from that self-same fifth horseman.

"The Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am proud to be a member, has approved this resolution, as has the Committee on Rules and Administration.

"I believe that the staggering figures, the latest available, as correlated by our Federal Bureau of Investigation, have in no small way pointed up to my responsive and responsible colleagues the need for such an inquiry.

"The newspapers tell only the most sensational part of the story of child crime.

"True enough, the accounts are startling to parents concerned with the spreading problem.

"The recent police raid on a teen-age fraternity 'smoker' here at which obscene motion pictures were displayed is sensational news.

"The 15-year-old New Jersey boy whose father taught him to rob and to murder makes a stark story.

"But I am convinced from a reading of the latest FBI figures that the headlines merely reflect a small part of what is happening to our society—to all levels of our society—which can countenance and enable such tragic events to transpire.

"Please permit me to touch upon merely a part of what the FBI found to be the facts concerning the incidence of child crime in these United States of America.

"Of the more than 1,100,000 arrests reported by 232 cities with populations exceeding 25,000, 147,632, or 13.3 percent, were boys and girls under 21 years of age.

"These youths accounted for 37.2 percent of the robbery arrests, 46.9 percent of the larcenies, 61.7 percent of the burglaries, and 68.6 percent of the auto thefts in the cities.

"More than 13 percent of all auto theft arrests were children who were less than 15 years of age, Mr. President.

"In our very midst, here in the District of Columbia, the Washington Criminal Justice Association reported that in 1952 there was an increase of 60.5 percent in delinquent acts committed by juveniles.

"The pattern is the same throughout the cities of our land. The results of an Associated Press survey made in 1952 showed that about a million children get into trouble each year, and if the total increases only in proportion to the child population, the police will have to handle 1,420,000 child cases in 1960. Heaven help us and our civilization, Mr. President, if the present trend continues.

"That this trend is continuing is known to all too few people. Surely, some parents see the problem. Welfare agencies do. However, too few people are bothering to take a second look at this situation.

"To root the problem out at its core; to alert local authorities to the methods of combating this evil, and where those methods might be falling short; to establish the menace firmly in the public mind for the problem it is—these worthy purposes, Mr. President, constitute part of the scope of this study we are proposing today.

"Since the resolution was introduced, my office has received many expressions of support from agencies such as the American Public Welfare Association, from interested church groups, from State officials and criminologists, and from juvenile and domestic relations court judges.

"These good proponents of my resolution have expressed a variety of reasons for their support. Witness what the Honorable Libby E. Sachar, judge of the juvenile and domestic relations court of Union County, N. J., had to say. Judge Sachar called it a very important piece of legislation, since we have not had a nationwide estimate of the true picture of delinquency for many years. There is no accurate record of the number of delinquents in the United States.

"I should consider this a great service in terms of having authentic figures and a true estimate of the situation."

"Commissioner Sanford Bates of our New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, a top-ranking student of criminology, advises me of his belief in the need for stimulation of 'real sacrifice and effort on the part of our parents, our social agencies, our politicians, and our local leaders.'"

"I feel that the work of the subcommittee would provide just such stimulation by throwing an effective spotlight on the situation and alert presently disinterested parties right down to the family level of their responsibilities and what they can do in the way of correction."

"The Honorable Harry W. Lindeman, Judge of the juvenile and domestic relations court of Essex County, N. J., called the resolution proper and timely. Judge Lindeman wrote: 'I have been greatly concerned during this past year with gangs of the older teen-age boys. When 14- to 17-year-old children take it upon themselves to settle fancied wrongs by use of guns, knives, brass knuckles, auto wrenches, and broken bottles, and when students are beaten and cowed into paying tribute as the price of being left alone, when groups of students of one school prey on students of another to preserve a superior social status or athletic prowess, and when constituted authority is pushed around by junior mobsters, and when citizens are mugged and robbed by gangs of boys seeking an easy dollar, then it is about time for the community and the Nation to map out an overall strategy of action to combat this unhealthy trend.'"

"These are just a few of the expressions of support which have been forthcoming since the resolution was introduced. Those who deal with the problem have given of their assurances that this study is a necessary one. I now call on the Senate of the United States to agree to give such expert opinion a forum for their ideas, so that we may correlate what has been done; determine what remains to be done, and supply the responsible agencies throughout our country with an overall study."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 89), as amended, was agreed to.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 19, 1956]

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calandar No. 1411, Senate Resolution 173, relating to the so-called Kefauver special committee for the study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 173) to conduct a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 173) to conduct a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 2, line 11, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "prior", and in line 21 after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$110,000", so as to make the resolution read:

"Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections

134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate insofar as they relate to the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States, including (a) the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors; (b) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws; (c) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (d) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

"Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from February 1, 1956, to January 31, 1957, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

"Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1957.

"Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$110,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment was, on page 2, line 11, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to insert "prior."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$110,000."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand an additional amendment is to be offered at this point.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in a discussion with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], I have been informed that the amendments I am about to offer are acceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection, first, to the committee amendment just stated?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wanted to make certain, from a parliamentary standpoint, that there would be no problem involved in treating the committee amendment as though it were an original part of the bill, so that the amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Tennessee will be entirely in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. On page 2, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "February" and insert in lieu thereof "March."

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. On page 2, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "\$110,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$55,000."

The \$55,000 will be in addition to the amount which was spent by the committee, under the resolution, for the month of February, \$5,000 having been expended at that time. So the total amount the committee

will have had under the amendment will be \$50,000.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, my understanding is that in line with the other amendment which has been offered, or which is to be offered, the work of the committee will be concluded with this amount. Is that the understanding?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have written to the senior Senator from Louisiana a letter which sets forth my position. The letter states that, so far as I am concerned, the work of the committee will be continued by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary with its regular staff. I personally do not expect or intend to ask for special appropriations next year.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understood the Senator in his conversation with me, the amount which is now proposed would complete the study. Is that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. There are on the agenda further investigations and additional reports which will be filed and which it is expected will be completed this year.

But I wish to make it clear that of course I cannot speak for any other Member of the Senate or the Committee on the Judiciary. The field of juvenile delinquency is an important one, and other matters might arise. But the agenda we now have, the investigations which are scheduled, and the reports to be filed, are expected to be completed this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter dated March 15, 1956, addressed to me by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have the letter read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter will be read by the clerk for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

MARCH 15, 1956.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This will confirm our telephone conversation of Saturday morning concerning Senate Resolution 173 to extend the work of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency.

I have talked with the other members of the subcommittee, Senator HENNING, Senator DANIEL, Senator LANGER, and Senator WILEY, and they have agreed to go along with the request for \$60,000, less one-twelfth for the money expended in February, making a total of \$55,000, effective March 1, 1956.

As I told you, as chairman, I will not seek an extension of time nor appropriation for this subcommittee next year, but will advise the Judiciary Committee that the delinquency matters should be handled with the regular staff after we have finished the necessary hearings, reports, and legislation that are before the subcommittee this year, and submit our final report and recommendations.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
Chairman.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the Senator from Tennessee for just a moment about the problem, because I think we are all looking forward to the report of his committee on juvenile delinquency.

In my opinion we expect much of the committee, and we have a right to expect much of it. I am certain that our expectations

will not be found wanting. In fact, I commend the Senator from Tennessee for the tenacity he has demonstrated in pursuing this very important study.

It has been my observation, however, that too frequently after a special committee has done a great piece of work and reported to the Senate, there is a tendency for the report of such a committee to be placed on file and to gather dust. Then in a few years the problem to which the committee directed its attention remains unsolved, and the investigation procedure must be started all over again.

So I should like to have from the Senator from Tennessee his answer to this question: Am I correct in my understanding that although his subcommittee is supposed to go out of existence, so far as the conducting of a special study on juvenile delinquency is concerned, it is not contemplated by the Committee on the Judiciary that its standing subcommittee, which would have jurisdiction over the subject matter of juvenile delinquency will cease its interest in pursuing the leads which the Senator's special committee report will give to the Committee on the Judiciary and to the Senate?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, we are confronted by a demand—and I say "a demand," because that is what it boils down to—by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for another \$30,000 to keep this subcommittee in being so as to enable the employees who are now on the payroll of the committee to continue their work. I do not see any good which will come from any further investigations of this problem. As I have stated, the Senate has spent on this investigation up to now \$433,000. There is \$24,000 remaining, and the resolution calls for \$30,000 more. The total amount which this investigation will have consumed—if this request is approved—will be almost a half million dollars for an investigation which was not to have cost more than \$75,000 when it was first proposed in the Senate.

The Senate now has an excellent opportunity to rid itself of an investigating subcommittee. I hope and pray that the Senate will reject the resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, there is no man for whom I have greater admiration and respect than the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I have admired the various fights he has made to save the taxpayers of the United States large sums of money. There is no doubt at all that he has saved them, at various times, very large sums, running into hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The situation relative to the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency is simply that the subcommittee asked for \$105,000. The Committee on the Judiciary considered the matter very fully and, by unanimous vote, raised the amount for which the subcommittee asked to \$150,000.

The request then went before the Committee on Rules and Administration, which conducted a full and complete investigation. Various members of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency appeared at that hearing and produced records. The Committee on Rules and Administration, by a unanimous vote, reported a resolution asking for \$110,000. When the resolution was considered by the Senate, the amount was reduced, at

the request of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to \$55,000.

The subcommittee employs, altogether, 12 persons, including all the investigators. We have already filed 2 reports, which have been ordered to be printed. There has been a widespread heavy demand for these reports. Parent-teachers' associations and clergymen from all over the country have asked for copies of the reports, and have used them.

In addition, the American Legion and the Amvets also became interested in the matter. Finally, all the other organizations composed of veterans of World Wars I and II and of the Korean war became interested in the subject.

When we got into the work, we found it was very much larger in scope than was originally anticipated. We found, for example, between the United States and Mexico—to consider this one item first—2,000 acres of land which are claimed by both Mexico and the United States. I went there to see that land. I went at the request of Protestant and Catholic organizations. What did I find there? I found something which has plagued the State Department for more than 100 years. I found that upon the 2,000 acres of land, on which there are a large number of shacks, there occurs almost every kind of law violation which can be conceived of, including narcotics.

The boundary line of those 2,000 acres between Mexico and the United States consists of two barbed wires. Law enforcement there is almost impossible. I appointed a committee, and we held a hearing. When we came back, we took up the matter with the State Department. The State Department suggested that we leave the matter alone for a while.

A few years ago a commission was appointed, and the Chief Justice of the Court of Canada was the judge. He decided in favor of Mexico. The United States refused to be bound by his decision. The result has been that between the United States and Mexico a problem exists which absolutely defies description.

A short time later, Judge Donovan, of St. Paul, Minn., rendered a decision, with which I feel certain every Senator is familiar, dealing with the black market in babies. He sent to the penitentiary some of the persons who appeared before him. Judge Donovan called upon the committee to investigate juvenile delinquency to make a full and complete investigation of the black market in babies.

Mr. President, I never could have believed that the situation which developed there could have existed in the United States of America. We found that women who had served terms in the penitentiaries had homes from which babies were being sold in the black market.

We found that four lawyers in the city of Chicago were trafficking in this business.

We found that unwed mothers, shortly after pregnancy, went to those lawyers and bargained to sell their babies at from \$2,500 to \$5,000 each.

In Miami, Fla., we discovered a headquarters in this black market baby busi-

ness. It is fair estimate to say, from all the evidence adduced, that approximately 25,000 babies were being sold in the black market each year.

Let us take the matter of pornographic literature. The amount my distinguished friend from Louisiana has mentioned, nearly half a million dollars, has been spent; and in my opinion, it is the best money the United States has spent in years and years.

In Baltimore we found one outfit which had a diagram of the places which were dealing in pornographic literature. We found it to be a \$150 million business. We found that there were branches of the Baltimore business in New York; and in New York man after man pleaded the first, and in some instances, the fifth amendment. They would not let the committee have their income-tax returns, and they would not testify where they got their pornographic literature.

We went to Houston, Tex. We went to my own State of North Dakota. A man by the name of Levine had three places from which pornographic literature had been distributed, not only to high-school boys, but to boys in the seventh and eighth grades. Levine was arrested, and I am glad to say was sent to the penitentiary by a Federal judge in the State of North Dakota.

The committee considered the question of correctional institutions. We consulted members of the Supreme Court with respect to getting their opinion as to whether additional courts should be created to deal with the matter of juvenile delinquency. That question is now under consideration.

We went to Alaska. I know that if my good friend the Senator from Louisiana, for whom I have the deepest affection, had been in the Aleutian Islands with us, and had seen the terrible juvenile delinquency situation existing there, he would be speaking now, not in opposition to the \$30,000 appropriation, but he would be asking for \$100,000. The situation is terrible. A report, which has not been published, but which has been prepared, goes into detail. We have to get the approval of the report from the Judiciary Committee. It is in the process of being submitted now, together with two other reports which are ready to be submitted to the Judiciary Committee. In addition, we are in the course of preparation of two other reports.

I might say that on a previous occasion I took up the matter of Indian juvenile delinquency in North Dakota.

This is one committee which does not get many headlines. It may be for that reason that some Senators are not as familiar with the problem as are Senators who are active in the committee.

We learned that at Fort Yates, N. Dak., 50 Indian juveniles who were in jail were using a common toilet. The situation in that jail was described by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], as the worst he had ever seen in his life. We took the matter up with the Indian Office. I am happy to report that \$50,000 has been spent at Fort Yates in North Dakota to build a better jail.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has given us a résumé of the activities of the committee of which he is an honored member. I am especially glad that he has brought to the attention of the Senate the situation of the Indians, because the Senator from Louisiana has mentioned that these matters should be settled at the State and local level. As a matter of fact, the Indians are supposed to be wards of the Federal Government. If they are on reservations, we can take care of them, but there are Indians living off the reservations in Billings, Butte, Havre, Mont., and a large aggregation of them on Hill 57 and Mount Royal outside of Great Falls, Mont. These landless Indians, who are not affiliated with any tribe, are being tossed back and forth by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington and by the local authorities in the State. The result is that an undue burden has been placed on the counties, municipalities, and States in looking after the Indians.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, in my opinion, is deliberately shirking its responsibilities in regard to these Indians, because they are not affiliated with any tribe. It is a social problem. Delinquency is rampant. I think we are not doing our duty when we ignore the first citizens of our country, the people from whose ancestors we took this continent. I certainly hope something will be done along the lines of Indian rehabilitation, especially for the landless Indians who are not affiliated with any tribes.

I have been informed that when the Senator appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration, it was his intention to look into the Montana situation to see if something could not be done to give the Indians who live in city dumps on Hill 57 and Mount Royal in the vicinity of Great Falls, some stability and to put the burden where it belongs so far as their welfare is concerned.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator. I might say it is the intention of the senior Senator from North Dakota, who is the ranking minority member of the committee, to go to the State of Montana, and I should like to take with me the two distinguished Senators from Montana.

Mr. President, let us consider the question of the Indian children who are not going to school. I call attention to the fact that the attorney general of New Mexico testified that thousands of Indian children, some of them 16 years old, and some of whom could not talk English, were not going to school. The present distinguished Governor of Arizona, the former majority leader of the Senate, Governor McFarland, testified that in the State of Arizona today 8,000 Indians of school age were not attending school. The distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] can testify to that fact.

We discussed the situation of the Papago Tribe, located about 100 miles from

Tucson, where the hospital had burned in 1947. The head of the Board of Health of the State of Arizona testified that of every 100 children born to that tribe, 17 of them died before they were 1 year old. Forty-two percent of them died before they were 6 years old. Fifty-two percent of them died before they were 17 years old.

When the situation was brought to the attention of the Senators from Arizona, the two Senators from that State [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. GOLDWATER] got together and offered an amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill providing nearly \$2 million, with the result that a hospital is being built today. If it had not been for the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, that death rate would still be going up. Not only that, but the death rate from tuberculosis among those Indian children is 30 times what the death rate is for the white people.

Mr. President, I could talk on this matter for hours, because it is very close to my heart, but I have stated the situation in substance.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was rather amused by what the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, as well as the distinguished Senator from Montana, said. All of us are acquainted with the situation with regard to the Indians. We have taken care of many of them. But I make the point that the evils referred to cannot be cured merely by exposing them.

Up to now we have had 30 hearings on juvenile delinquency—14 during the 83d Congress and 16 during the 84th Congress. One report was made during the 83d Congress, and 7 reports were made during the 84th Congress.

All we have obtained are reports on top of reports, following hearings on top of hearings.

Mr. President, in order to deal with this difficulty, something other than hearings must occur. We shall never deal with the difficulty merely by exposing it. I do not know of any legislation that has resulted from any of the hearings, although that was the reason for the original investigation.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that 17 bills are pending.

Mr. ELLENDER. They have been pending, but they have never been considered by the Senate. Certainly enough testimony is now on hand to make it possible for action to be taken by the committee on the pending bills.

My point is that the subcommittee holds hearings and makes reports; but when the bills designed to correct the evils complained of are before the committee, the committee takes the position that it must hold hearings over and over again. As the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has said, legislation has been proposed. However, it is still in the committees.

Mr. President, I say it is just a waste of the time of Senators and it is an unnecessary expense to continue these hearings.

As I have pointed out on many occasions, the Senate has been increasing the appropriations for investigations by

many, many thousands of dollars each year. Last year, as I remember, the Senate spent in the neighborhood of \$1,900,000 for special investigations. This year the expenditure will amount to \$2,189,583.38. Of that huge sum, the Judiciary Committee spent \$917,666.69, the RECORD reveals that the Judiciary Committee has spent almost half of the total amount the Senate has from year to year been making available for its special investigations. I think it is time to stop some of them, and the juvenile delinquency investigation in particular should be brought to a close without the appropriation of a single additional penny.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield, so that I may address an inquiry to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I know of the great interest the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has constantly had in the matter of juvenile delinquency, particularly in respect to the Indian investigation, which he feels very deeply that he would like to continue, and that it should be continued, and that the reports should be made available to the Senate and to the country.

As the Senator from North Dakota has quite correctly pointed out, when there was colloquy on this subject with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on the floor of the Senate on March 19, 1956—as appears at page 5029 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—a commitment was made by the Senator from Tennessee that if the resolution then pending—which called for \$55,000—was adopted, that would make it possible for the work to be completed, and it would be completed. But, as the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out, he himself made his views clear at that time, and stated that he would not feel personally bound by such an arrangement.

I would be prepared to support the Senator's resolution if he would agree to an amendment to strike out "\$85,000" and insert "\$80,000." That would allow the Senator \$25,000 with which to carry on that work and, I hope, to bring it to completion and to develop the facts which he feels that it is very important to develop.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me say that my heart is very, very sad; but I reluctantly accept the amendment. It is better to get \$25,000 for these poor, poor, neglected and starved Indians, than to get nothing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, and I wish to thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to thank my friend, the Senator from California, for being willing to have at least that amount made available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from California will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 6, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "\$85,000", and to insert in lieu thereof "\$80,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 303), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution No. 173, agreed to on March 20, 1956, be amended by striking out in section 4, lines 21 and 22, "Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$55,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$80,000."

TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND ITS ENVIRONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] has a conference report which he wishes to have the Senate consider. I understand that all the papers in connection with the conference report are now at the desk; and I ask the Senator from Michigan to submit the report.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3073) to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes. 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 July 19, 1956, pp. 13571-13576, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think a brief explanation should be made, for the RECORD, of what the conference report provides regarding the District of Columbia transit problem.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the conference report merely sets forth the criteria under which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enter into an agreement with a private operator, for the operation of a transit system in the District of Columbia.

The report further authorizes the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in the event the pending contract does not reach completion, to deal with other private operators. The report sets forth almost nothing else of consequence. It anticipates that the contract pending between the Capital Transit Co. and the so-called Chalk group will take effect approximately on August 15.

I hope that statement supplies the necessary information.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

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

The report was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2457, Senate Resolution 306, providing additional funds for the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand the resolution, it provides for an additional \$100,000 with which to carry on investigations, should there be any contest in the elections.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is my understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 306) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 176, agreed to February 17, 1956, is hereby amended as follows:

In section 4, strike out "\$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000."

APPOINTMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR IN BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS AND ONE ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—DISCHARGE OF A COMMITTEE—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, an authorization bill (S. 4164) to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Bureau of Public Roads, one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on July 3. I call the attention of the Senate to the Reorganization Act of 1946, which establishes the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Works over all measures relating to roads and post roads.

The Committee on Public Works has worked hard and long on the Federal Aid Highway Act, which recently became law. It is believed that the program should be carried forward under competent administration and supervision.

Therefore, I move that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 4164, and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Works, in order that that committee may consider the questions the bill involves.

The bill provides for the employment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Bureau of Public Roads and for one additional Secretary of Commerce, and has some other purposes.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand correctly that this is a proposal to create more assistant secretaries?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is not a proposal by the Senator from Texas to create them; it is a proposal by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Bureau of Public Roads and also for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The bill was originally referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, but it was thought that the Committee on Public Works, which has a deep interest in the matter, should have jurisdiction over the bill, and the chairman and the other members of that committee have asked me to request that the bill be referred to their committee. I understand that that is agreeable to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, when the bill was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, naturally we proceeded to act on it but if matters will be expedited by having the bill referred to the Committee on Public Works, we have no objection to its rereferral.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, an amendment will be offered to delete certain provisions from this bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I so understand.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As the chairman has stated, this section of the bill deals with the creation of new positions because of the new highway legislation, recently passed. It was included in the bill only to get action. I certainly have no objection to having the bill referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The Government has been spending half a billion dollars a year for road construction throughout the Nation. For the next 2 years it will be spending \$3 billion. I sincerely hope that early action will be taken. I have no objection to the rereferral of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 4164, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The motion was agreed to.

MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE JUDICIARY FROM 3 TO 5 P. M. TODAY, FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSIDERING CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I send a proposed unanimous-consent agreement to the desk and ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be read by the clerk.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be authorized, upon call by the chairman, to meet during the session of the Senate from 3 p. m. to 5 p. m., on the afternoon of Friday, July 20, 1956, for the purpose of considering only the bills which were listed on page 13498 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, July 19, when unanimous consent was granted the Judiciary Committee to meet this morning. The said bills are to be called up and considered in the order designated by the chairman and any amendments thereto shall be germane within the judgment of the chairman of the committee. Any other bills, nominations or motions can be considered by unanimous consent of the committee.

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

SUPPLEMENTATION OF FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. 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. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). 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 12, 1956, pp. 10096-10098, 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. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation and to ask some questions of the Senator from New Mexico with respect to the conference report.

I was one of the conferees on this measure. I also had a bill which would have authorized the same type of program. There were a number of other bills, and eventually we worked out the committee bill. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. The committee bill merged the best features of all the bills presented, and this is the measure which finally went to conference. Substantially the same provisions are in the conference report as were in the bill when it passed the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Utah had a bill, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] had a bill, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] had some suggestions to make. We worked them over and came out with a bill containing those provisions.

Mr. WATKINS. It was a bipartisan effort.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was a bipartisan effort, in which we all joined.

Mr. WATKINS. Under the circumstances, it had to do with the passage of the watershed amendment. Does the

Senator from New Mexico see any possible conflict between the two measures?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. The small projects bill will be chiefly utilized in the reclamation States. The other bill will be utilized in the remaining areas of the country. The two bills are more or less companion measures. The small projects bill should be passed, because it is very essential to the Western States.

Mr. WATKINS. The Poage bill, so-called, is applicable all over the United States, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to say, if I may, that this bill marks a period of great progress in reclamation and water development not only in the West, but throughout the United States. For many years the people of the West have desired this kind of legislation so that small projects which are not under consideration by the Bureau of Reclamation may receive some attention. Many of them are difficult to have built. They require long-term financing and it is difficult to get the money. That is one reason why the people wanted legislation to take care of the smaller projects which would have an overall effect which is very important to the economy of the West.

I am very happy that the small projects bill has been reported and is now before the Senate for final approval. I think a splendid job was done, particularly by the Subcommittee on Reclamation and Irrigation, and I am happy to have been associated with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico in working out the program.

Mr. ANDERSON. We were all very happy to have the Senator from Utah associated with us.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I wish to join in commending the Senator from New Mexico. This is a very important measure to all the States in the West. Under the provisions now in the conference report, it is applicable to the reclamation States in the West; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. The bill provides that local organizations shall pay not to exceed 25 percent of that part of the costs which are allocable to nonreimbursable items.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. BARRETT. I think it is a splendid piece of legislation and will do a great deal for the development of the West.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I simply wish to associate myself with the remarks just made. I think this is a splendid piece of legislation.

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

The report was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day the eminent Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] called up a conference report on the Small Projects Reclamation Act. At the time the conference report was agreed to, I was not on the floor, although I had given notice that I wished to be notified when the conference report was brought up. Through an unavoidable error, that was not done. The Senator

from New Mexico is perfectly innocent in the matter. He should in no sense be blamed for it. But the truth is that the conference report was agreed to with a very small attendance of Senators on the floor, and I did not have an opportunity to inquire about the bill as I had hoped to do.

I have had a private conversation with the Senator from New Mexico. I am now delighted to see that he has just come on the floor. I would appreciate it if, out of order, I might have the opportunity to ask some questions of the Senator from New Mexico with particular reference to the 160-acre limitation provision.

Is my understanding correct that when the small projects reclamation bill passed the Senate, it included an amendment, sponsored by the Senator from Illinois, which provided that the present 160-acre limitation should be continued?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct; that provision was in the bill, and the conference report preserved the 160-acre principle as to all new land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The wording, however, which the Senator from Illinois inserted, was eliminated; is not that true? I do not find it in the bill as it has come back from conference.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the exact language which the Senator from Illinois placed in the bill was eliminated, but I am certain when I say to him that on all new land which will be brought in by the Small Projects Act the 160-acre limitation will apply.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, land which previously had not received irrigation water?

Mr. ANDERSON. Land which never had been irrigated. As to land which has been irrigated previously, of course, Congress has had a fairly consistent practice of not applying the 160-acre limitation to such tracts.

I call the attention of the able Senator from Illinois to the fact that in some cases there has been an attempt to limit the acreage. In this particular instance, for his information, I may say that if the area exceeds 160 acres, then there must be a special payment of interest, beyond the 160 acres, during the entire period, at the rate which the Government is paying for its money, so long as that money is furnished. That will tend to discourage the use of this type of water on supplemental land. That applies to everything over 160 acres.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for that statement. This is at least an improvement over some procedures.

But is not the term "supplemental water" frequently abused? Is it not true that as to certain land, notably in the Central Valley of California, water will be pumped from subsurface deposits, and then when water is brought out through the irrigation ditches, that water is said to be supplemental water, and the water is then brought down from the mountains through the irrigation ditches, freed from the 160-acre limitation? In this way the taxpayers' money is used to help big and not small farmers.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not able specifically to answer the question. I believe more water is used as surface water, perhaps, in the Central Valley project than anywhere else; but the problem in the Central Valley project is sometimes to get rid of excess water, not to acquire new water.

I must say to the Senator from Illinois that the problem of the Central Valley project in California has been extremely complex; it is not like anything else in the United States. But I point out to him that in some of the legislation which has been passed, provision was made that the water might be supplied without interest up to 480 acres. In the case of the Big Thompson project, in Colorado, there was no restriction whatever on supplemental water; the area could go up to 2,000 acres, if that was desired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That provision, I might say, was adopted over the objection of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was the will of Congress; but I point out to the Senator that we have come a long way toward meeting his objection. We have come from the several thousand acres provided in the Big Thompson to 480 acres in the San Luis; and from the 480 acres in the San Luis, we came to 160 acres in this bill. The bill meets exactly the 160-acre limitation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But on supplemental water one can go up to 480 acres in this bill provided he pays the interest.

Mr. ANDERSON. In this bill he will start to pay interest at 160 acres, whereas in the San Luis project there was an exemption up to 480 acres. No interest was paid up to 480 acres. So the bill is as close to a 160-acre limitation as it can come and still recognize supplemental water rights.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The 160-acre limitation, which was placed in the original Reclamation Act by Senator Newlands, of Nevada, and which was approved, as I remember it, by President Theodore Roosevelt, is basic to our water policy; namely, that the Government should make these expenditures in order to build up small farms rather than huge farms.

Mr. ANDERSON. Precisely; but I may say to the Senator from Illinois that the original Reclamation Act was related to areas in regions where the climate was extremely favorable, and 160 acres was sufficient for a farm. But in the areas at higher levels, where there is a short growing season and a rather limited time in which to grow a crop, the Bureau of Reclamation itself has recognized that the 160-acre limitation is not workable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The regions at higher altitudes, having short growing seasons, are the regions in which probably there should be no irrigation projects. They are regions which grow forage crops, and in some cases fruits; but they do not have the high yields per acre of the low altitudes in the Salt River Valley, the Central Valley, and the Imperial Valley.

I have noticed that the reclamation advocates are always willing and anxious to extend the 160 acres, but are never willing to contract it. In the low altitudes, where citrus fruit is grown, one

can make a very good living on 20, 30, or 40 acres.

The so-called 160-acre limitation—which is really a 320-acre limitation, because a man's wife also will be given 160 acres—provides riches beyond dreams of avarice for those in the lush valleys I have mentioned. Nevertheless, there is never any proposal to reduce the acreage limitations in those areas. No; the proposal is to extend the acreage limitation, wherever that can be done. The principle of flexibility works only one way.

I should like to ask one final question. There is a water shortage not merely in the so-called irrigation States, but there is also a great water shortage all over the country, and many authorities, such as Professor Sears, now of Yale, formerly of the University of Oklahoma, and who is a great geographer and an expert on climate, maintains that a much larger increase in agricultural production can be obtained by irrigating the Middle West than by irrigating the Southwest; and that the added yield from 5 or 6 inches more water in Illinois would be far more effective than would 12 inches of water on the barren sands of New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say to the Senator from Illinois that that statement is perfectly correct, and that is probably why the delta of the Mississippi, one of the richest of all the farmlands in the world, has turned to irrigation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the bill confine itself to the irrigation States, or does it permit the small irrigation projects to be constructed in States to the east of the so-called irrigation area?

Mr. ANDERSON. I can answer the Senator in this way: There were two bills, this bill and the Poage bill. The provisions were contained at one time in one bill. Then it was deemed undesirable to pass it in that form, because one agency administers the provisions of the law for the so-called irrigation States, and the Poage bill was passed for the other States. The bill passed the Senate this morning.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has it passed the House?

Mr. ANDERSON. It has passed the House.

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL IN- STITUTE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDHOOD

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 664 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Foreign Relations is discharged from the consideration of House Joint Resolution 664, which will be read by title.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 664) to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the American Interna-

tional Institute for the Protection of Childhood and authorizing an appropriation therefor was read twice by title.

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

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 664) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 195 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate Joint Resolution 195 is indefinitely postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1777. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize common carriers to carry a disabled person requiring an attendant and such attendant at the usual fare charged for one person;

S. 2572. An act to authorize the interchange of lands between the Department of Agriculture and military departments of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; and

S. 3832. An act to provide for the disposal of the Government-owned synthetic rubber research laboratories at Akron, Ohio.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5337) to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable commodities.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2182) for the relief of the city of Elkins, W. Va.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3903) to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title II of the act, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the

conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. ANDRESEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 86) authorizing the conferees on H. R. 1774, abolishing the Verendrye National Monument, N. Dak., to consider certain additional Senate amendments.

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

H. R. 5435. An act to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Federal Civil Defense Administration to procure radiological instruments and detection devices, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

H. R. 12170. An act to remove the present \$1,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a naval aircraft at the Wold-Chamberlain Airfield, Minneapolis, Minn.; and

H. J. Res. 549. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the State of New York to negotiate and enter into an agreement or compact with the Government of Canada for the establishment of the Niagara Frontier Port Authority with power to take over, maintain, and operate the present highway bridge over the Niagara River between the city of Buffalo, N. Y., and the city of Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Reports Nos. 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, and 2244, current session;

H. Con. Res. 261. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on civil defense for national survival held during the current session by a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations;

H. Con. Res. 262. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to print 40,000 additional copies of the hearings of the Research and Development Subcommittee on Progress Report on Research in Medicine, Biology, and Agriculture Using Radioactive Isotopes; and

H. Con. Res. 263. Concurrent resolution authorizing additional copies of the hearing on Labor-Management Problems of the American Merchant Marine.

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. 3498. A bill to extend authority of the American Battle Monuments Commission to all areas in which the Armed Forces of the United States have conducted operations since April 6, 1917, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9801. An act to authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 5435. An act to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Federal Civil Defense Administration to procure radiological instruments and detection devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 254) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Reports Nos. 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, and 2244, current session, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 10,000 additional copies each of House Reports Nos. 2240, 2241, 2242, 2243, and 2244, current session, all of which are reports on the Communist conspiracy.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 261) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings on civil defense for national survival held during the current session by a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations not to exceed 3,000 additional copies of each part of the hearing held by the Subcommittee on Military Operations, Committee on Government Operations, during the current session relative to civil defense for national survival.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 262) authorizing the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to print 40,000 additional copies of the hearings of the Research and Development Subcommittee on "Progress Report on Research in Medicine, Biology, and Agriculture Using Radioactive Isotopes," was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed with illustrations for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy 40,000 additional copies of the hearings held by the Research and Development Subcommittee of the said joint committee during the 84th Congress entitled "Progress Report on Research in Medicine, Biology, and Agriculture Using Radioactive Isotopes."

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 263) authorizing additional copies of the hearing on Labor-Management Problems of the American Merchant Marine, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of

Representatives, 1,000 additional copies of the hearing held by said committee during the current Congress, first session, relative to labor-management problems of the American merchant marine.

EXECUTIVE PAY ACT, 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7619) to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—BASIC COMPENSATION FOR HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER FEDERAL OFFICIALS

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as "Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956."

SEC. 102. The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this section shall be \$25,000.

- (1) Secretary of State.
- (2) Secretary of Treasury.
- (3) Secretary of Defense.
- (4) Attorney General.
- (5) Postmaster General.
- (6) Secretary of the Interior.
- (7) Secretary of Agriculture.
- (8) Secretary of Commerce.
- (9) Secretary of Labor.
- (10) Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SEC. 103. (a) The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this subsection shall be \$22,500.

- (1) Director, Bureau of the Budget.
- (2) Comptroller General.
- (3) Director, Office of Defense Mobilization.

(b) The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this subsection shall be \$22,000.

- (1) Secretary of the Army.
- (2) Secretary of the Navy.
- (3) Secretary of the Air Force.

SEC. 104. The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this section shall be \$21,000.

- (1) Commissioner, Internal Revenue.
- (2) Director of Central Intelligence.
- (3) Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(4) Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration.

- (5) Administrator of General Services.
- (6) Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency.

(7) Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

- (8) Director, International Cooperation Administration.
- (9) Director, United States Information Agency.

(10) Governor, Farm Credit Administration.

- (11) President, Export-Import Bank of Washington.
- (12) Under Secretary of the Treasury.

(13) Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

- (14) Deputy Postmaster General.
- (15) Under Secretary of Interior.
- (16) Under Secretary of Agriculture.

(17) Under Secretary of Commerce.

- (18) Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation.
- (19) Under Secretary of Labor.

(20) Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SEC. 105. The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this section shall be \$20,500.

(1) Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.
 (2) Chairman, Civil Service Commission.
 (3) Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.
 (4) Chairman, Federal Communications Commission.
 (5) Chairman, Board of Directors, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
 (6) Chairman, Federal Maritime Board.
 (7) Chairman, Federal Power Commission.
 (8) Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.
 (9) Chairman, Federal Trade Commission.
 (10) Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.
 (11) Chairman, Home Loan Bank Board.
 (12) Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission.
 (13) Chairman, National Labor Relations Board.
 (14) Chairman, National Mediation Board.
 (15) Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board.
 (16) Chairman, Renegotiation Board.
 (17) Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.
 (18) Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board.
 (19) Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority.
 (20) Chairman, United States Tariff Commission.
 (21) Comptroller of the Currency.
 (22) Assistant Comptroller General.
 (23) Deputy Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration.
 (24) Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.
 (25) Deputy Director, Bureau of the Budget.
 (26) Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency.
 (27) Deputy Director, Office of Defense Mobilization.
 (28) Deputy Director, United States Information Agency.
 (29) Deputy Under Secretary, Department of State (3).
 (30) Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.
 (31) First Vice President, Export-Import Bank of Washington.
 SEC. 106. (a) The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this subsection shall be \$20,000.
 (1) Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, State Department.
 (2) Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.
 (3) Administrator, Commodity Stabilization Service.
 (4) Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration.
 (5) Administrator, Small Business Administration.
 (6) Administrator, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.
 (7) Administrator, Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.
 (8) Archivist of the United States.
 (9) Assistant Directors, Bureau of the Budget (2).
 (10) Assistant Postmasters General (5).
 (11) Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture (3).
 (12) Assistant Secretaries of Commerce (3).
 (13) Assistant Secretaries of Defense (9).
 (14) Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare (2).
 (15) Assistant Secretaries of Interior (3).
 (16) Assistant Secretaries of Labor (3).
 (17) Assistant Secretaries of State (10).
 (18) Assistant Secretaries of Treasury (3).
 (19) Assistant Secretaries of Air Force (4).
 (20) Assistant Secretaries of Army (4).
 (21) Assistant Secretaries of Navy (4).
 (22) Associate Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(23) Chairman, Military Liaison Committee, AEC, Department of Defense.
 (24) Commissioner, Community Facilities, Housing and Home Finance Agency.
 (25) Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration.
 (26) Commissioner of Patents.
 (27) Commissioner, Public Housing Administration.
 (28) Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration.
 (29) Counselor of the Department of State.
 (30) Deputy Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency.
 (31) Deputy Administrator, General Services Administration.
 (32) Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency.
 (33) Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts.
 (34) Director, Bureau of Prisons.
 (35) Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
 (36) Director, National Science Foundation.
 (37) Director, Selective Service.
 (38) Federal Highway Administrator.
 (39) Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.
 (40) General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board.
 (41) Governor of Alaska.
 (42) Governor of the Canal Zone.
 (43) Governor of Hawaii.
 (44) Governor of Guam.
 (45) Governor of the Virgin Islands.
 (46) Librarian of Congress.
 (47) President, Federal National Mortgage Association.
 (48) Public Printer.
 (49) Special Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
 (50) Under Secretary of the Army.
 (51) Under Secretary of the Navy.
 (52) Under Secretary of the Air Force.
 (53) Legal Adviser, solicitor, or general counsel of an executive department (excluding Department of Justice).
 (54) Members of boards and commissions (excluding chairmen):
 Civil Aeronautics Board (4).
 Civil Service Commission (2).
 Council of Economic Advisers (2).
 Board of Directors, Export-Import Bank of Washington (3).
 Federal Communications Commission (6).
 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (1).
 Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System (6).
 Federal Maritime Board (2).
 Foreign Claims Settlement Commission (2).
 Federal Power Commission (4).
 Federal Trade Commission (4).
 Home Loan Bank Board (2).
 Interstate Commerce Commission (10).
 National Labor Relations Board (4).
 National Mediation Board (2).
 Railroad Retirement Board (2).
 Renegotiation Board (4).
 Securities and Exchange Commission (4).
 Subversive Activities Control Board (4).
 Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority (2).
 U. S. Tariff Commission (5).
 (b) The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this subsection shall be \$19,000.
 (1) Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission (3).
 (2) Commissioner, United States Court of Claims (12).
 SEC. 107. The annual rate of basic compensation of each of the offices or positions listed in this section shall be \$17,500.
 (1) Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture.
 (2) Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration.

(3) Administrator, Farmers' Home Administration.
 (4) Administrator, Soil Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.
 (5) Assistant Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts.
 (6) Associate Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.
 (7) Chief Assistant Librarian of Congress.
 (8) Chief Forester of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.
 (9) Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.
 (10) Commissioner of Customs.
 (11) Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration.
 (12) Commissioner of Narcotics.
 (13) Commissioner of Public Buildings Service.
 (14) Commissioner of Public Roads.
 (15) Commissioner of Reclamation.
 (16) Commissioner of Social Security.
 (17) Commissioner, United States Court of Claims (12).
 (18) Deputy Administrator, Small Business Administration (2).
 (19) Deputy Administrator, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.
 (20) Deputy Commissioner, Internal Revenue.
 (21) Deputy Public Printer.
 (22) First Assistant Commissioner of Patents.
 (23) Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 108. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this title, the chairman or other head of each independent board or commission in the executive branch shall receive, during the period of his service as chairman or other head of such board or commission, annual basic compensation at a rate which is \$500 more than the annual rate of basic compensation prescribed by this title for the other members of such board or commission.

SEC. 109. Section 105 of title 3 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 105. Compensation of secretaries and executive, administrative, and staff assistants to President.

"The President is authorized to fix the compensation of the 6 administrative assistants authorized to be appointed under section 106 of this title, of the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, and of 8 other secretaries or other immediate staff assistants in the White House Office, as follows: Two at rates not exceeding \$22,500 per annum, 3 at rates not exceeding \$21,000 per annum, 7 at rates not exceeding \$20,000 per annum, and 3 at rates not exceeding \$17,500 per annum."

SEC. 110. The annual compensation for each of the offices established by section 1 (d) of Reorganization Plan Numbered 7 of 1953, effective August 1, 1953 (67 Stat. 639) shall be established by the Secretary of State at a rate not more than \$19,000.

SEC. 111. Section 2 of Public Law 565, 79th Congress, approved July 30, 1946 (60 Stat. 712), is amended by striking out "\$12,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$15,000".

SEC. 112. Section 527 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, approved August 26, 1954 (Public Law 665, 83d Cong.) 68 Stat. 832) is amended by striking out "\$15,000 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$19,000 per annum."

SEC. 113. (a) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule continued in section 603 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out:

"GS-17----- 13,975 14,190 14,405 14,620
 GS-18----- 14,800"

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"GS-17. 13,975 14,190 14,405 14,620 14,835
 GS-18. 16,000."

(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at a scheduled rate of grade 17 or 18 of the General Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled rate in effect on and after such date;

(2) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is in a position in grade 17 of the General Schedule and is receiving basic compensation at a rate between two scheduled rates of such grade, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date;

(3) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is in a position in grade 17 of the General Schedule and is receiving basic compensation at a rate which is in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade as provided in this section, he shall continue to receive such higher rate of basic compensation until (i) he leaves such position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended.

SEC. 114. The Postal Field Service Schedule in section 301 (a) of the act of June 10, 1955 (Public Law 68, 84th Cong.) is amended by striking out:

"18.... 12,500 12,800 13,100 13,400 13,700 14,000 14,300
19.... 13,600 13,900 14,200 14,500 14,800
20.... 14,800"

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"18.... 12,800 13,100 13,400 13,700 14,000 14,300 14,600
19.... 14,000 14,300 14,600 14,900 15,200
20.... 16,000."

SEC. 115. Section 3 of the act of January 3, 1946, as amended (38 U. S. C. 15b), is hereby amended as follows:

(a) The last sentence of section 3 (b) is amended to read: "During the period of his service as such, the Chief Medical Director shall be paid a salary of \$17,800 a year."

(b) The last sentence of section 3 (c) is amended to read: "During the period of his service as such, the Deputy Chief Medical Director shall be paid a salary of \$16,800 a year."

(c) That portion of section 3 (d) which precedes the proviso is amended to read: "Each Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be appointed by the Administrator upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director and shall be paid a salary of \$15,800."

SEC. 116. (a) The first section of the act approved August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 715; Public Law 313, 80th Cong.), as amended, relating to salary limitations on research and development positions requiring the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel in certain departments and agencies, is amended by striking out "\$10,000" and "\$15,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,500" and "\$19,000", respectively.

(b) Section 208 (g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 210 (g)), relating to salary limitations on research and development positions requiring the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel in the Public Health Service is amended by striking out "\$10,000" and "\$20,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,000" and "\$19,000", respectively.

SEC. 117. The salary amendments contained in section 116 shall not affect the authority of the Civil Service Commission or the procedure for fixing the pay of individual officers or employees under the statutes therein amended; except that the existing rate of basic compensation of any officer

or employee to whom such section applies which is less than a rate of \$12,500 per annum shall be increased to such rate on the effective date of this title.

SEC. 118. Section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, as amended (21 U. S. C. 113a), relating to salary limitation on technical experts or scientists for research and study of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases, is hereby amended by striking out "\$15,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$19,000."

SEC. 119. The last paragraph under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, is amended by striking out so much thereof as reads "the basic compensation of one employee of each such committee may be fixed at any rate not in excess of \$3,460 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "the basic compensation of two employees of each such committee may be fixed at any rate not in excess of \$8,460 per annum."

SEC. 120. The gross rate of compensation of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate shall be \$17,600 per annum.

SEC. 121. This title shall take effect at the beginning of the first pay period commencing after June 30, 1956.

TITLE II—PROVISIONS RELATING TO ORGANIZATION OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SEC. 201. (a) The first section of the act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," approved January 16, 1883, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 632), is amended by inserting immediately after the first paragraph thereof a paragraph as follows:

"The term of office of each such Commissioner shall be 6 years, except that (1) the terms of office of the Commissioners holding office on the effective date of this paragraph (including the term of office of an individual appointed to fill any vacancy in the Commission existing on such effective date) shall expire, as designated by the President, one at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 4 years, and one at the end of 6 years, after such effective date; (2) any Commissioner appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term of his predecessor shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (3) upon the expiration of his term of office a Commissioner may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified."

(b) Such first section of such act of January 16, 1883, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"In addition to designating a Chairman of the Commission from time to time, pursuant to section 1 of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1949, the President shall from time to time designate one of the Commissioners as Vice Chairman of the Commission. During the absence or disability of the Commissioner designated as Chairman, or in the event of a vacancy in the office of such Commissioner, the Commissioner designated as Vice Chairman shall perform those functions of the Chairman which were transferred to the Chairman by the provisions of section 2 (a) (2) to 2 (a) (6), inclusive, of such Reorganization Plan. During the absence or disability of both the Commissioner designated as Chairman and the Commissioner designated as Vice Chairman, or in the event of vacancies in the offices of both such Commissioners, the remaining Commissioner shall perform such functions. During the absence or disability of all three Commissioners, or in the event of vacancies in the offices of all three Commissioners, the Executive Director shall perform such functions; but the Executive Director shall at no time sit as a member or acting member of the Commission."

SEC. 202. (a) This section and section 201 (b) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

(b) Section 201 (a) shall take effect on March 1, 1957.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. (a) The President shall hereafter appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a General Counsel of the Post Office Department, a General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, a General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a General Counsel of the Department of the Army, a General Counsel of the Department of the Navy, and a General Counsel of the Department of the Air Force.

(b) The existing office of Solicitor of the Post Office Department and the existing offices of General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, shall be abolished effective upon the appointment and qualification of the General Counsels of such respective departments provided for by subsection (a) or April 1, 1957, whichever is earlier.

SEC. 302. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "subsections (c), (d), and (e)" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (c), (d), (e), and (f)"; and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:

"(f) The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts is authorized to place a total of four positions in the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in grade 18 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by subsection (b)."

SEC. 303. (a) The positions of seven Directors of Commodity Offices, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, shall be in grade GS-16 of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by section 505 (b) of such act.

(b) The positions of three Deputy Administrators of the Agricultural Research Service, Department of Agriculture, shall be in grade GS-18 of the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by section 505 (b) of such act.

SEC. 304. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, order, or regulation, the head of the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce shall be a Federal Highway Administrator appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrator shall receive basic compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments and shall perform such duties as the Secretary of Commerce may prescribe or as may be required by law.

(b) The term "Commissioner of Public Roads," as used in all laws, orders, and regulations heretofore enacted, issued, or promulgated shall be deemed to mean "Federal Highway Administrator" on and after the date of enactment of this act.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) hereof there shall be a Commissioner of Public Roads in the Bureau of Public Roads who shall be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, and perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Federal Highway Administrator.

SEC. 305. The paragraph under the heading "General Provisions" under the appropriations for the Post Office Department contained in chapter IV of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (64 Stat. 1050; 31 U. S. C. 695), is amended by striking out "the receipt of revenue from fourth-class mail service sufficient to pay the cost of such service" and inserting "that the cost of

fourth-class mail service will not exceed by more than 10 percent the revenues therefrom."

TITLE IV—CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

SEC. 401. The Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Definitions

"SECTION 1. Wherever used in this act—

"(a) The term 'employee' shall mean a civilian officer or employee in or under the Government and, except for purposes of section 2, shall mean a person to whom this act applies.

"(b) The term 'Member' shall mean the Vice President, a United States Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from a Territory, or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico and, except for purposes of section 2, shall mean a Member to whom this act applies.

"(c) The term 'congressional employee' means an employee of the Senate or House of Representatives or of a committee of either House, an employee of a joint committee of the two Houses, an elected officer of the Senate or House of Representatives who is not a Member of either House, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives and the employees in their respective offices, an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate and a person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their official duties, a member of the Capitol Police force, an employee of the Vice President if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and an employee of a Member if such employee's compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

"(d) The term 'basic salary' shall not include bonuses, allowances, overtime pay, or salary, pay, or compensation given in addition to the base pay of the position as fixed by law or regulation: *Provided*, That the term 'basic salary' shall not include military pay for persons who enter upon active military service after the effective date of this act: *And provided further*, That for employees paid on a fee basis, the maximum amount of basic salary which may be used shall be \$10,000 per annum. For a Member, the term 'basic salary' shall include, from April 1, 1954, to February 28, 1955, the amount received as expense allowance under section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and such amount from January 3, 1953, to March 31, 1954, provided deposit is made thereon as provided in section 4.

"(e) The term 'average salary' shall mean the largest annual rate resulting from averaging, over any period of 5 consecutive years of creditable service, a Member's or an employee's rates of basic salary in effect during such period, with each rate weighted by the time it was in effect.

"(f) The term 'fund' shall mean the civil-service retirement and disability fund created by the act of May 22, 1920.

"(g) The terms 'disabled' and 'disability' shall mean totally disabled for useful and efficient service in the grade or class of position last occupied by the employee or Member by reason of disease or injury not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on his part within the 5 years next prior to becoming so disabled.

"(h) The term 'widow,' for purposes of section 10, shall mean the surviving wife of an employee or Member who was married to such individual for at least 2 years immediately preceding his death or is the mother of issue by such marriage.

"(i) The term 'widower,' for purposes of section 10, shall mean the surviving husband of an employee or Member who was mar-

ried to such employee or Member for at least 2 years immediately preceding her death or is the father of issue by such marriage. The term 'dependent widower,' for purposes of section 10, shall mean a 'widower' who is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability, and who received more than one-half his support from such employee or Member.

"(j) The term 'child,' for purposes of section 10, shall mean an unmarried child, including (1) an adopted child, and (2) a stepchild or recognized natural child who received more than one-half his support from and lived with the Member or employee in a regular parent-child relationship, under the age of 18 years, or such unmarried child regardless of age who because of physical or mental disability incurred before age 18 is incapable of self-support.

"(k) The term 'Government' shall mean the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of the United States Government, including Government-owned or controlled corporations and Gallaudet College, and the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"(l) The term 'lump-sum credit' shall mean the unrefunded amount consisting of (1) the retirement deductions made from the basic salary of an employee or Member, (2) any sums deposited by an employee or Member covering prior service, and (3) interest on such deductions and deposits at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded annually to December 31, 1956, or, in the case of an employee separated or transferred to a position not within the purview of this act before he has completed 5 years' service or a Member separated before he has completed 5 years of Member service, to the date of the separation or transfer. The lump-sum credit shall not include interest if the service covered thereby aggregates 1 year or less, nor shall it include interest for the fractional part of a month in the total service.

"(m) The term 'Commission' shall mean the United States Civil Service Commission.

"(n) The term 'annuitant' shall mean any former employee or Member who, on the basis of his service, has met all requirements of the act for title to annuity and has filed claim therefor.

"(o) The term 'survivor' shall mean a person who is entitled to annuity under this act based on the service of a deceased employee or Member or of a deceased annuitant.

"(p) The term 'survivor annuitant' shall mean a survivor who has filed claim for annuity.

"(q) The term 'service' shall mean employment which is creditable under section 3.

"(r) The term 'military service' shall mean honorable active service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, but shall not include service in the National Guard except when ordered to active duty in the service of the United States.

"(s) The term 'Member service' shall mean service as a Member and shall include the period from the date of the beginning of the term for which the Member is elected or appointed to the date on which he takes office as a Member.

"Coverage

"SEC. 2. (a) This act shall apply to each employee and member, except as hereinafter provided.

"(b) This act shall not apply to the President, to any judge of the United States as defined under section 451 of title 28 of the United States Code, or to any employee of the Government subject to another retirement system for Government employees.

"(c) This act shall not apply to any Member or to any congressional employee until he gives notice in writing, within 6 months after the date of entrance into the service, to the

officer by whom his salary is paid, of his desire to come within the purview of this act.

"(d) This act shall not apply to any temporary congressional employee unless such employee is appointed at an annual rate of salary and gives notice in writing, within 6 months after the date of entrance into the service, to the officer by whom his salary is paid, of his desire to come within the purview of this act.

"(e) The Commission may exclude from the operation of this act any employee or group of employees in the executive branch of the United States Government, or of the District of Columbia government upon recommendation by its Commissioners, whose tenure of office or employment is temporary or intermittent, except that no employee shall be excluded under this subsection after he shall have had more than 12 months' continuous service.

"(f) This act shall not apply to any temporary employee of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, of the courts specified in section 610 of title 28 of the United States Code; and the Architect of the Capitol and the Librarian of Congress are authorized to exclude from the operation of this act any employees under the office of the Architect of the Capitol and the Library of Congress, respectively, whose tenure of employment is temporary or of uncertain duration.

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any Executive order, this act shall apply to each United States Commissioner whose total compensation for services rendered as United States Commissioner is not less than \$3,000 in each of the last 3 consecutive calendar years (1) ending prior to the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act amendments of 1956 or (2) ending prior to the first day of any calendar year which begins after such effective date. For the purposes of this act, the employment and compensation of each such United States Commissioner coming within the purview of this act pursuant to this subsection shall be held and considered to be on a daily basis when actually employed; but nothing in this act shall affect, otherwise than for the purposes of this act, the basis, under applicable law other than this act, on which such United States Commissioner is employed or on which his compensation is determined and paid.

"Creditable service

"SEC. 3. (a) An employee's service for the purposes of this act including service as a substitute in the postal service shall be credited from the date of original employment to the date of the separation upon which title to annuity is based in the civilian service of the Government. Credit shall similarly be allowed for service in the Pan American Sanitary Bureau. No credit shall be allowed for any period of separation from the service in excess of 3 calendar days.

"(b) An employee or Member shall be allowed credit for periods of military service prior to the date of the separation upon which title to annuity is based; however, if an employee or Member is awarded retired pay on account of military service, the period of service upon which such retired pay is based shall not be included, unless such retired pay is awarded on account of a service-connected disability incurred in line of duty or is awarded under title III of Public Law 810, 80th Congress, except that for purposes of section 9 (c) (1), a Member (1) shall be allowed credit only for periods of military service not exceeding 5 years, plus any military service performed by the Member upon leaving his office, for the purpose of performing such service, during any war or national emergency proclaimed by the President or declared by the Congress and prior to his final separation from service as Member and (2) may not receive credit for military service for which credit is allowed for the purposes of

retired pay under any other provisions of law. Nothing in this act shall affect the right of an employee or a Member to retired pay, pension, or compensation in addition to the annuity herein provided.

"(c) Credit shall be allowed for leaves of absence granted an employee while performing military service or while receiving benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended. Except for a substitute in the postal service, there shall be excluded from credit so much of any other leaves of absence without pay as may exceed 6 months in the aggregate in any calendar year.

"(d) An employee who during the period of any war, or of any national emergency as proclaimed by the President or declared by the Congress, has left or leaves his position to enter the military service shall not be considered, for the purposes of this act, as separated from his civilian position by reason of such military service, unless he shall apply for and receive a lump-sum benefit under this act.

"(e) The total service of an employee or Member shall be the full years and 12th parts thereof, excluding from the aggregate the fractional part of a month, if any.

"(f) An employee must have completed at least 5 years of civilian service before he shall be eligible for annuity under this act.

"(g) An employee or Member must have, within the 2-year period preceding any separation from service, other than a separation by reason of death or disability, completed at least 1 year of creditable civilian service during which he was subject to this act before he or his survivors shall be eligible for annuity under this act based on such separation. Failure to meet this service requirement shall not deprive the individual or his survivors of any annuity rights which attached upon a previous separation.

"(h) An employee who (1) has at least 5 years' Member service and (2) has served as a Member at any time after August 2, 1946, shall not be allowed credit for any service which is used in the computation of an annuity under section 9 (c).

"(i) In the case of each United States Commissioner who comes within the purview of this act pursuant to section 2 (g) of this act, service rendered prior to, on, or after the effective date of the Civil Service Retirement Act amendments of 1956 as United States Commissioner shall be credited for the purposes of this act on the basis of one three-hundred-and-thirtieth of a year for each day on which such United States Commissioner renders service in such capacity and which is not credited for the purposes of this act for service performed by him in any capacity other than United States Commissioner. Such credit shall not be granted for service rendered as United States Commissioner for more than 313 days in any 1 year.

"Deductions and deposits

"Sec. 4. (a) From and after the first day of the first pay period which begins after December 31, 1956, there shall be deducted and withheld from each employee's basic salary an amount equal to 7 percent of such basic salary and from each Member's basic salary an amount equal to 8 percent of such basic salary. From and after the first day of the first pay period which begins after June 30, 1957, an equal sum shall also be contributed from the respective appropriation or fund which is used for payment of his salary, pay or compensation, or in the case of an elected official, from such appropriation or fund as may be available for payment of other salaries of the same office or establishment. The amounts so deducted and withheld by each department or agency, together with the amounts so contributed, shall, in accordance with such procedures as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, be deposited by the depart-

ment or agency in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the fund. There shall also be so credited all deposits made by employees or members under this section. Amounts contributed under this subsection from appropriations of the Post Office Department shall not be considered as costs of providing postal service for the purpose of establishing postal rates.

"(b) Each employee or Member shall be deemed to consent and agree to such deductions from basic salary, and payment less such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all regular services during the period covered by such payment, except the right to the benefits to which he shall be entitled under this act, notwithstanding any law, rule, or regulation affecting the individual's salary.

"(c) Each employee or Member credited with civilian service after July 31, 1920, for which, for any reason whatsoever, no retirement deductions or deposits have been made, may deposit with interest an amount equal to the following percentages of his basic salary received for such service:

	Percent- age of basic salary	Service period
Employee.....	2½.....	Aug. 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926.
	3½.....	July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942.
	5.....	July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1948.
	6.....	July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1956.
	7.....	After Dec. 31, 1956.
Member for Member serv- ice.	2½.....	Aug. 1, 1920, to June 30, 1926.
	3½.....	July 1, 1926, to June 30, 1942.
	5.....	July 1, 1942, to Aug. 1, 1946.
	6.....	Aug. 2, 1946, to Dec. 31, 1956.
	8.....	After Dec. 31, 1956.

"(d) Each employee or Member who has received a refund of retirement deductions under this or any other retirement system established for employees of the Government covering service for which he may be allowed credit under this act may deposit the amount received, with interest. No credit shall be allowed for the service covered by the refund until the deposit is made.

"(e) Interest under subsection (c) or (d) shall be computed from the midpoint of each service period included in the computation, or from the date refund was paid, to the date of deposit or commencing date of annuity, whichever is earlier. The interest shall be computed at the rate of 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter compounded annually. Such deposit may be made in one or more installments.

"(f) Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Commission, amounts deducted under subsection (a) and deposited under subsections (c) and (d) shall be entered on individual retirement records.

"(g) No deposit shall be required for any service prior to August 1, 1920, for periods of military service or for any service for the Panama Railroad Company prior to January 1, 1924.

"Mandatory separation

"Sec. 5. (a) Except as hereinafter provided, an employee who shall have attained the age of 70 years and completed 15 years of service shall be automatically separated from the service. Such separation shall be effective on the last day of the month in which such employee attains the age of 70 years or completes 15 years of service if then beyond such age, and all salary shall cease from that day.

"(b) Each employing office shall notify each employee under its direction of the date of such separation from the service at least 60 days in advance thereof: *Provided*, That subsection (a) shall not take effect without the consent of the employee until 60 days after he has been so notified.

(c) The President may, by Executive order, exempt from automatic separation under this section any employee when, in his judgment, the public interest so requires.

"(d) The automatic separation provisions of this section shall not apply to any person named in any act of Congress providing for the continuance of such person in the service, to any Member, to any congressional employee, to the Architect of the Capitol or any employee under the office of the Architect of the Capitol, or to any employee in the judicial branch within the classes made subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, by the act of July 13, 1937.

"(e) In the case of an officer or employee of The Alaska Railroad, Territory of Alaska, or an officer or employee who is a citizen of the United States employed on the Isthmus of Panama by the Panama Canal Company or the Canal Zone Government, the provisions of this section shall apply upon his attaining the age of 62 years and completing 15 years of service on the Isthmus of Panama or in the Territory of Alaska.

"Immediate retirement

"Sec. 6. (a) Any employee who attains the age of 60 years and completes 30 years of service shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9.

"(b) Any employee who attains the age of 55 years and completes 30 years of service shall, upon separation from the service prior to attainment of the age of 60 years, be paid a reduced annuity computed as provided in section 9.

"(c) Any employee the duties of whose position are primarily the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States, including any employee engaged in such activity who has been transferred to a supervisory or administrative position, who attains the age of 50 years and completes 20 years of service in the performance of such duties, may, if the head of his department or agency recommends his retirement and the Commission approves, voluntarily retire from the service, and be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9 (i). The head of the department or agency and the Commission shall give full consideration to the degree of hazard to which such employee is subjected in the performance of his duties, rather than the general duties of the class of the position held by such employee.

"(d) Any employee who completes 25 years of service or who attains the age of 50 years and completes 20 years of service shall upon involuntary separation from the service not by removal for cause on charges of misconduct or delinquency, be paid a reduced annuity computed as provided in section 9.

"(e) Any employee who attains the age of 62 years and completes 5 years of service shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9.

"(f) Any member who attains the age of 62 years and completes 5 years of member service, or who attains the age of 60 years and completes 10 years of member service, shall, upon separation from the service, be paid an annuity computed as provided in section 9. No member or survivor of a member shall be entitled to receive an annuity under this act unless there shall have been deducted or deposited the amounts specified in section 4 with respect to his last 5 years of Member service.

"Disability retirement"

"SEC. 7. (a) Any employee who completes 5 years of civilian service and who is found by the Commission to have become disabled shall, upon his own application or upon application by his department or agency, be retired on an annuity computed as provided in section 9. Any Member who completes 5 years of Member service and who is found by the Commission to have become disabled shall, upon his own application, be retired on an annuity computed as provided in section 9.

"(b) No claim shall be allowed under this section unless the application is filed with the Commission prior to separation of the employee or Member from the service or within 1 year thereafter. This time limitation may be waived by the Commission for an individual who at the date of separation from service or within 1 year thereafter is mentally incompetent, if the application is filed with the Commission within 1 year from the date of restoration of such individual to competency or the appointment of a fiduciary, whichever is the earlier.

"(c) Each annuitant retired under this section or under section 6 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, unless his disability is permanent in character, shall at the expiration of 1 year from the date of such retirement and annually thereafter, until reaching age 60, be examined under the direction of the Commission. If the annuitant fails to submit to examination as required under this section, payment of the annuity shall be suspended until continuance of the disability is satisfactorily established.

"(d) If such annuitant, before reaching age 60, recovers from his disability or is restored to an earning capacity fairly comparable to the current rate of compensation of the position occupied at the time of retirement, payment of the annuity shall cease (1) upon reemployment by the Government, (2) 1 year from the date of the medical examination showing such recovery, or (3) 1 year from the date of determination that he is so restored, whichever is earliest. Earning capacity shall be deemed restored if in each of 2 succeeding calendar years the income of the annuitant from wages or self-employment or both shall equal at least 80 percent of the current rate of compensation of the position occupied immediately prior to retirement.

"(e) If such annuitant whose annuity is discontinued under subsection (d) is not reemployed in any position included in the provisions of this act, he shall be considered, except for service credit, as having been involuntarily separated from the service for the purposes of this act as of the date of discontinuance of the disability annuity and shall, after such discontinuance, be entitled to annuity in accordance with the applicable provisions of this act.

"(f) No person shall be entitled to receive an annuity under this act and compensation for injury or disability to himself under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, covering the same period of time. This provision shall not bar the right of any claimant to the greater benefit conferred by either act for any part of the same period of time. Neither this provision nor any provision in such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, shall deny to any person an annuity accruing to such person under this act on account of service rendered by him, or deny any concurrent benefit to such person under such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, on account of the death of any other person.

"(g) Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the right of any person entitled to an annuity under this act shall not be affected because such person has received an award of compensation in a lump sum under section 14 of the act of September 7, 1916, as amended, except that where such

annuity is payable on account of the same disability for which compensation under such section has been paid, so much of such compensation as has been paid for any period extended beyond the date such annuity becomes effective, as determined by the Department of Labor, shall be refunded to the Department of Labor, to be covered into the Federal Employees' Compensation Fund. Before such person shall receive such annuity he shall (1) refund to such Department the amount representing such commuted payments for such extended period, or (2) authorize the deduction of such amount from the annuity payable to him under this act, which amount shall be transmitted to such Department for reimbursement to such fund. Deductions from such annuity may be made from accrued and accruing payments, or may be prorated against and paid from accruing payments in such manner as the Department of Labor shall determine, whenever it finds that the financial circumstances of the annuitant are such as to warrant such deferred refunding.

"Deferred retirement"

"SEC. 8. (a) Any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of this act after completing 5 years of civilian service may be paid an annuity beginning at the age of 62 years computed as provided in section 9.

"(b) Any Member who is separated from the service as a Member after completing 5 years of Member service may be paid an annuity beginning at the age of 62 years, computed as provided in section 9.

"Computation of annuity"

"SEC. 9. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the annuity of an employee retiring under this act shall be (1) the larger of (A) 1½ percent of the average salary multiplied by so much of the total service as does not exceed 5 years, or (B) 1 percent of the average salary, plus \$25, multiplied by so much of the total service as does not exceed 5 years, plus (2) the larger of (A) 2 percent of the average salary multiplied by so much of the total service as exceeds 5 years, or (B) 1 percent of the average salary, plus \$25, multiplied by so much of the total service as exceeds 5 years: *Provided*, That the annuity shall not exceed 80 percent of the average salary: *Provided further*, That the annuity of an employee retiring under section 7 shall be at least (1) 40 percent of the average salary or (2) the sum obtained under this subsection after increasing his total service by the period elapsing between the date of separation and the date he attains the age of 60 years, whichever is the lesser, but this proviso shall not increase the annuity of any survivor.

"(b) The annuity of a congressional employee retiring under this act shall, if he so elects at the time his annuity commences, be (1) 2½ percent of the average salary multiplied by his military service and service as a congressional employee, not exceeding a total of 15 years, plus (2) 1½ percent of the average salary multiplied by so much of the remainder of his total service as does not exceed 5 years, plus (3) 2 percent of the average salary multiplied by so much of the remainder of his total service as exceeds 5 years: *Provided*, That the annuity shall not exceed 80 percent of the average salary. This subsection shall not apply unless the congressional employee (1) has had at least 5 years' service as a congressional employee, (2) has had deductions withheld from his salary or made deposit covering his last 5 years of civilian service, and (3) has served as a congressional employee during the last 11 months of his civilian service: *Provided further*, That the annuity of a congressional employee retiring under section 7 shall be at least (1) 40 percent of the average salary or (2) the sum obtained under this subsec-

tion after increasing his service as a congressional employee by the period elapsing between the date of separation and the date he attains the age of 60 years, whichever is the lesser, but this provision shall not increase the annuity of any survivor.

"(c) The annuity of a Member retiring under this act shall be an amount equal to—
"(1) 2½ percent of the average salary multiplied by the total of his Member and creditable military service;

"(2) 2½ percent of the average salary multiplied by his total years of service, not exceeding 15, performed as a congressional employee prior to his separation from service as a Member, other than any such service which he may elect to exclude;

"(3) 1½ percent of such average salary multiplied by so much of his total service, other than service used in computing annuity under clauses (1) and (2), as does not exceed 5 years, performed prior to his separation from service as a Member, and other than any such service which he may elect to exclude; and

"(4) 2 percent of such average salary multiplied by his total service, other than service used in computing annuity under clauses (1), (2), and (3), performed prior to his separation from service as a Member, and other than any such service which he may elect to exclude.

In no case shall an annuity computed under this subsection exceed 80 percent of the basic salary that he is receiving at the time of such separation from the service, and in no case shall the annuity of a Member retiring under section 7 be less than (A) 40 percent of the average salary or (B) the sum obtained under this subsection after increasing his Member service by the period elapsing between the date of separation and the date he attains the age of 60 years, whichever is the lesser, but this provision shall not increase the annuity of any survivor.

"(d) The annuity as hereinbefore provided, for an employee retiring under section 6 (b) or 6 (d), shall be reduced by one-twelfth of 1 percent for each full month not in excess of 60, and one-sixth of 1 percent for each full month in excess of 60, such employee is under the age of 60 years at date of separation.

"(e) The annuity as hereinbefore provided shall be reduced by 10 percent of any deposit described in section 4 (c) remaining unpaid, unless the employee or Member shall elect to eliminate the service involved for purposes of annuity computation.

"(f) Any employee or Member retiring under section 6, 7, or 8 may at the time of retirement elect a reduced annuity, in lieu of the annuity as hereinbefore provided, and designate in writing his wife or husband to receive an annuity after the retired individual's death computed as provided in section 10 (a) (1). The annuity of the employee or Member making such election, excluding any increase because of retirement under section 7, shall be reduced by 2½ percent of so much of the portion thereof designated under section 10 (a) (1) as does not exceed \$2,400 and by 10 percent of so much of the portion so designated as exceeds \$2,400.

"(g) Any unmarried employee or Member retiring under section 6 or 8, and found by the Commission to be in good health, may at the time of retirement elect a reduced annuity, in lieu of the annuity as hereinbefore provided, and designate in writing a person having an insurable interest in the employee or Member to receive an annuity after the retired individual's death. The annuity payable to the employee or Member making such election shall be reduced by 10 percent of an annuity computed as provided in section 9 and by 5 percent of an annuity so computed for each full 5 years the person designated is younger than the retiring employee or Member, but such total reduction shall not exceed 40 percent.

"(h) The annuity as hereinbefore provided, for an employee who is a citizen of the United States, shall be increased by \$36 multiplied by total service in the employ of either the Alaska Engineering Commission or the Alaska Railroad in the Territory of Alaska between March 12, 1914 and July 1, 1923, or in the employ of either the Isthmian Canal Commission or the Panama Railroad Company on the Isthmus of Panama between May 4, 1904, and April 1, 1914.

"(i) The annuity of an employee retiring under section 6 (c) shall be 2 percent of the average salary multiplied by the total service: *Provided*, That the annuity shall not exceed 80 percent of the average salary.

"Survivor annuities

"Sec. 10. (a) (1) If a Member or employee dies after having retired under any provision of this act and is survived by a wife or husband designated under section 9 (f) such wife or husband shall be paid an annuity equal to 50 percent of so much of an annuity computed as provided in subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of section 9, as may apply with respect to the annuitant, as is designated in writing for such purpose by such Member or employee at the time he makes the election provided for by section 9 (f).

"(2) An annuity computed under this subsection shall begin on the first day of the month in which the retired employee dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon the survivor's death or remarriage.

"(b) The annuity of a survivor designated under section 9 (g) shall be 50 percent of the reduced annuity computed as provided in subsections (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (g) of section 9 as may apply with respect to the annuitant. The annuity of such survivor shall begin on the first day of the month in which the retired employee dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon the survivor's death.

"(c) If an employee dies after completing at least 5 years of civilian service, or a Member dies after completing at least 5 years of Member service, the widow or dependent widower of such employee or Member shall be paid an annuity equal to 50 percent of an annuity computed as provided in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 9 as may apply with respect to the employee or Member. The annuity of such widow or dependent widower shall begin on the first day of the month after the employee or Member dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon death or remarriage of the widow or widower, or upon the widower's becoming capable of self-support.

"(d) If an employee dies after completing 5 years of civilian service or a Member dies after completing 5 years of Member service, or an employee or a Member dies after having retired under any provision of the act, and is survived by a wife or by a husband who is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability and who received more than one-half of his support from such employee or Member, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 40 percent of the employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children, (2) \$600, or (3) \$1,800 divided by the number of children. If such employee or Member is not survived by a wife or husband, each surviving child shall be paid an annuity equal to the smallest of (1) 50 percent of the employee's or Member's average salary divided by the number of children, (2) \$720, or (3) \$2,160 divided by the number of children. The child's annuity shall begin on the first day of the month after the employee or Member dies, and such annuity or any right thereto shall terminate upon (1) his attaining age 18 unless incapable of self-support, (2) his becoming capable of self-support after age 18, (3) his

marriage, or (4) his death. Upon the death of the wife or dependent husband or termination of the annuity of the child, the annuity of any other child or children shall be recomputed and paid as though such wife, dependent husband, or child had not survived the employee or Member.

"Lump-sum benefits

"Sec. 11. (a) Any employee who is separated or transferred to a position not within the purview of this act after he has completed 5 but less than 20 years of service, and any Member who is separated after he has completed 5 but less than 20 years of Member service, shall upon application therefor be paid the lump-sum credit. Any employee who is separated or transferred to a position not within the purview of this act before he has completed 5 years' service, and any Member who is separated before he has completed 5 years of Member service, shall be paid the lump-sum credit. The receipt of payment of the lump-sum credit by the individual shall void all annuity rights under this act, unless and until he shall be reemployed in the service subject to this act.

"(b) Each present or former employee or Member may, under regulations prescribed by the Commission, designate a beneficiary or beneficiaries for the purposes of this act.

"(c) Lump-sum benefits authorized under subsections (d), (e), and (f) of this section shall be paid in the following order of precedence to such person or persons surviving the employee or Member and alive at the date title to the payment arises, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"First, to the beneficiary or beneficiaries designated by the employee or Member in a writing received in the Commission prior to his death;

"Second, if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow or widower of the employee or Member;

"Third, if none of the above, to the child or children of the employee or Member and descendants of deceased children by representation;

"Fourth, if none of the above, to the parents of the employee or Member or the survivor of them;

"Fifth, if none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of the employee or Member;

"Sixth, if none of the above, to other next of kin of the employee or Member as may be determined by the Commission to be entitled under the laws of the domicile of the individual at the time of his death.

"(d) If an employee or Member dies (1) without a survivor, or (2) with a survivor or survivors and the right of all survivors shall terminate before claim for survivor annuity is filed, or if a former employee or Member not retired dies, the lump-sum credit shall be paid.

"(e) If all annuity rights under this act based on the service of a deceased employee or Member shall terminate before the total annuity paid equals the lump-sum credit, the difference shall be paid.

"(f) If an annuitant dies, any annuity accrued and unpaid shall be paid.

"(g) Any annuity accrued and unpaid upon the termination (other than by death) of the annuity of any annuitant or survivor annuitant shall be paid to such person. Any survivor annuity accrued and unpaid upon the death of any survivor annuitant shall be paid in the following order of precedence, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"First, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of the survivor annuitant;

"Second, if there is no such executor or administrator, payment may be made, after the expiration of 30 days from the date of death of such survivor annuitant, to such next of kin of the survivor annuitant as may be

determined by the Commission to be entitled under the laws of the survivor annuitant's domicile at the time of his death.

"Additional annuities

"Sec. 12. (a) Any employee or Member may, under regulations prescribed by the Commission, voluntarily contribute additional sums in multiples of \$25, but the total may not exceed 10 percent of his basic salary for his creditable service from and after August 1, 1920. The voluntary contribution account in each case shall be the sum of such unrefunded contributions, plus interest at 3 percent per annum compounded annually to date of separation or transfer to a position not within the purview of this act or, in case of an individual who is separated with title to a deferred annuity and does not claim the voluntary contribution account, to the commencing date fixed for such deferred annuity or date of death, whichever is earlier.

"(b) Such voluntary contribution account shall be used to purchase at retirement an annuity in addition to the annuity otherwise provided. For each \$100 in such voluntary contribution account, the additional annuity shall consist of \$7, increased by 20 cents for each full year, if any, such employee or Member is over the age of 55 years at the date of retirement.

"(c) A retiring employee or Member may elect a reduced additional annuity in lieu of the additional annuity described in subsection (b) and designate in writing a person to receive after his death an annuity of 50 percent of his reduced additional annuity. The additional annuity of the employee or Member making such election shall be reduced by 10 percent, and by 5 percent for each full 5 years the person designated is younger than the retiring employee or Member, but such total reduction shall not exceed 40 percent.

"(d) Any employee or Member who is separated from the service before becoming eligible for immediate or deferred annuity or who transfers to a position wherein he does not continue subject to this act shall be paid the voluntary contribution account. Any employee or Member who is separated from the service after becoming eligible for a deferred annuity under section 8 may elect to receive, in lieu of additional annuity, the voluntary contribution account, provided his separation occurs and application for payment is filed with the Commission at least 31 days before the commencing date of annuity.

"(e) If any present or former employer or Member not retired dies, the voluntary contribution account shall be paid under the provisions of section 11 (c). If all additional annuities or any right thereto based on the voluntary contribution account of a deceased employee or Member terminate before the total additional annuity paid equals such account, the difference shall be paid under the provisions of section 11 (c).

"Reemployment of annuitants

"Sec. 13. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an annuitant heretofore or hereafter retired under this act shall not, by reason of his retired status, be barred from employment in any appointive position for which he is qualified. An annuitant so reemployed shall serve at the will of the appointing officer.

"(b) If an annuitant under this act (other than (1) a disability annuitant whose annuity is terminated by reason of his recovery or restoration of earning capacity, or (2) a Member retired under this act) hereafter becomes employed in an appointive or elective position subject to this act, annuity payments shall be discontinued during such employment and deductions for the retirement funds shall be withheld from his salary. If such annuitant performs actual fulltime service for a period of at least 1

year, his right to future annuity shall be determined upon the basis of the law in effect at the time of termination of such period of employment and service performed during such period shall be credited for such purpose. If such annuitant does not perform actual fulltime service for a period of at least 1 year, his annuity payments shall be resumed in the same amount and amounts deducted from his salary during such period of employment shall be returned upon the expiration of such period. If an annuitant under this act (other than (1) a disability annuitant whose annuity is terminated by reason of his recovery or restoration of earning capacity, or (2) a Member retired under this act) hereafter becomes employed in an appointive or elective position not subject to this act, annuity payments shall be discontinued during such reemployment and resumed in the same amount upon termination of such employment.

"(c) If a Member heretofore or hereafter retired under this act hereafter becomes employed in an appointive or elective position, annuity payments shall be discontinued during such employment and resumed in the same amount upon termination of such employment: *Provided*, That if such retired Member takes office as Member and gives notice as provided in section 2 (c), his service as Member during such period shall be credited in determining his right to and the amount of his subsequent annuity.

"Payment of benefits"

"Sec. 14. (a) Each annuity is stated as an annual amount, one-twelfth of which, fixed at the nearest dollar, accrues monthly and is payable on the first business day of the month after it accrues.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided, the annuity of an employee shall commence on the first of the month after separation from the service, or on the first of the month after salary ceases provided the employee meets the service and the age or disability requirements for title to annuity at that time. The annuity of a Member or of an elected officer of the Senate or House of Representatives shall commence on the day following the day on which salary shall cease provided the person entitled to such annuity meets the service and the age or disability requirements for title to annuity at that time. The annuity of an employee or Member under section 8 shall commence on the first of the month after the occurrence of the event on which payment of the annuity is based.

"(c) An annuity shall terminate on the last day of the month preceding the month in which death or any other terminating event provided in this act occurs.

"(d) Any person entitled to annuity from the fund may decline to accept all or any part of such annuity by a waiver signed and filed with the Commission. Such waiver may be revoked in writing at any time, but no payment of the annuity waived shall be made covering the period during which such waiver was in effect.

"(e) Where any payment is due a minor, or a person mentally incompetent or under other legal disability, such payment may be made to the person who is constituted guardian or other fiduciary by the law of the State of residence of such claimant or is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate: *Provided*, That where no guardian or other fiduciary of the person under legal disability has been appointed under the laws of the State of residence of the claimant, payment may be made to any person who, in the judgment of the Commission, is responsible for the care of the claimant, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person.

"Exemption from legal processes"

"Sec. 15. (a) None of the moneys mentioned in this act shall be assignable, either

in law or equity, or be subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be no recovery of any payments under this act from any person when, in the judgment of the Commission, such person is without fault and such recovery would be contrary to equity and good conscience; nor shall there be any withholding of recovery of any moneys mentioned in this act on account of any certification or payment made by any former employee of the United States in the discharge of his official duties unless the head of the department or agency on behalf of which the certification or payment was made certifies to the Commission that such certification or payment involved fraud on the part of such employee.

"Administration"

"Sec. 16 (a) This act shall be administered by the Commission. Except as otherwise specifically provided herein, the Commission is hereby authorized and directed to perform, or cause to be performed, any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect.

"(b) Applications under this act shall be in such form as the Commission shall prescribe, and shall be supported by such certificates from departments or agencies as the Commission may deem necessary to the determination of the rights of applicants. The Commission shall adjudicate all claims under this act.

"(c) Questions of dependency and disability arising under this act shall be determined by the Commission and its decisions with respect to such matters shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to review. The Commission may order or direct at any time such medical or other examinations as it shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the disability or dependency of any person receiving or applying for annuity under this act, and may suspend or deny any such annuity for failure to submit to any such examination.

"(d) An appeal to the Commission shall lie from any administrative action or order affecting the rights or interests of any person or of the United States under this act, the procedure on appeal to be prescribed by the Commission.

"(e) Fees for examinations made under the provisions of this act, by physicians or surgeons who are not medical officers of the United States, shall be fixed by the Commission, and such fees, together with reasonable traveling and other expenses incurred in connection with such examinations, shall be paid out of the appropriations for the cost of administering this act.

"(f) The Commission shall publish an annual report upon the operations of this act.

"(g) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed to select three actuaries, to be known as the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement System. It shall be the duty of such Board to report annually upon the actuarial status of the system and to furnish its advice and opinion on matters referred to it by the Commission, and it shall have the authority to recommend to the Commission and to the Congress such changes as in the Board's judgment may be deemed necessary to protect the public interest and maintain the system upon a sound financial basis. The Commission shall keep or cause to be kept such records as it deems necessary for making periodic actuarial valuations of the Civil Service Retirement System, and the Board shall make such valuations at intervals of 5 years, or oftener if deemed necessary by the Commission. The compensation of the members of the Board of Actuaries, exclusive of such

members as are in the employ of the United States, shall be fixed by the Commission.

"Civil service retirement and disability fund"

"Sec. 17. (a) The fund is hereby appropriated for the payment of benefits as provided in this act.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to accept and credit to the fund moneys received in the form of donations, gifts, legacies, or bequests, or otherwise contributed for the benefit of civil-service employees generally.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall immediately invest in interest-bearing securities of the United States, such currently available portions of the fund as are not immediately required for payments from the fund, and the income derived from such investments shall constitute a part of the fund.

"(d) The purposes for which obligations of the United States may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are hereby extended to authorize the issuance at par of public-debt obligations for purchase by the fund. Such obligations issued for purchase by the fund shall have maturities fixed with due regard for the needs of the fund and bear interest at a rate equal to the average rate of interest computed as to the end of the calendar month next preceding the date of such issue, borne by all marketable interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt that are not due or callable until after the expiration of 5 years from the date of original issue; except that where such average rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent, the rate of interest of such obligations shall be multiple of one-eighth of 1 percent nearest such average rate. Such obligations shall be issued for purchase by the fund only if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the purchase in the market of other interest-bearing obligations of the United States, or of obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States on original issue or at the market price, is not in the public interest.

"Short title"

"Sec. 18. This act may be cited as the 'Civil Service Retirement Act'."

Members of faculty of Naval Academy

Sec. 402. (a) On and after the effective date of this title persons employed as members of the civilian faculties of the United States Naval Academy and the United States Naval Postgraduate School shall be included within the terms of the Civil Service Retirement Act, and on and after that date the act of January 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1092), as amended, shall not apply to such persons.

(b) In lieu of the deposit prescribed by section 4 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, an employee who by virtue of subsection (a) is included within the terms of such act shall deposit, for service rendered prior to the effective date of this title as a member of the civilian faculty of the United States Naval Academy or of the United States Naval Postgraduate School, a sum equal to so much of the repurchase price of his annuity policy carried as required by the act of January 16, 1936, as amended, as is based on the monthly allotments which were registered with the Navy Allotment Office toward the purchase of that annuity, the deposit to be made within 6 months after the effective date of this title. Should the deposit not be made within that period no credit shall be allowed under the Civil Service Retirement Act for service rendered as a member of the civilian faculty of the United States Naval Academy or of the United States Naval Postgraduate School subsequent to July 31, 1920, and prior to the effective date of this title. If the deposit is made, such service shall be held and considered to be service during which the em-

ployee was subject to the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Retroactive application of certain benefits

Sec. 403. The amendment approved September 30, 1949 (Public Law 310, 81st Cong.), to section 4 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, insofar as it relates to the amount of the reduction in the annuities of officers and employees who elect to receive reduced annuities under such section, shall take effect as of April 1, 1948, but no increase in annuity shall be payable by reason of such amendment, to those who retired on or after July 1, 1948, and prior to October 1, 1949, for any period prior to the first day of the first month which begins after the effective date of this title.

Continuation of prior rights

Sec. 404. Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by this title shall not apply in the case of employees or Members retired or otherwise separated prior to its effective date, and the rights of such persons and their survivors shall continue in the same manner and to the same extent as if this title had not been enacted.

Vice President

Sec. 405. The notice required by section 2 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act may be given, by any person holding the office of Vice President on the effective date of this title, at any time within 15 days after such effective date, and in the case of any such person service performed in such office shall be considered service during which he was subject to such act for the purpose of section 3 (g) thereof.

Future salary increases to include increases to annuitants

Sec. 406. It is the policy of the Congress that whenever in the future any general adjustment is made in the salaries of Government employees, corresponding adjustments should be made in the annuities of retired employees.

Forfeiture of annuities of persons remaining outside United States to avoid prosecution

Sec. 407. The act entitled "An act to prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses, and for other purposes," approved September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1142), is amended by adding at the end of section 2 thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) In any case in which, after the date of enactment of this subsection, any person under indictment for any offense within the purview of the first section of this Act willfully remains outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions, for a period in excess of 1 year with knowledge of such indictment, no annuity or retired pay shall be paid, for any period subsequent to the end of such 1-year period to such person or to the survivor or beneficiary of such person, on the basis of the service of such person, as an officer or employee of the Government unless and until a nolle prosequi to the entire indictment is entered upon the record or such person returns and thereafter the indictment is dismissed or after trial by court the accused is found not guilty of the offense or offenses charged in the indictment."

Effective date

Sec. 408. This title shall take effect on January 1, 1957.

Short title

Sec. 409. This title may be cited as the "Civil Service Retirement Act Amendments of 1956."

TITLE V—ADDITIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

Sec. 501. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of the first section of the act of August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 715; Public Law 313, 80th Cong.), as amended, are amended to read as follows: "(a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized

to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 275 positions in the Department of Defense and not more than 50 positions in the National Security Agency, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions, relating to the national defense, military and naval medicine, and any and all other activities of the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, as the case may be, which require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel.

"(b) The Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, not to exceed 60 positions in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established in order to enable the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to secure and retain the services of specially qualified personnel necessary in the discharge of the duty of the Committee to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution.

"(c) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not to exceed 10 positions of a professional or scientific nature in the Department of the Interior, each such position being established in order to enable the Department of the Interior to effectuate those research and development functions and activities of such Department which require the services of specially qualified professional or scientific personnel.

"(d) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not to exceed 35 positions of a professional or scientific nature in the Department of Commerce, each such position being established in order to enable the Department of Commerce to effectuate those research and development functions and activities of such Department which require the services of specially qualified professional or scientific personnel."

(b) Nothing contained in the amendment made to such act of August 1, 1947, by subsection (a) of this section shall affect any position existing under authority of subsection (a) of the first section of such act of August 1, 1947, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of such amendment, the compensation attached to any such position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his right to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken under authority of subsection (a) of such first section of such act of August 1, 1947, as contained in the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Subsection (c) of the first section of such act of August 1, 1947, as amended, is hereby redesignated subsection (e) of such first section.

(d) Section 3 of such Act of August 1, 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) Each officer, with respect to positions established by him under this act, shall submit to the Congress, not later than February 1 of each year, a report which sets forth—

"(1) the number of such positions so established or in existence during the immediately preceding calendar year,

"(2) the name, rate of compensation, and description of the qualifications of each incumbent of each such position, together with the position title and a statement of the functions, duties, and responsibilities performed by each such incumbent, except that nothing contained in this section shall require the resubmission of information required under this paragraph which has been reported pursuant to this section and which remains unchanged, and

"(3) such other information as he deems appropriate or which may be required by the Congress or a committee thereof.

"(b) In any instance in which any officer so required to submit such report may find full public disclosure of any or all of the above-specified items to be detrimental to the national security such officer is authorized—

"(1) to omit in his annual report those items with respect to which full public disclosure is found by him to be detrimental to the national security,

"(2) to inform the Congress of such omission, and

"(3) at the request of any congressional committee to which such report is referred, to present all information concerning such items."

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.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] will make a statement explaining the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, H. R. 7619, which passed the House during the closing hours of the first session of the 84th Congress, related only to the pay of certain Federal officials.

The committee amendment strikes out all of the bill after the enacting clause and substitutes therefor a new bill greatly more comprehensive than the House bill.

Title 1 of the bill increases the rates of pay for the heads of executive departments and other Federal officials.

Title 2 of the bill relates to the organization and management of the Civil Service Commission.

Title 3 of the bill relates to the establishment and classification of a number of positions in the executive departments. Also, title 3 contains a section relating to the affairs of the Post Office Department.

Title 4 of the bill relates to civil-service retirement.

Title 5 authorizes the establishment of additional scientific positions in several departments of the Government.

Mr. President, title 1 of the bill establishes a new pay structure for top officials of the Government. The new structure provides \$25,000 for Cabinet positions; \$22,500 for a small number of officials outside the Cabinet who, nevertheless, participate in Cabinet meetings or have other unusual responsibility; \$22,000 for the Secretaries of the armed services; \$21,000 for Under Secretaries and comparable positions; \$20,500 for the chairmen of boards and commissions and positions of comparable responsibility; \$20,000 for members of boards and commissions and for Assistant Secretaries; \$19,000 for two groups of commissioners—Indian Claims Commissioners and Commissioners of the United States Court of Claims—who are of a semijudicial nature; \$15,000 may be paid

to representatives and alternates to UNESCO.

The rates of pay of grades 17 and 18 of the Classification Act are adjusted to conform with the general pay pattern.

The rates of pay of the three highest grades of the Postal Field Service are similarly adjusted.

The salaries of the top medical men of the Veterans' Administration are raised.

The ceiling is raised on salaries which may be paid to a limited number of scientific personnel engaged in research and development activities.

This title of the bill also provides for the adjustment in the pay of isolated positions here and there in the Federal service.

Mr. President, title 2 of the bill, which relates to the organization of the Civil Service Commission, provides—

First, that the term of each Civil Service Commissioner shall be 6 years, except that the terms of the present three Commissioners shall be 2, 4, and 6 years, respectively, in order to establish the tenure of the Commissioners on a proper rotation basis.

Secondly, it is provided that the President shall, from time to time, designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission, who shall, in order, be responsible for the administration and function of the Civil Service Commission. In the absence of both the Chairman and Vice Chairman, the third Commissioner would become the responsible head of the Commission. On rare occasion, when all three Commissioners might be absent, the Executive Director would be the responsible head of the Commission.

At present, the Executive Director is responsible for the operation of the Commission. In the absence of the Executive Director, the Assistant takes over, and in his absence, the Second Assistant, and so forth.

This is not a good situation. The Commissioners do not now possess the responsibility that they should have in order to do an effective job. The bill provides that the redelegation of responsibility to the Commissioners shall take effect on the date of enactment of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I must leave the floor, and before doing so I wish to say to the Members of the Senate that it was a privilege for me to serve with the Senator from South Carolina and with the ranking member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and with every member of the committee. The subject under consideration by the Senate received thorough study by the subcommittee. The conclusions arrived at were not quickly or easily reached, but only after a very analytical and exhaustive, and extensive, and thorough study of all the phases of the subject.

I wish to take occasion to congratulate the chairman and every member of the subcommittee for the fine work they did on the pending bill, as well as to con-

gratulate the members of the staff of the committee.

The pay increases provided in the bill are sorely needed. I believe they reflect the prestige of the important positions in the Government service. The bill will do much to keep up and raise the morale of our Government employees in the higher echelon.

A short time ago we did something for the benefit of the rank and file Government employees. Today we are doing something for officials in the upper echelon, who have been neglected for a long time—perhaps for too long a time.

Again I wish to say that the Senate ought to be appreciative of the fine work which was done by the distinguished chairman of the committee. I hope the Senate will show its appreciation by voting favorably on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I thank the junior Senator from Rhode Island, and I wish to add one thing to what he has said. It is that as a member of the full committee he worked a great deal with us on the subcommittee. His help was very beneficial to us in arriving at our final conclusions, which are contained in the pending bill. I wish to thank him for his patience and his attention to the subject.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to have additional information, because, frankly, I have not come to any final conclusion on the provisions of the bill which relate to the Civil Service Commission. For the benefit of the legislative record I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether, in regard to the particular section which has been added, any testimony was taken before the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will say to the Senator from California that the committee had been making a study of that subject for the past 2 years, as the ranking minority member of the committee will bear me out. Likewise, a very thorough study was made by the House committee. I might say that the Senate appropriated additional money to our committee for the purpose of making that study.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator another question, and I ask it without any partisanship at all, because the situation I am about to describe would apply whether the administration was Republican or Democratic.

I suppose the thought behind the enactment of the present law was that, since the Executive is charged with the administration of the executive branch of the Government, he should be free to appoint the members of the Civil Service Commission and to remove them at his pleasure. I wonder whether the distinguished chairman could discuss that subject.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say to the Senator from California that that provision has not been changed; the President still has the right to make the appointments. I shall be glad to go into that a little later.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator go into it for the benefit of the record? I should like to have him develop the difference between the law as it now stands and what the law would be under the proposed amendment which the committee is offering, which would provide for a staggered term arrangement. In a good many commissions of a supervisory or semijudicial nature, that system works well. Inasmuch as the committee proposes to make a basic change in what has been the law under both Democratic and Republican administrations, I hope the Senator will explain that feature of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall be glad to do so a little later. I shall go into it more fully.

Mr. President, title 3 of the bill contains a number of miscellaneous provisions primarily related to the establishment and classification for pay purposes of isolated positions here and there in the Federal service.

Under present law, the general counsels of 7 of the 10 executive departments are appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The bill provides that the other three general counsels be appointed in the same manner. The three departments are: Post Office Department, Agriculture Department, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Additionally, the bill provides that the general counsels in the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The bill authorizes the allocation of the four existing positions in the administrative office of the United States courts to grade 18.

The bill authorizes the allocation of the seven existing positions of Director, Commodity Offices, Commodity Stabilization Service, Department of Agriculture, to grade 16.

The bill authorizes the allocation of three existing positions in the Agriculture Research Service, Department of Agriculture, to grade 18.

The bill authorizes the creation of a new position in the Department of Commerce to head up the new public roads program. The title of the position is that of Federal Highway Administrator.

Also in title 4 of the bill is a provision relating to the postal service.

Section 305 of the bill contains a provision recently approved in the Senate, which appeared in S. 1292. It provides that the difference between fourth-class mail income and estimated fourth-class mail cost can be as much as 10 percent before the Postmaster General is required to request changes in parcel-post rates before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

This provision provides the Postmaster General with a little leeway in the matter. It avoids the necessity of his going to the Interstate Commerce Commission every time there is an adjustment in pay or other legislative action which has an effect on expense in the Post Office Department.

Mr. President, title 4 of the bill embodies S. 2875, the retirement bill which

was approved in the Senate on May 23, 1956.

Title 4 is the same as S. 2875 with a few minor modifications. I am confident the modifications will be found to be completely acceptable not only to the Members of the Senate, but also to the administration.

Furthermore, I am in a position to state that they will be acceptable to the rank and file of our loyal, hardworking, and devoted Federal employees, who have such a vital interest in the matter.

Briefly, the modifications made by this bill in S. 2875 are as follows:

First, S. 2875 would have permitted optional retirement at any age upon completion of 30 years or service.

This bill restores the provision of present law which requires that the employee must have attained the age of 55 before he can so retire.

Secondly, S. 2875 provided automatic survivorship benefits without penalty of one-half of the first \$2,400 of the retiring employee's earned annuity.

The bill, as amended, reinstates the provision of present law which requires that an employee elect survivorship benefits, and it reestablishes a penalty when such an election is made.

Under present law the penalty is 5 percent on the first \$1,500 of the employee's earned annuity, and 10 percent on any amount in excess thereof.

Under the bill, as amended, the penalty is 2½ percent of the first \$2,400 of the employee's earned annuity, and 10 percent on any amount in excess thereof.

Third—and closely related to the above provision—under present law when an employee elects survivorship benefits, he must do so on the full amount of his earned annuity.

The bill, as amended, permits an employee to designate the portion of his earned annuity he desires used for such a purpose. For example, if an employee should retire with an earned annuity of \$2,500, his situation might be such that in the event of his death \$900 would be adequate income for his surviving widow.

Accordingly, he would set aside the first \$1,800 of his annuity for survivorship purposes, and he would be penalized 2½ percent on only the \$1,800. He would take no penalty on the amount in excess thereof, and his widow would receive no benefit therefrom.

Mr. President, these constitute the principal changes in S. 2875 made by the bill. In total, they reduce the estimated cost of S. 2875 by well over \$100 million a year. They go far toward meeting every objection to the bill voiced by the administration. Yet they in no way emasculate the worthy and desirable features of the bill.

Mr. President, title 5 provides for the establishment of additional scientific positions in the Department of Defense, the National Security Agency, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the Department of the Interior, and in the Department of Commerce. The establishment of these positions was approved by the House. The House enacted H. R. 11040 b for this purpose.

It was clearly established in the public hearings held in the House and in the

Senate on this bill that these positions are necessary for the defense of this Nation, for progress in the field of medicine, science, and in the interest of our national welfare.

Mr. President, H. R. 7619 was unanimously approved by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This was done after consideration of its various component parts by several subcommittees. Public hearings were held on most of its provisions.

All of its provisions have been thoroughly considered over a long period of time. It is a needed bill, it is a good bill, and it should be enacted into law without material change.

Mr. President, if the Senator from California will listen, I wish to give the information requested.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives, after a survey and study extending over a period of 4 years, recommended that the term of office of the Civil Service Commissioners be placed on a staggered basis, with a fixed term of 6 years. Reference is made to pages 4, 5, 52 and 53 of the attached House Report No. 1844, 84th Congress.

The Civil Service Commission is the only major permanent operating Commission or Board of the Federal Government in which the members do not have fixed terms of office. Attached is a tabulation of the Boards and Commissions showing the number of members and terms of office, the provision for designation of the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, and the legislative authority under which they were constituted.

Due to the very purpose and nature of the Civil Service Commission, its activities and policies must at all time be held above partisan political consideration and they must be exempt from pressure insofar as is possible. This pressure may be political; it may be from Members of Congress, from other Government officials, from employee groups, from business interests, or from various other sources. The organization of the Civil Service Commission as it is now constituted lends itself to pressure from all sources.

It will be noted from the attached table that the Commission is also the only major Commission or Board of the Federal Government where a line of succession to the chairmanship is to a civil service employee and not to another member. Under the present organization of the Commission, the line of succession to the Chairman extends from the Chairman to the Executive Director and from him down to the lowest messenger. The other two Commissioners, appointees of the President and confirmed by the Senate, can succeed only to the chairmanship after the lowest and last employee of the Civil Service Commission is absent, probably gone to the ballgame.

The charge has been made that the provisions of title II would disturb the operations and activities of the Civil Service Commission. It has also been stated that its present organization is based on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. This charge is unsupported.

The provisions of title II would in no way disturb either the organization of the Civil Service Commission as recommended by the Hoover Commission or its operations and other activities. On the contrary, they will greatly strengthen the management of the Commission and the effectiveness of its programs, with the benefits extending throughout the entire Government, by providing for continuity of top-level leadership of the Commission on a sound and permanent basis.

The provisions of title II do not disturb the present law which make the Commissioners subject to removal at the pleasure of the President.

The present Commissioners can also remain in office, at the will of the President, without reconfirmation by the Senate. The President will designate one Commissioner for each of the 2-, 4-, and 6-year starting terms of office.

The two Commissioners, other than the Chairman under present organization, have no recognition either in the management or operations of the Commission and very little in the establishment of policy and relationships to the Congress and other departments of Government. If this condition is to continue to exist, we might as well abolish the 3-member Commission and establish a 1-member system for the entire operation of the merit system of the Federal Government.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point part of the report of House Civil Service Committee above referred to.

There being no objection, the report is as follows:

THE COMMISSION

Present organization of the Commission: Existing law provides for 3 Civil Service Commissioners, not more than 2 of whom may be of the same political party. The Chairman of the Commission and the other 2 members are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Generally, upon change in administration an entirely new Commission is appointed.

In 1953 the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission was assigned the additional responsibility of the newly created position of Personnel Adviser to the President. The present incumbent of the chair has served in the dual capacity of Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and Personnel Adviser to the President for most of his term of office.

The division of responsibility of the Civil Service Commission between the Chairman and the full Commission under Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1949, in practice has not materially reduced the responsibility of the Chairman. A large measure of responsibility for management of the Civil Service Commission has been delegated to the Executive Director of the Commission, particularly since the beginning of the dual role of the Chairman. The two members of the Commission exercise little or no management control. As noted elsewhere in this report, in the absence of the Chairman the Executive Director is the operating head of the Commission.

Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and Personnel Adviser to the President: The present dual office of Personnel Adviser to the President and Chairman of the Civil Service Commission in some respects has operated as a deterrent to the effective discharge of the full responsibility of the Commission. In the judgment of the committee

the disadvantages of the dual role far outweigh the advantages. Occupancy of these two high offices by one individual at the same time may subject him to pressures and special concerns of individual administrative officials. Time and effort urgently needed in the direction of the affairs of the Civil Service Commission undoubtedly tend to be diverted to extraneous matters which at best are only indirectly related to the mission of this important agency. The chairmanship of the Civil Service Commission is a full-time job which requires the undivided attention of the incumbent—just as the management of other agencies requires the attention of the titular heads thereof. See recommendation (2), page 53.

Commission meetings: The Civil Service Commissioners held 26 formal meetings during the calendar year 1955, and a number of other, informal, meetings to take up special problems, such as budget estimates, as they arose. There is no firm policy of holding meetings on a specific day each week, although it was stated that generally there was an effort to set aside each Wednesday for a meeting of the Commissioners.

The bulk of the work requiring Commission attention is handled individually by the Commissioners by referring staff files from one Commissioner to another for notation and decision. The formal minutes of the Commission are made up not only from the formal meetings but from decisions as indicated on these files that are referred to the individual Commissioners without any formal meeting. In practice, the schedule of meetings is worked out by the Executive Secretary to the Commission, who endeavors to arrange the meetings on Wednesdays. This has been the custom in the Commission for a good many years past. However, because of other appointments and obligations, it is frequently necessary to select another time for a Commission meeting.

In the judgment of the committee, at least one regular, formal weekly meeting of the Civil Service Commission would contribute materially to improvement in the management and operations of the Commission. See recommendation (2), page 53.

RECOMMENDATIONS

(d) Continue the present requirement that not more than two Civil Service Commissioners be of the same political party and that the Chairman and members of the Commission be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Consideration also should be given to the inclusion in such legislation, among other matters, of provisions to—

(a) Achieve for the Civil Service Commission greater independence of action, continuity of top management, and freedom from outside influence or domination through the establishment of 6-year, overlapping terms of office for Civil Service Commissioners, such terms to be placed in effect on a staggered basis, beginning with the first day of a specific calendar year, by the appointment of (i) one Commissioner to a term expiring at the end of 2 years, (ii) one Commissioner to a term expiring at the end of 4 years, and (iii) one Commissioner to a term expiring at the end of 6 years—the term of any Commissioner appointed thereafter to expire at the end of a 6-year period, or multiple thereof, after the prescribed expiration date of one of the original terms;

(b) Require that at least one Civil Service Commissioner have served 5 or more years in the classified civil service;

(c) Establish a firm line of succession for the office of Chairman of the Civil Service Commission whereunder (i) in the absence of the Chairman the other majority Commissioner shall act as Chairman, (ii) in the absence of the Chairman and the other ma-

jority Commissioner the minority Commissioner shall act as Chairman, and (iii) in the absence of the Chairman and both other Commissioners the Executive Director shall act as Chairman;

(d) Spell out in affirmative language that the decisions and determinations of the Civil Service Commission authorized by law or order are final and conclusive on the executive agencies and enforceable by legal proceedings in any instance in which the Commissioners, by a majority vote, shall determine and certify that such action is necessary in the public interest; and

(e) Authorize the Civil Service Commission (1) to require an explanation of reasons for any failure to make an appointment from a certificate or list of eligibles furnished by the Commission at the request of an appointing authority and (ii) if, in the judgment of the Commission, the facts warrant to direct abolishment of any position (A) for which a certificate or list of eligibles has been furnished upon request and to which no appointment has been made from such certificate or list (or by promotion or transfer) within such time as the Commission may prescribe or (B) for which two or more certificates or lists of eligibles have been furnished upon request and to which no appointment has been made from any such certificate or list or by promotion or transfer.

(2) THE COMMISSION

(a) The office of Chairman of the Civil Service Commission is a full-time job and should comprise no special duties and responsibilities, as personnel adviser to the President or otherwise, which are above and beyond those normally found in the relationship of the head of an independent agency to the Chief Executive.

(b) The Civil Service Commission should establish a firm policy of holding formal meetings at least once each week to consider and determine matters of policy and problems requiring the attention of the Commissioners.

(c) Greater emphasis should be placed upon the staff and advisory capacity of the Commission in its dealings with other agencies.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. First, I have some perfecting amendments which I send to the desk.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, before the Senator from South Carolina yields the floor, I should like to ask him a few questions.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have here a copy of a letter written by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to Representative MURRAY, chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1956.
The Honorable TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives,
United States Congress.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letters of March 19 and March 22, 1956, requesting the Commission's views on H. R. 9998 and H. R. 10041, identical bills "To

amend the first section of the Civil Service Act of January 16, 1883, as amended, so as to provide for 6-year terms of office for members of the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes."

These bills would provide for fixed overlapping terms of office for Civil Service Commissioners and establish a different line of succession for the office of chairman.

The Commission is opposed to the enactment of these bills.

The present organization is working very well. It is based on a recommendation made in 1949 by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (the first Hoover Commission). In our opinion, our organization is effective and logical and has provided a satisfactory framework for the exercise of the Commission's responsibilities.

In reviewing the entire matter, we have come to the conclusion that the method of appointment of Commissioners should not be changed. Commissioners should continue to serve at the pleasure of the President without having fixed terms of office established by law. In addition, we believe that the separation of operations from policy and appellate functions should be continued. This logically calls for the Executive Director's acting in the absence of the Chairman of the Commission for purposes of continuity of operations. Since the time of the other two Commissioners is spent on policy and appellate functions, they cannot be expected to be familiar with day-to-day operations.

Reorganization Plan No. 5 has worked too well to date to discard it without further trial. In the course of this further trial, responsible executive branch officials will give continuous thought to any needed changes in the Commission's structure and functions.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee, and that enactment of this legislation would not be in accord with the President's program.

By direction of the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator from Georgia wish to ask me a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to obtain the floor in order to present amendments to the bill. If the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] wishes to interrogate the Senator in reference to something which has already been covered, I shall be glad to wait.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the amendment of the committee, on page 24, line 5, it is proposed to strike out:

(32) Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency.

On pages 24 and 25, renumbered paragraphs (33) to (54) as (32) to (53), respectively.

On page 25, line 5, after "executive" insert "or military."

On page 27, lines 13 and 14, strike out:

(17) Commissioner, United States Court of Claims (12).

On page 27, renumber paragraphs (18) to (23) as (17) to (22), respectively.

On page 32, line 4, strike out "\$12,000" and insert "\$12,500."

On page 71, line 22, insert before the period a colon and add "Provided fur-

ther, That this subsection shall not apply to a Member appointed by the President of the United States to a position not requiring confirmation by the Senate."

On page 44, before the semicolon in line 7, insert the following: "or to construction employees or any other temporary, part-time, or intermittent employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the amendments offered by the Senator from South Carolina will be considered en bloc.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I understand these are the amendments that have been discussed; is that a fact?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We did discuss them.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. These amendments do not include the civil-service retirement portion of the bill, do they?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No. These are merely technical amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in my understanding that under this bill the members of the Cabinet are to receive salaries of \$25,000 a year?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. The House provided for that in its bill, and we have it in our bill. The salary is now \$22,500.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Under Secretary of State and the Deputy Secretary of Defense are to receive salaries of \$22,500, is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are to receive salaries of \$22,000?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are several Under Secretaries referred to on page 20 of the bill, such as the Under Secretary of the Interior, the Under Secretary of Agriculture, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, the Under Secretary of Commerce, the Under Secretary of Labor, the Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who are to receive salaries of \$21,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And are there not a number of Deputy Under Secretaries included in the bill? Does not every Under Secretary have one or more deputies?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Perhaps.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will they not receive increases?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Perhaps.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are two new grades put in, 17 and 18?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are the numbers in grades 17 and 18 increased?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In some instances.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So, the deputies will probably be placed in grade 17 or grade 18. There are deputy secretaries and undersecretaries in virtually every department of Government. Then there are deputies to the deputies, or deputies to the undersecretaries. They will probably be in grades 17 and 18, will they not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They will remain in whatever grade classification they may be in at the present time.

We have made some few increases in the bill with reference to grades 17 and 18.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The bill probably would upgrade grade 18 persons. In other words, the deputies to the deputies and the deputies to the under secretaries are not forgotten?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is very reassuring to these functionaries. I notice that on page 23 a number of assistant secretaries are also given increases.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To make that clear, everyone in grade 18 is increased from \$14,800 to \$16,000, under the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That will be good for them, if not for the taxpayers.

On page 23, under "assistant secretaries," I find 5 Assistant Postmasters General, 3 Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, 3 Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, 9 Assistant Secretaries of Defense, 2 Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, 3 Assistant Secretaries of the Interior, 3 Assistant Secretaries of Labor, 10 Assistant Secretaries of State, 3 Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury, 4 Assistant Secretaries of the Air Force, 4 Assistant Secretaries of the Army, 4 Assistant Secretaries of the Navy.

If my arithmetic is correct, that is a total of 53 assistant secretaries whose pay is to be increased to \$20,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If every one of the 53 assistant secretaries has a deputy assistant secretary, what will happen to the 53 deputy assistant secretaries?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Their salaries will not be changed unless they are already in grade 18. If they are already in grade 18, their pay will be increased from \$14,800 to \$16,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not probable that almost all the deputies to assistant secretaries are in grade 18 now?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There are only 176 in the entire Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Could we have a breakdown of the number of deputies to the assistant secretaries and the deputies to the under secretaries?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For the information of the Senator from

Illinois, in grades 17 and 18 there are only 178 officials in the entire Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator mean that there are not more than 178 deputies to under secretaries or deputies to assistant secretaries? That is reassuring. I thought the number probably ran into many hundreds.

Can the Senator from South Carolina inform us how many more under secretaries, deputy secretaries, assistant secretaries, deputy under secretaries, and deputy assistant secretaries there are now than there were 3½ years ago?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee did not go into that in this classification.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that would be an extremely important answer to have.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Their salaries will not be touched at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But large increases are being handed down?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Not in the bill. There are 662 only.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The salaries of the deputy secretaries go up; the salaries of the under secretaries go up; the salaries of the assistant secretaries go up; the salaries of deputy under secretaries who are in grade 18 go up; and the salaries of deputies to assistant secretaries who are in grade 18 go up.

My question is how many more deputy secretaries, under secretaries, assistant secretaries, deputies to under secretaries, deputies to deputy under secretaries, and deputies to assistant secretaries are there now than there were 3½ years ago? We have been proliferating officialdom, to use a large word, all around. One cannot go downtown without bumping into a deputy; and he does not wear a sheriff's badge, either.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should imagine their number has increased; and my rough guess would be that their number has about doubled.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the Department of Defense used to have nine civilians in the top positions. Now there are 32 secretaries, under secretaries, assistant secretaries, deputies to deputies, and deputies to assistant secretaries. Perhaps I have missed some of them.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator from Illinois to a very large extent; but the committee did not go into that question in this bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the positions have been created by this administration under their efficiency program to reduce the number of governmental employees. Does not the Senator think it would be a good subject for the Committee on Government Operations to look into? Would it not be well for that committee to ascertain the number of assistant secretaries, assistants to assistant secretaries, deputies to assistants, and deputies to deputies the Government now has on its rolls?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. For the information of the Senator from Illinois, the committee has not made a study of that question up until this time, but we intend to make such a study.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it would be very helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc, submitted by the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Johnston).

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Title V of the proposed legislation. Title V of the bill as reported by the committee has in essence the same provisions as H. R. 11040, which has passed the House. It provides for the creation of some 275 additional professional grades in the highest pay brackets. Most of them are within the Department of Defense.

I have made some study of this question, and, in my opinion, Congress would not be justified in creating that many positions in that high category at this time. I am therefore offering an amendment as a substitute for title V of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAIRD in the chair). Does the Senator desire to have the amendment read in full?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is agreeable to me to have the amendment printed in the RECORD, rather than have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. RUSSELL's amendment to the committee amendment is as follows:

On page 81, beginning in line 19, strike out down to and including line 10 on page 85, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"Sec. 501. (a) Subsections (a) and (b) of the first section of the act of August 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 715; Public Law 313, 80th Cong.), as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 120 positions in the Department of Defense and not more than 25 positions in the National Security Agency, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions, relating to the national defense, military and naval medicine, and any and all other activities of the Department of Defense and the National Security Agency, as the case may be, which require the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel.

"(b) The Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for, in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, not to exceed 20 positions in the professional and scientific service, each such position being established in order to enable the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to secure and retain the services of specially qualified personnel necessary in the discharge of the duty of the Committee to supervise and direct the scientific study of the problems of flight with a view to their practical solution."

"(b) Nothing contained in the amendment made to such act of August 1, 1947, by subsection (a) of this section shall affect any position existing under authority of subsection (a) of the first section of such act of August 1, 1947, as in effect immediately prior to the effective date of such amendment, the compensation attached to any such position, and any incumbent thereof, his appointment thereto, and his right to receive the compensation attached thereto, until appropriate action is taken under authority of subsection (a) of such first section of such act of August 1, 1947, as contained in the amendment made by subsection (a) of this section.

"Sec. —. Section 505 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (69 Stat. 179; 5 U. S. C., sec. 1105), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Subject to subsection (c), (d), and (e) of this section, a majority of the Civil Service Commissioners are authorized to establish and, from time to time, revise the maximum number of positions (not to exceed 1,215) which may be in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule at any one time, except that under such authority such maximum number of positions shall not exceed 329 for grade 17 and 126 for grade 18. The United States Civil Service Commission shall report annually to the Congress the total number of positions established under this subsection for grades 16, 17, and 18 of the General Schedule and the total number of positions so established for each such grade."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall describe very briefly what the proposed substitute will do. In the Department of Defense at the present time 45 of these professional positions are authorized. The committee proposal allows 180 additional positions. The amendment which I propose allows 75 additional positions.

The National Security Agency, Mr. President, which is one of the most important agencies of our Government, although it is not referred to very often, and I think this is the first time it has ever appeared in any bill which has come before the Congress—the Agency was created by Executive order—does not at the present time have any of these scientific and professional positions in the higher grades. The Agency had requested 50 positions. My suggested amendment proposes 25 additional positions.

The reason the amendment provides a higher percentage of such positions for that Agency than it does for some of the other agencies is the peculiar nature of the work which is done by the National Security Agency. The work is of such a nature that when a man leaves the Agency, the training he has received in the Government does not in any way help him obtain a position in private employment.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics at the present time has 10 such positions, and it has requested 50 positions. That is provided in the committee amendment. The amendment which I propose doubles the number the Advisory Committee has at the present time, and allows it 10 additional professional positions. The Advisory Committee proposes to promote 10 persons presently employed by them, and, thereafter fill the 10 positions in the lower grades by employing new personnel.

The committee proposes to give to the Department of Commerce 35 additional scientific positions. I have discussed this matter with the Secretary of Commerce. Of course, he would like to get the 35 professional positions, but he has stated to me, within the hour, that his greatest need is in the so-called supergrades, GS-16, 17, and 18; that he needs the positions in those categories to assist him in the administration of the tremendous highway program which was recently adopted by the Congress. The amendment I have proposed allows 15 positions in the higher grades, or the

supergrades, to the Department of Commerce.

The essential difference between the provisions of H. R. 11040, as found in title V, and the substitute I propose is that the number of high-grade positions is reduced from 275 to 145.

I may say, with respect to these scientific grades, it is very difficult to recruit personnel for those grades all at one time.

I do not think my amendment would injure any of these agencies in the slightest degree. The next Congress can examine into the needs of the agencies and ascertain whether it is necessary to create this large number of scientific and professional positions.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to add a word to what the Senator from Georgia has said about the amendment. I know the departments would like to have more of the high-grade positions, but representatives of the Defense Department have discussed the matter with the Senator from Georgia and with me. While they would like to have more of the high-grade positions, I believe the amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be very helpful to the Department of Defense as well as the Department of Commerce. The Secretary of Commerce has also talked to me.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be accepted by the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to say that the House bill is before the Senate. Hearings were held on the House bill. A question was raised as to how many of the high-grade positions should be created. For that reason, I informed those concerned that I thought we ought to take the matter up with the Committee on Armed Services, and especially with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator suggested that the proposals be put in the bill. Then when it reached the floor he would offer his amendment clarifying the matter, as he thought it ought to be.

So far as I am concerned, and I think the committee felt that way about it at the time, I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—before the amendment is accepted I should like to make a statement.

It is understood that Senator RUSSELL would propose to amend title V of H. R. 7619 to reduce the numbers of scientific and professional positions proposed by the act. Title V would increase the number of scientific and professional positions now authorized for certain departments and agencies engaged in scientific research and development. While this title reads as though the heads of the departments and agencies concerned have a wide open authority to establish positions and rates of pay under it, this is not the case nor would it be appropriate. The situation with regard to the

control of positions under this title is as follows:

While the positions authorized to be established under the title are for the use of the specific agencies named, before they can be established and appointments made to them the department or agency must have the approval of the Civil Service Commission of the rate of pay which it proposes for each position and of the qualifications of each individual which it proposes to appoint to such positions. In fact the control of pay fixing and appointment is tighter in the case of these positions than is the case when positions are established under the Classification Act. Title V does not authorize any increase in the number of so-called supergrade positions under the Classification Act. It deals solely with scientific and professional positions for which the Congress initially authorized limited numbers of such positions in Public Law 313 on August 1, 1947. Authorization of the additional positions provided in title V is essential to the scientific research and development work conducted by the Federal Government if our Government is to keep abreast and ahead of the demands made on it in this field.

The bulk of the positions covered by title V are in three critical areas:

The Department of Defense for the use of the Army and Navy, and Air Force in their scientific and professional research and development programs in a variety of fields ranging from guided missiles to the field of medicine.

The National Security Agency.

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics whose research in the aeronautical field is basic to the continued development of our aircraft industry. Its research and development work is made available not only to the Army, Navy, and Air Force, but also to the private industrial concerns in the aircraft field.

The authorization of these positions can in no way be termed a raid on the Treasury or a political maneuver to secure more high-paid jobs for political purposes. Each individual who has been approved for appointment under the present authorizations for such positions which would be increased by title V has been an outstanding scientist or professional man in his field of work. The departments and agencies who have the special authorities which are being increased under title V have in no instance abused the authority or used it improperly since they have first received authorization for appointments and pay fixing in 1947.

To reduce the number of scientific and professional positions proposed to be authorized by title V would be failing to recognize our critical need for advanced work by the Federal Government in the fields of basic research and applied science.

I appreciate the work the Senator from Georgia has done. It is a real problem to determine the number of personnel that each agency should have in the super positions. There is a great demand for them. In many instances—in fact, I should say in most instances—their employment is justified. We have

tried, as I know the Senator from Georgia has tried, to take care of the agencies at this time.

I did not hear the number the Senator from Georgia suggested for the Department of Defense.

Mr. RUSSELL. The number suggested for the Department of Defense is a total of 120. At the present time the Department has 45 super positions. The proposed amendment would allow them 75 additional positions in this category.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to say to the Senator from Georgia that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] visited with me and stated he was greatly concerned about the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and he told me he had discussed with the Senator from Georgia the number of super positions needed in that agency. As I understand, that agency now has 10 such positions, and would receive 10 additional under the proposed amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. I may say that the Senator from Virginia has discussed this matter with me on two occasions, and urged increases in the authorization for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. But, in my opinion, if we double the number that agency now have, and they are permitted to fill the 10 old positions—because they will be recruiting 10 new men to fill the lower grades which have been vacated for the higher grades—that should suffice to allow the agency to pursue its activities.

Mr. CARLSON. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics had requested 60 such positions. As I understand, all the positions which were to be filled would be filled by moving up to those grades persons presently employed by the agency. The amendment will give the agency 20 of those super positions. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. The agency will have 20 of the highest professional grade positions recognized by existing law. As the Senator has stated, the agency proposes to fill the top positions by promotion; but, as the Senator well knows, when the agency does fill those positions by promotion, that does not automatically abolish the lower positions which are occupied by those who will be promoted. Additional personnel will fill the vacancies created by the promotion of personnel to the 10 additional scientific and professional grades.

Mr. CARLSON. In conclusion, I wish again to commend the Senator from Georgia for the work he has done on the matter. I know he has worked earnestly and sincerely in trying in an effort to protect the interests of the Government. There is great demand by private industry for scientists and other personnel in various Government agencies. While we can never expect to meet private industry salaries, we can, in every way possible, by granting salary increases and fringe benefits, encourage employees to stay with the Government when we need them.

If it develops by next January that a sufficient number of positions have not been made available to take care of the

interests of the Government, I am sure the Senator from Georgia, and I know the Senator from Kansas, will try to protect those interests.

Mr. RUSSELL. If it develops that this number of positions is not sufficient to meet the needs of the agencies, I shall favor action by Congress to increase the number so as to enable the departments to meet their needs.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Georgia for his work in cutting out a large number of the high-salaried positions, which apparently are grossly excessive in number.

I have made a rough calculation; and I think his amendment to the committee amendment will save several million dollars. He deserves a great deal of credit for paring down the excessive estimates by the executive departments.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have been seeking for some time to obtain information on this question. There are approximately 13 Under Secretaries, 2 Secretaries, and then there are some Deputy Under Secretaries. There are 53 Assistant Secretaries, 21 of whom are in the Defense Department. I am seeking to ascertain how many deputies to Deputy Secretaries and Under Secretaries and how many deputies to Assistant Secretaries there are in the Government.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois must seek his information at a source that is wiser and has more information than does the Senator from Georgia. I doubt very much that in the Government service there is any living human being who could answer that question offhand.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Georgia think there is any computing machine which could add up the total?

Mr. RUSSELL. Some remarkable electronic computing machines have been developed in the past few years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Georgia think it would be necessary to use an electronic computing machine in order to arrive at the answer to my question?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, figures in regard to some of the other executive departments have been available. I myself am more familiar with the Department of Defense than I am with some of the other departments and agencies.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in connection with that point will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Illinois is an eminent statistician and economist; but I do not want him to state on the floor of the Senate that this amendment to the committee amendment will save hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I said millions of dollars.

Mr. CARLSON. The fact is that the committee amendment provides for an increase from a maximum of \$15,000 to a maximum of \$19,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But when additional positions are created and when men already in the Government service are moved into the new positions, it is necessary for others to occupy the positions the men promoted have vacated.

Mr. CARLSON. At any rate, the Senator from Georgia has stated the number; and I point out that the difference is the difference between \$15,000 and \$19,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Kansas. In some instances, I think the difference might be somewhat greater.

Mr. President, I make no claim that the saving this amendment to the committee amendment will effectuate will pay off the public debt or result in some other great accomplishment; the saving will be a rather modest one. However, I was brought up in a rather Spartan household, and it seems that I waste a great deal of time in the Senate in trying to save a few dollars here or a million dollars there. In view of the tremendous Government operations which now are going on, the saving which will result from this amendment to the committee amendment will be almost infinitesimal. However, when I see that I can save a few dollars for the national Treasury, my instinct tells me I should do what I can to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Perhaps the adding machine the Senator from Georgia has at his disposal will not permit him to state the total number of Deputy and Assistant Secretaries for the entire Government; but can he state the number for the Department of Defense?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot answer that question. I know that during World War II there was a total, I believe, of 8 Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries in the various defense agencies; and in January 1953, when the present administration came into power, there were 17 Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Defense; and as of today there are 30. A bill which has been passed by the House of Representatives, and on yesterday was in the Senate Armed Services Committee—where it was tabled—would have created three additional Secretaries.

Of course, I am sure it is only coincidental; but I was interested to observe that in testimony given before the Congress some 2 years ago, the Secretary of Defense testified there were 33 vice presidents of General Motors Corp.; and if the committee had reported the bill to which I have just referred, and if the bill had been passed, there would have been 33 Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries of the Defense Department.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Georgia remember what the late Fred Allen had to say about the numerous vice presidents of broadcasting companies? The remarks were very caustic and well deserved. I think Mr. Allen would have equal fun with the number of these deputies, assistants, and so forth.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am afraid that I am not familiar with that particular historical incident.

Mr. President, I ask that the question be put on the adoption of my amendment, which proposes a substitute for title V of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 28, between lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to insert the following:

Sec. 110. (a) The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall receive such compensation, in addition to his pay and allowances under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, as will make his compensation equal to \$20,000 per annum, in addition to such allowances.

(b) The Deputy Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall receive such compensation, in addition to his pay and allowances under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, as will make his compensation equal to \$19,000 per annum, in addition to such allowances.

(c) The Director, National Institutes of Health, the Chief, Bureau of Medical Services, and the Chief, Bureau of State Services, of the Public Health Service, shall each receive such compensation, in addition to his pay and allowances under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, as will make his compensation equal to \$17,500 per annum, in addition to such allowances.

Renumber succeeding sections.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to adjust the rate of compensation of five top doctors who are responsible for administration of the United States Public Health Service.

The committee unanimously agreed to adjust the rate of compensation of the top position; that is, the position of the Surgeon General of the United States. After this action had been taken, certain technical problems which developed made it necessary to leave the position out of the bill as it was reported. These technical problems have now been resolved, and it has been determined that, in addition to adjusting the pay of the Surgeon General, as a matter of equity the rate of pay of four additional positions should be adjusted. The matter has been discussed with members of the Committee, and meets with approval of the members of the committee.

When we were discussing the matter in the committee, at one time we thought that perhaps the ones in these positions might continue to receive the salaries attaching to their ranks in the military services—for instance, the salary of brigadier general, and so forth. For that reason, we thought that perhaps we should not interfere with the existing arrangements. However, we have found that that is not true. For that reason,

we believe the salaries should be adjusted in the way proposed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield? Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. If I correctly understand the amendment, I think it will increase the salary of the Surgeon General of the United States and 3 or 4 other positions in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the RECORD should show that in the case of the Surgeon General, who is a member of the military forces of the United States, and who draws a certain salary as a member of the United States Army, even though he will receive the increased salary proposed by the amendment, his salary will revert to his previous salary when he leaves his present position.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to address a question to the Senator from South Carolina. On page 35 of the committee report, I notice it is stated that a change is made in the status of a number of legal officers of the Government, including that for the Department of Agriculture, that for the Department of the Army, that for the Department of the Navy, and that for the Department of the Air Force. Will the Senator tell us briefly why that change was made, and the effect of it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In general terms, we made a study of the subject, the subcommittee and the staff working together, and we came to the conclusion that the salaries for the officials referred to should be increased in the amounts indicated. The committee was unanimous.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is there anything to prevent the creation of two higher positions when this provision is enacted? Can the grade at present occupied by the General Counsel of the Department of the Army be filled by another appointment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No; it cannot.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is confident of that?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am confident of that. That question was raised, and we were told that it could not be.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is confident that that language applies only to the offices of these individuals, and does not increase the total number of positions in these departments?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is entirely correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Can the Senator tell us how many positions in the so-called super grades—16, 17, and 18—are created by this bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should say not more than a dozen.

Mr. RUSSELL. I notice on page 36 that when we increase the grade of Deputy Administrators of the Agricultural Research Service to grade GS-18, we say that "Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by section 305 (b) of such act." Does that mean that the grades now occupied by those positions, which are either 16 or 17, can be filled by new appointments?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No; they cannot.

Mr. RUSSELL. That relates only to the three new deputies?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There are no new grades.

Mr. RUSSELL. On page 80 I find an interesting statement, with which I have no violent disagreement, but I was rather curious as to its significance. I refer to section 406, in the retirement provisions of the bill, I believe. That section reads as follows:

Sec. 406. It is the policy of the Congress that whenever in the future any general adjustment is made in the salaries of Government employees, corresponding adjustments should be made in the annuities of retired employees.

Was that provision in the retirement bill as it passed the Senate?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was in the retirement bill. That is a statement of policy.

Mr. RUSSELL. I feel somewhat bound by our action in supporting the retirement bill.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina for the consideration he has shown me.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. Beginning with line 19 on page 30, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 4 on page 33.

On page 33, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "Sec. 121" and insert "Sec. 119."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, it is the belief of the sponsors of this amendment that the matters covered in these two sections of the bill should be considered in the legislative bill, and for that reason we offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 52, lines 18 and 19, in the committee amendment,

it is proposed to strike out "attains the age of 55 years and."

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this is similar to the amendment adopted by the Senate in connection with a previous bill. This amendment would permit retirement after 30 years' service, but the retirement allowance would be adjusted downward, depending upon the age of the person so retired.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment with the senior Senator from Kentucky. While I opposed a similar amendment which was previously before the Senate, the Senate voted to include it in the bill. Therefore I think we should take it to conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I was on the floor when a similar amendment was agreed to on a previous occasion, and I favored the amendment. The only reason we did not keep it in the bill was that we thought perhaps it would be more likely to meet the approval of the House if it were not in the bill. We shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Let me say to my friend, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and to the ranking minority member [Mr. CARLSON], that I am delighted to have them take the amendment to conference. However, when they go to conference I hope they will give consideration to the fact that this question has been previously voted upon by the Senate, which expressed itself by a vote of 46 to 36 in favor of the amendment. I hope they will take that fact into consideration when they are discussing this subject in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire whether the Senator from South Carolina will yield to me for some further questions.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that on the White House staff there are now 12 administrative assistants to the President?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from South Carolina remember that when the executive staff of the President was first established under the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 7 assistants were provided for, at a salary of only \$10,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from South Carolina remember the

heated objections from the other side of the aisle at that time to the creation of that number of positions of administrative assistant in the office of the President?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There was some discussion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There was quite bitter discussion, was there not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now there are 12, and the administration wants 3 more, or a total of 15.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So there will be twice as many assistants as President Roosevelt had, at greatly increased salaries; is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am also intrigued by the fact that two of the new positions which are to be created are two "Deputy Assistants to the Deputy Assistant" to the President.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. The same thought was running through my mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, we have not only Deputy Under Secretaries and Deputies to Deputies to Assistant Secretaries, but we have Deputy Assistants to the Deputy Assistants to the Assistant Secretaries. Would the Senator say that this was a government by deputization?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We do not wish to criticize anyone for not being on the job all the time. One must have assistants when he is absent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask if it is not the function of the Deputy Assistants to the President, the Assistants to the President, and the Deputy Assistants to the Deputy Assistant to ride herd on the various Government departments, and therefore ride herd on the Deputy Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries, the Deputies to the Deputy Secretaries, the Deputies to the Under Secretaries, and the Deputies to the Assistant Secretaries? Is not that their function?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To see that there is proper coordination between the Assistants and the Deputies to the Assistants.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator remember the debate in connection with the WPA, when the WPA proposal was nearly wrecked when someone discovered that there were supervisors of supervisors?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I remember that discussion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It nearly killed the WPA.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But here we have Deputy Assistantants and Assistants riding herd on Secretaries, Under Secretaries, Deputy Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, Deputies to Under Secretaries, and Deputies to Assistant Secretaries.

Is that not true?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Apparently their work has become so onerous that it is now necessary to create deputy assistants to deputy assistants. Would the Senator from South Carolina inform the Senate whether there are deputy assistants to the deputy assistants to the deputy assistants in the Office of the President? In other words, do the deputy assistants to the deputy assistants have deputies who in turn act for them?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have not investigated that situation. That might be so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It might be an interesting subject for investigation. Does not the Senator from South Carolina believe that this business has gone too far?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 28, after line 19, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 112. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the compensation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of \$17,500 each per annum.

(b) The Engineer Commissioner, appointed from the Corps of Engineers, shall receive an annual compensation which, when added to any compensation he receives as an officer of the United States Army, will equal the compensation authorized for a Commissioner by subsection (a) of this section.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. The pending amendment is a very simple one. Its purpose and effect is to raise the compensation of the District of Columbia Commissioners from their present salary of \$14,620 to \$17,500. There are 3 Commissioners—2 civilian Commissioners and 1 engineer Commissioner. In the case of the latter he would be paid the difference between his Army compensation and \$17,500.

The amendment has been approved unanimously by the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I understand that the leadership on both sides and the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service have no objection to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The salaries of the Commissioners were not included in the pending bill. However, I believe that the District of Columbia Commissioners should receive this increase to \$17,500.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I believe the increase could very equitably be much higher, but I am satisfied that at the present time this is the best we can do. Therefore I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair.) The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on

Public Works asked me to have a bill referred. I did not understand that his request included the striking of certain provisions from the pending bill. After consultation with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I believe I should offer an amendment to strike from the pending bill the subject matter in the bill which was rereferred; otherwise there would be no use of rereferring the bill, because the subject matter would have been taken care of in the pending bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I offer an amendment to strike line 13 of page 24, which reads "(38) Federal Highway Administrator;" and to strike section 304 of the bill, beginning at line 23 on page 36, down to and including line 16 on page 37.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should now like to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of the committee. As I understand, the amendment which has been adopted by the Senate will completely take care of the situation complained of by the Committee on Public Works. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So far as I know, it will take care of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am doing this without any prejudice to what the committee may do about it. It is a subject which that committee wishes to consider. At the same time I desire to make it abundantly clear that I have no personal feeling in the matter. I am acting on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works. I appreciate the attitude of my friend, the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the sections of the bill be renumbered.

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

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 19, it is proposed to strike out line 24, and to insert after line 12 the following: "The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs."

Mr. DIRKSEN. The purport of the amendment is to provide for the transposition of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from one section to another, to put him in a slightly higher class. Very properly he belongs along with the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Army, and the Secretary of the Air Force. Such a provision was carried in the Senate version of the bill in 1955. However, in the pending bill he is dropped into another category.

Mr. President, the amendment I have offered would transfer the Veterans' Administrator to a higher pay bracket. I

think the bill has been well constructed. It is on the basis of responsibility, so, certainly, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs should be included in the next higher bracket.

He is in charge of the veterans' hospitals with a caseload of more than 113,000 bed patients. At last report there were 181,287 civilian employees on the rolls of the Veterans' Administration. When it comes to money that agency is the fourth largest, because the appropriation for it is in excess of \$4 billion. The veterans and dependents on the rolls today number more than 3½ million. Veterans' Administrator is looking after 25,000 vocational cases. The Administrator is administering a program which includes 784,000 GI's for benefits under the GI bill. He is also administering a loan program involving 4,480,000 loans with an aggregate total of \$33 billion. In addition to all this, there are in force at least 5,600,000 national life insurance policies and some 400,000 World War II insurance policies. It is a tremendous operation, and I believe, on the basis of size and responsibility, the Administrator should be moved into the next highest bracket and should be given that additional prestige and recognition.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The subcommittee gave a great deal of study to this question. They felt that the Administrator should not be placed on a higher list, but should be held to the \$21,000 salary. I think all the members of the committee were unanimous in that belief. It gets the bill out of gear, so to speak, if we place the Administrator in a higher bracket and leave the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and other officials of that class, where they are. So, we classed them all together, which we thought was correct.

I hope the Senate will see fit to reject the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment it is proposed, on page 26, after line 11, to insert the following new section (3) under section 106 (b): "Assistant to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we have a Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and an Associate Director. Then we have Assistant to the Director. My amendment applies to the Assistant to the Director, whose work is done very competently. The person occupying this post is an outstanding individual with whom I think Members of Congress have come in contact with

and of whom they have a very high opinion. I certainly think he is one of the most capable officials in Government.

I think that, by and large, the committee has done an excellent job, and I wish to commend the distinguished chairman of the committee and the members of the committee for their excellent work, and I certainly would not offer this amendment if this were not an unusual situation. I think this is an unusual situation, because of the responsibility of the job, because of the high type of man who holds the job, and because of the respect in which he is held by committees of the Congress of the United States come in contact with him.

I hope my amendment will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to the committee amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is another amendment which might get the bill out of gear. The position is not even in the executive pay bill; it comes under the Classification Act. He would be in grade 18. He is receiving a promotion from \$14,800 to \$16,000. There are many persons who hold positions of the same type in the Government. If we place this man in a higher position the others should be placed in higher positions. So, much as I like this man and the work he is doing, I do not think, personally, I could agree to the amendment.

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

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I submit another amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 28, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "seven" and insert in lieu thereof "eight."

On page 28, line 18, it is proposed to strike out "three" and insert in lieu thereof "two."

Mr. BRIDGES. In effect, the amendment would create one more assistant on the White House staff at a higher rate, in lieu of one at a lower rate.

The purpose of the amendment is to place the salary of the Secretary to the Cabinet at a higher rate level than he now has. The Cabinet is composed of the closest associates of the President in the executive branch of the Government, and the Secretary to the Cabinet carries on his shoulders great responsibilities. He is the chief liaison officer between the President and the Cabinet. His position is as important a position as there is on the general White House level. This official is responsible for the preparation of the Cabinet agenda and to determine those items to be rec-

ommended to the President for Cabinet discussion.

I think the position is filled competently today by a man of outstanding ability. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am sorry that I cannot agree to accept the amendment. The committee has already advanced the rate of pay of three positions at \$17,500 in the President's office. I feel that that is sufficient at this time. Under the circumstances, I ask the Senate to reject the amendment.

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

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to offer an amendment to the bill, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, because the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] wishes to offer one final amendment before the bill shall be passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Texas suggests the absence of a quorum, I should like to propound a question to the chairman of the committee.

The retirement features which are included in the committee amendment include the same rate of contribution for the retirement of Members of Congress as did the retirement bill which passed earlier with the Williams amendment, do they not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They are the same.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wanted to be certain that there had been no inadvertent change.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They remain the same.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggested the absence of a quorum so that my friend, the Senator from Oregon, could come to the floor to offer an amendment he desired to offer before the Senate took final action on the bill. As soon as action has been taken on the amendment and then on the bill, it will be my purpose to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the mutual security appropriation bill, on which there will be a limitation of the time for debate.

The Senate will remain in session late this evening in the hope that some action can be had on at least several amendments to the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from

Oregon to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 33, it is proposed to strike out lines 5 and 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 121. (a) Except as provided in this section, this title shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period which began after December 31, 1955.

(b) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began after December 31, 1955 and ending on the date of enactment of this act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Cong.), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began after January 31, 1955, and ending on the date of enactment of this act by an officer or employee who dies during such period. For the purposes of this subsection, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(c) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this title shall be held and considered to be effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of such enactment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in essence, the amendment provides for retroactive pay for 6 months. I invite the attention of the Senator from South Carolina, the able chairman of the committee, while I ask him a question or two.

The amendment has been very carefully prepared by the legislative counsel. It is an amendment, which has been considered from the standpoint of all the technical problems which I happen to know were discussed in committee in regard to retroactivity. It is an amendment which I think is just and equitable.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question or two about the history of the bill. Am I correct in my understanding that the subject matter of the bill is the same as the subject matter of the bill which was sought to be passed on the floor of the Senate in the closing hours of the last session of Congress?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that at that time there were many Senators who wanted the bill passed? It had been passed a matter of an hour or two previously by the House of Representatives on the closing night of the session, and strong representations had been made

to the Senate by the House leadership for passage of the bill by the Senate that night. Is not that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true. The committee, if the Senator from Oregon will recall, quickly held a session and reported the House bill, with a few minor amendments, but the Senate committee did not have time to hold any hearings or to make a formal report.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator will recall there were a considerable number of objections expressed on the floor of the Senate—and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show them—by colleagues of mine, because of the fact that the Senator from South Carolina, as committee chairman, when asked a question about it, very frankly told us that his committee had not had time to conduct hearings on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator will recall that I held the floor that night in opposition to the bill, because I felt, as did a considerable number of my colleagues, who expressed themselves in the RECORD at that time, that the bill should be subjected to hearings, because of its complexities which were perfectly clear to us as we came to examine the bill on the floor of the Senate. At that time I said I felt we ought to be perfectly fair to the employees, and when the bill was brought up in the next session of Congress and hearings were held—and we hoped it would be disposed of very early in the next session of Congress—I would urge that the increased pay should be made retroactive. Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I recall the Senator's making a statement similar to that.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I make this statement about the history of the bill because I believe the employees are entitled to the equity I am pleading for this afternoon, for if in the closing hours of the session there had not been objection to the bill providing increased pay for employees would have been passed. But the bill came to the floor of the Senate without any committee hearings having been held on it, I think within the last 4 or 5 hours of the closing day of the last session of the Congress and objection was raised. The Senator agrees with me on that; does he not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator in his statement.

Mr. MORSE. I assume that, although there have been some changes made in the bill which was submitted on the last day of the last session, the general framework of the bill remains pretty much the same. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would say in most instances it is the same.

Mr. MORSE. One of the last efforts of the last evening of the last session was to get the executive pay bill passed, but some of us felt that, in accordance with proper parliamentary procedure in the Senate of the United States, a bill of such magnitude ought to be subjected to hearings. How right we were, be-

cause when Congress reconvened, at its next session, the bill came before the committee headed by the able Senator from South Carolina; here we are in the closing days of the present session, and we find the bill before us, but now having had extensive and prolonged hearings. We were quite right that night when we said the executive pay bill should not be passed without hearings, as the very record made by the committee demonstrates. The group who objected to the pay bill that night thought it would be exceedingly unwise to pass it under the conditions prevailing at the time its consideration was proposed.

I think we were right in another matter, Mr. President, when, in our plea for time to have hearings at the beginning of the next session of Congress, we made the statement that we thought, in fairness to the employees, we ought to support the principle of retroactivity when the bill was ultimately considered. One of the arguments made on the floor of the Senate, as the RECORD will show, was that if we stopped the bill that night we would do an injustice to employees of the executive departments who would otherwise have obtained an increase in salary unless the pay increases were made retroactive. That statement is true today. So we should make certain that injustice is not done by providing retroactivity.

I have gone into this matter with counsel, and I am advised the amendment I have submitted is a sound amendment from the standpoint of the legal problems involved. I submit it is a sound amendment so far as the equities are concerned; and I think, in justice to the employees, in view of the record we as the Senate ourselves have made on this matter, we owe it to them.

I was always of the opinion that in the last session of Congress it was unfortunate that the administration did not attempt to obtain action on the bill early enough in the session so our committee could have held hearings. Our able chairman, as I recall it very distinctly—and I am willing to let the record speak for itself—said, on that last night of the session, that the bill had not been brought before the committee in time to have hearings on it. I recall saying that, of course the responsibility for that was the administration's. But now the responsibility is ours to do justice for these employees.

Mr. President, I am asking for 6 months of retroactivity. I think it is only fair and proper. I am submitting my amendment on two grounds.

First, the bill should have been in shape, based on hearings, so that it could have been passed at the session of Congress. I think the employees concerned have been done an injustice because of delay by the Senate, the delay having been caused in the first instance, in my opinion, by the failure of the administration to get the bill to Congress in time for it to have due consideration. But that is over the dam. Now we have a problem in connection with a bill on which there have been adequate hearings. It is a good bill in most particulars, as I understand, although I have not had the time

to make as careful a study of it as I should like. But the committee seems to be pretty much in agreement that it is a fair bill.

Therefore, in the second place, we ought to take care of the retroactive equities, which I think these employees deserve. The retroactivity does not go back far—only 6 months. It goes back to December 31, 1955.

I submit the amendment on the basis of its obvious justice and fairness to these employees.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am forced to oppose the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, principally on the ground that the best way I know to kill the bill before the Senate in the closing hours of the session and the increases the bill provides for the Cabinet members, under secretaries, secretaries, and other high executives of this great Nation of ours, would be to burden the bill with retroactivity.

I know we legislate for groups and not for persons, but I do not believe that the chances for the House's approval and the signature of the President would be enhanced by providing a \$12,500 bonus for persons in high salary brackets who are not severely in need.

It was the fault of the administration, I assure my distinguished colleague, that last year the bill came before the Congress in the closing days of the session. The committee had been asking for a bill to be submitted. Again, the Congress could have considered the bill in January, had the administration been ready to send a bill for the appropriate committee to consider.

Frankly, I do not like retroactivity. Once we start making salary increases retroactive, where are we to draw the cutoff line? Consider persons who receive the meager sum of \$60 a month in social security benefits. Bills affecting such persons sometimes are pending for 2 or 3 years. Yet the only practical way to enact such legislation is to base the beginning of the benefits on the passage of the bill.

Only once have we deviated from that course and provided retroactivity. I supported such action because twice we saw the President, at the insistence of the Postmaster General, veto the overwhelming action of both Houses in giving the poorly paid postal workers increased pay. If the President vetoed the action of both Houses, not once, but twice, in the case of a bill which provided increases for men making between \$2,500 and \$3,000 a year—persons who were in desperate need of an increase to pay grocery bills and rent—what would happen to the pending bill?

In this case we are dealing with retroactivity for distinguished executives of our Government, including such persons as Charles Wilson, formerly the president of General Motors Corp. We are also dealing with the pay of Secretary Weeks, another millionaire, the Secretary of Commerce. We are dealing with the pay of many other men who accepted their present Government positions at personal sacrifice to themselves, I must say.

However, when we try to hew to the line of retroactivity when we deal with

\$25,000-a-year salaries for the top executives, in my opinion we are dealing with a matter so dangerous that I think it would be likely to jeopardize enactment of the bill itself.

The pending bill is not the same as the one which came before the Senate on the closing day of the last session. The bill now before the Senate covers well over 100 pay increases which were not even mentioned in the bill which was before the Senate on the last day of the last session. Are we going to provide for 6 months' retroactivity, along the line of a bonus of \$10,000 or \$11,000, in the case of such positions? I think we must draw the line. We are dealing with the public funds, and we must be careful.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague on the committee.

Mr. PASTORE. Will not the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma agree that the committee considered this particular aspect of the bill, and devoted quite a number of hours to discussing it, and was of the opinion that this measure is somewhat different from the vetoed postal pay bill of last year, which contained a retroactive clause. In this case we are dealing not only with pay increases, but also with adjustments. I believe that, after all, sufficient equity is provided by the bill if passed as it now stands, and if it is made effective as of the date of its passage.

As the Senator from Oklahoma has already pointed out, in this case we are dealing with the salaries of those who occupy the top echelons, those who make the policies. They look to the White House for their benefits. The White House assumed that responsibility last year, but not in time. However, that was not our fault.

This year I again raised, before the committee, the point that no scientific analysis had been made of the relationship between some of these positions. Because of the failure to make such an analysis, much hard work had to be done by our very diligent and alert staff. We devoted hours and hours of consideration to the matter, and we judged each group in relation to the others, so that no inequity would be done to any individual or any group of individuals within the categories specified in the bill. All that has been done.

I am afraid that if now we deal with the feature the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has raised, and which we have fully discussed, much as I appreciate the noble motive of my friend, the Senator from Oregon, I am afraid we would be doing an impractical thing; and, rather than help, I am afraid it might jeopardize the chances of having the bill signed by the President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I rise to support the position of the committee in not including retroactive features in the bill.

I certainly hope the amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be rejected.

I think it would be an unsound practice to make the bill retroactive; I think there is no necessity for doing so. In my opinion, the Congress is being equitable and reasonably generous by means of the provisions of the bill as reported and as amended up to this time on the floor.

I certainly hope the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to make the provisions of the bill retroactive will be rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make another brief statement.

First, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the bill now before the Senate provides for any increases in the salary brackets, over and above those provided in the bill which was before the Senate on the last evening of the last day of the last session; and if there are in the pending bill any such increases in salaries, I wish to ask whether the committee voted for any of them because of the fact that they would be made at a time later than when they would have been made if the Congress had enacted the bill at the last session. In other words, in fixing the salaries which are provided by the pending bill, did the committee take into account the fact that the Senate did not act on the other bill at the last session?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No, we did not take that into consideration; that is my answer to the Senator's question. I cannot speak for every member of the committee; that point was not discussed with them.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on that point will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that if the bill of last year had been enacted, it would not have done as much equity as will be done by the pending bill, because the pending bill is a great improvement over last year's bill; and when many of the persons affected examine the pending bill, they will thank God that the Congress did not pass the other bill.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Oklahoma agree with that opinion?

Mr. MONRONEY. I do.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, agree with that opinion?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do. After the studies were made, some improvements have been made, and some of the jobs have been moved from one class to another.

Mr. MORSE. I believe there is no doubt—and I do not think any Member of the Senate can deny—that if I had not held the floor for several hours during the last night of the last session of Congress, so as to block passage of that bill, it would have been passed then, even though hearings had not been held on it.

Therefore, I find myself in this position: At that time I also said that I

would make a fight for retroactivity, after hearings had been held, because I thought the employees were entitled to retroactivity. At that time I said that I thought we should not attempt to pass such a bill when hearings had not been held on it.

Thereafter I received a good many calls from my friends in the Departments downtown. If any Senator on the other side of the aisle thinks I do not have many friends there, he is mistaken.

Many of my friends began to call me, thereafter. They asked, "What did you mean by blocking our pay increase? We are not responsible for the fact that the administration did not get the bill to Congress in time for hearings to be held. We think the bill is a good one."

I explained to them that I thought a very important procedural matter which should be protected was involved. I said to them, "I want you to know that I will fight for retroactivity for you, because I think you are entitled to it."

So I wish to point out that I am morally obligated to those persons to fight for retroactivity, because I am the one who prevented them from receiving this pay increase many, many months ago.

I do not draw the distinction that my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, draws between the high paid and the low paid persons on the Government payroll. After all, regardless of whether they are high paid or low paid—and many of them are not getting very much pay, let me say—they are entitled to fair pay for the service they render.

The committee has decided that the bill as reported by it provides for fair pay for the services rendered. If the bill which was before the Senate on the closing day of the last session of Congress provided for fair pay—I refer to the bill which did not reach the committee in time for hearings to be held—then this amendment should be agreed to. That is why I am pressing for adoption of the amendment.

Because of the confidence I have in him and the reliance I have placed on him from time to time, I should like to hear from the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I should like to know what his position on this matter is.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I had expected to take the floor to make a few observations on this subject.

We are getting into the same situation in which we were on the closing night of the first session of the 84th Congress. The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] had the floor at that time, and he courteously yielded to me. The history he has given to us this afternoon is exactly correct.

I should like to read for the record the statement which I made through the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon, who at that time said he would be glad to yield to me provided he did not lose the floor. I said, on August 3, 1955:

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon may yield to me for a few minutes, without losing his right to the floor.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon.

I sincerely hope that an executive pay bill can be approved at this session of Congress. Congress has voted increases in pay for Members of Congress. We have voted increases in pay for the legislative branch of the Government. We have voted increases totaling \$700 million for the salaried employees of the Government. Congress has voted increases of \$200 million for the postal employees of the Nation, and \$300 million for the classified workers of the Government.

Now we are asked in the closing hours of this session to vote \$1,500,000 for increases in pay for the executive branch of the Government. Frankly, I do not think it is fair to ask the executive branch of the Government to operate on their present basis.

I sincerely hope the distinguished Senator from Oregon will permit us to proceed at this time with the bill. I do not think there would be any difficulty in approving the proposed legislation, because the Senate might take the House bill, adopt it with some amendments, send it back to the House, and I am advised the House would accept it.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Georgia are absolutely correct when they say there were no hearings. The bill came to the Senate on July 15. It was not the fault of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or of the ranking minority member, or of any other member. Frankly, I wish the bill had come to the Senate before that date, but that is the situation.

The President sent a letter to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and asked for the proposed legislation. We have tried to comply with that request, and I sincerely hope the Congress will not adjourn without passing the bill. I thank the Senator for yielding.

And so, Mr. President, we now find ourselves in almost the exact situation with respect to time. I still feel very strongly that this Congress should have acted upon the legislation last July. But the fact remains that no action was taken and the inequities created cannot be cured nor alleviated through a reasonable retroactive clause. I sincerely urge the prompt passage of this legislation which is long overdue.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I may say jocularly that since my last comment a couple of my colleagues have been ribbing me a little as to whether or not I am making a plea for a little retroactive pay for my opponent in the forthcoming campaign. That does not make any difference. I think he has it coming to him; and after November I think he is going to need it.

I still think I am making a sound argument on the equities, and from the standpoint of justice to these employees. I was responsible for the fact that they did not get a bill on the last night of the previous session. I will do exactly the same thing again as I did that night, because I think the committee has demonstrated the soundness of my position by the fact that long hearings were required. Extensive hearings were required to draft an acceptable bill. That shows how right I was in insisting on hearings.

I shall ask for a vote on my amendment, because I feel that I am morally committed to do so. I think it is a sound and just amendment. I submit the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as I have previously stated, the final enactment of the bill will be endangered if this amendment is included.

In the second place, we shall be establishing a policy of retroactivity when we vote for retroactive pay for Cabinet members and top-salaried people. Such a policy would rise to plague us, and would cost the Government hundreds of millions of dollars in retroactive pay for those top-salaried employees. The only time retroactivity should ever be considered by the Senate is when our lowest paid employees have been discriminated against for many months because of a Presidential veto of legislation previously passed by the House and Senate.

Let us not do anything to set a pattern of retroactivity, or we shall be picking up 1 or 2 years' back salary.

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

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question on another subject.

It is reported to me that the Comptroller of the Currency, who is covered by this bill, receives not only his full salary, but a full pension by reason of a former Federal position held by him. I am advised that the committee was requested to look into this subject. If so, I should like to know, first, what it found, and, second, what it proposes to do to deal with the situation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. He does draw retirement pay. It is not from the Federal Government. It is from the Federal Reserve. It does not come from the Government.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator feel that it is sound and fair to provide him with that pension—that is what it is—and also the full salary provided in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We felt that the salary was for the position, and not necessarily for the man. He may leave the position tomorrow, or some other time. If the position did not carry the proper salary, special legislation would be required in the case of a new occupant of the position.

Mr. MORSE. When the Senator says the Comptroller of the Currency is receiving a pension from a retirement fund, does he mean that he is receiving it as the result of a former Federal position which he held?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was a position with the Federal Reserve Bank. The money does not come from the Government.

Mr. MORSE. It does not come from the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It does not come from the Treasury of the United States.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that while the expenses of the Federal Reserve Banks are deducted from their earnings, the major portion of the residue is turned over to the Federal Government? So in effect the pension paid to this man by the Federal Reserve System diminishes the amount of the residual sums which otherwise would be turned over to the Government; and therefore most of it, in effect, comes from diminished revenues of the Federal Government?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Illinois is entirely correct; but the retirement system would have to be changed if anything were to be done about the situation. We are not dealing with the retirement law at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Are there instances of employees covered by the bill who are collecting pensions or retirement income from Federal sources as a result of previously held Federal positions, and who are now collecting salaries from the Federal Government?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There may be a few. Military retirement pay, of course, is exempted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that a large number of retired generals have been appointed to administrative positions? Are they drawing their military retirement pensions as well as their salaries?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My recollection is that there are about 15 of them in that category at the present time. There are in the Government service at the present time about 15 former military officers who are drawing pensions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I saw a list the other day, and while I did not make a precise count, it seems to me that there were somewhere between 50 and 100 retired generals and admirals who had been appointed in the last 3 or 4 years to administrative positions or to commissions. It may be that not all of them are drawing retirement pay.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It will be necessary to exempt them from the law, I will tell the Senator, and to let them draw their pay, because Congress enacted that law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call this matter to the attention of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Rhode Island, and the Senator from Oklahoma, because if I understand the situation correctly—and it has been represented to me to be the fact—I am disturbed by what I consider to be an unfairness.

Let us consider the social-security system, and the case of an old man or an old woman who wishes to earn a little money, in addition to the small payment he or she gets from the social-security system, perhaps to the extent of \$40 or \$50 a month for cutting the lawn or the raking of leaves in a neighbor's yard. Under existing law, that amount of money must be deducted from the social-security payments. We have been fight-

ing for some time to try to make provision so that these old people, in addition to receiving the little pittance of social-security payments may earn and keep a few extra dollars over and above what they receive from the social-security system.

I understand from the Senator from Illinois—and he has confirmed what I previously understood—that there are in the Government employ a group of people, some of them retired generals or retired admirals, who apparently are in the employ of the Government and are receiving, in addition to their pay, retirement benefits from the Federal Government. Now we are about to increase their salaries substantially because they have been called back into Government service for some administrative work.

I cannot square the justice of our handling those two classes of employees, the one class that receives social-security payments, and the other the class of high-paid Government employees, who are allowed to collect their full salary and in addition collect their retirement pay. I should like to have an explanation of the equities involved in that kind of situation.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator, of course, does not make a good point. However, he must realize that we are dealing with the Federal Retirement Act and also with certain positions, not with individuals. If we had gone into every individual case, I will say to the Senator, we would not have a bill before the Senate today. However, I call the attention of the Senator to section 13 (b) at page 70 of the bill, which reads:

(b) If an annuitant under this act (other than (1) a disability annuitant whose annuity is terminated by reason of his recovery or restoration of earning capacity, or (2) a Member retired under this act) hereafter becomes employed in an appointive or elective position subject to this act, annuity payments shall be discontinued during such employment and deductions for the retirement fund shall be withheld from his salary.

And so forth. Therefore, we do take care of most of those people. There may be some individuals who are getting some retirement pay under another system.

We did not go into all of these phases, but they should be looked into thoroughly. If we had undertaken to go into all of them, the pending bill would not be on the floor today; we would not have an executive pay bill.

We could not look into every situation, because it would involve a tremendous study; but at some time in the future such a thorough study should be made, particularly with respect to the military people who are receiving retirement pay and are also drawing salaries in positions with the Government. Such a study should be undertaken. We did not go into it thoroughly, not because we were derelict in our duty but because it was not intimately related to the work we were concerned with in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we did not have this problem to this great extent until after the Second World War, when officers of

the military forces were turned loose, so to speak. They are now getting jobs with the Government, and in some positions they can draw their salary and also their retirement pay for their military service. I believe we should look into this matter very thoroughly and stop paying them both retirement pay and their salaries. I believe we all agree to that. Frankly, I believe we are employing too many military men in civilian positions in the Federal Government.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I agree with what the Senator from Oregon has said. When the social-security bill was under consideration a few days ago I offered an amendment to the public assistance feature of the bill, to permit people on public assistance to earn up to \$50 a month without having such money deducted from their old-age assistance payments.

I was deeply disappointed that the administration, through HEW, vigorously opposed my proposal. I only wish that they would be one-half so zealous in getting at the double payments to the high-paid administrators, who are retired military officers, as they were in opposing the proposal to allow a poor man or a poor woman on old-age assistance to keep \$50 of earned income.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say, in conclusion, that I thank the Senator from Illinois. As has been pointed out, it is a very important principle concerning which we ought to be consistent in the enactment of legislation. It would be a non sequitur for me to take the position that because a wrong was done somewhere else in connection with other legislation, we ought to perpetrate a similar wrong in the pending bill.

However, I believe it is important that the Senate be informed of this principle, and ought to be a little more careful in protecting the interests of the people who need the money most. When we are making the fight for the old people and for the disabled people trying to obtain some increases in their pension benefits, let us keep in mind an hour such as this when we proceeded to vote salary increases to Government officials and employees who are already in the high-paid brackets in the Government service.

I am in favor of the proposed increases in the pending bill, because in this instance we are going to get good return for the expenditure.

In view of the general pay scale we have adopted, including the congressional pay scale, the employees whose salaries will be increased by the bill are entitled to them.

I close by saying that we have a long way to go in Federal legislation before we do justice to those who are receiving social-security benefits and those who are disabled. Much has been said about the great job we were supposed to have done because we established a 50-year age limit for disability in the bill the Senate passed the other day.

In my judgment the fact that we establish any age limit at all is a shocking thing, because when a fellow citizen

under social security is disabled, he ought to get disability benefits immediately. If at age 38 he is disabled, and has a wife and three children, for example, he should not have to wait until he is 50 before he can get disability benefits. He ought to get them the next day, if social security is to carry out the social conscience on which it is supposedly premised.

That has no relation to the question of whether we should do justice on the pending bill. However, I wish to point out that we ought to be careful to apply the same standard of equity when we are dealing with those who are in the low-pay class that we apply when we are dealing, as we are today, to those in the high-pay class.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

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

The bill (H. R. 7619) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. JENNER conferees on the part of the Senate.

RENEWAL OF LICENSE TO USE CERTAIN LAND IN ST. MARYS FALLS CANAL PROJECT, MICHIGAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2693, House bill 8047.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8047) granting authority to the Secretary of the Army to renew the license of the Ira D. MacLachlan Post, No. 3, the American Legion, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to use a certain parcel of land in St. Marys Falls Canal project.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the bill has been cleared with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is correct, but I wish to make a brief statement concerning the bill, because it could become a very close question, so far as protecting the Federal interest is concerned. But I think it is adequately protected in the bill because of the equity.

What we are dealing with is a piece of Federal property on which a Federal building was located. It was leased in 1930 to an American Legion post. The American Legion post occupied the building. The building burned down, but, under the lease, the post had the obligation to replace the building. The original building was valued at \$7,000, and the building which the American Legion post built to replace the original building cost \$18,000. There is quite a difference in value.

This is a transaction which goes back to 1930. In 1930 it was the policy of the Federal Government to grant leases for this type of use without any rent being paid, but with a requirement on the part of the lessee to keep the buildings in repair and to replace them in case they were destroyed.

So, as I have studied the mathematics of the case, I would say that the Federal Government could not possibly lose if this bill were enacted into law, because of the great difference in the value of the building which the Legion has placed on the property and that of the original building. The Federal Government would still be ahead.

Mr. President, I make this statement so that no one can say in the future that MORSE let something get by that violated the Morse formula. I shall never do that. In this instance the Federal Government is the one which has the advantage.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the bill.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 8047) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 2691, Senate bill 3356.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3356) to direct the Secretary of the Navy or his designee to convey a 240 55/100-acre tract of land situated near the city of Grand Prairie in Dallas County, Tex., to the State of Texas.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is another one of the bills thoroughly in line with the policy we have followed, because the Federal interest is the advantage it obtains from the National Guard training which will result from the use of the property.

I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 7, line 9, after the word "now", to strike out "exist, including but not restricted to a public road easement here-

tofore granted along the west boundary of said airport and four additional tract easements for roadway purposes heretofore committed by the Secretary of the Navy and proposed to be granted in favor of Dallas County, Tex.," and insert "exist," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy or his designee is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Texas all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, together with all buildings, improvements thereon, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, in and to two hundred forty and fifty-five one-hundredths acres of land situated in Dallas County, Tex., out of the McKinney and Williams survey, abstract numbered 1045 and the Elizabeth Gray survey, abstract numbered 517, near the city of Grand Prairie, and having been acquired in fee simple by the United States of America by declaration of taking filed August 4, 1942, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Dallas Division, in the case of United States against 274.3 acres of land, Lou Foote, et al., civil numbered 699; and by declaration of taking filed October 20, 1943, in the aforesaid court in the case of the United States against 6.84 acres of land, Herman Waldman, et al., civil numbered 840, and said two hundred forty and fifty-five one-hundredths-acre tract of land being the major portion of the Grand Prairie Airport, formerly designated, outlying field numbered 26803, United States Naval Air Station, Dallas, Tex., being more particularly described as follows:

First tract: Beginning at the northeast corner of the W. C. May survey, abstract numbered 890, said corner being a Bois D'Arc fence corner post, being the upper L corner of the E. Gray survey, abstract numbered 517, and running thence north 89 degrees 26 minutes west along the south line of the said E. Gray survey, being also the north line of said W. C. May survey, 1,111.0 feet to a spike set in the centerline of a bridge over branch for southwest corner of the said E. Gray survey being also at the southeast corner of the Tapley Holland survey, abstract numbered 644, from which a 1½-inch iron pipe bears south 89 degrees 26 minutes east 20 feet; thence north 0 degree 22 minutes 30 seconds east along the centerline of a 40-foot road locally called Twelfth Street Road at 2,123 feet, a jog in said road right-of-way increasing its width to 60 feet, at 2,529.1 feet a stake set for the northwest corner of the E. Gray survey and the southwest corner of the McKinney and Williams survey, abstract numbered 1045, continuing on said course and with the centerline of Twelfth Street and along the west line of said McKinney and Williams survey to a total distance of 4,113.95 feet to a ¾-inch iron pipe set in the centerline of said Twelfth Street on the south line of Jefferson Avenue, from which a cedar fence corner post bears north 81 degrees 39 minutes 30 seconds east 30.2 feet; thence north 81 degrees 39 minutes 30 seconds east along the south line of Jefferson Avenue 1,936.48 feet to a point of circular curve; thence on a curve to the left having a radius of 2,864.93 feet through a central angle of 17 degrees 02 minutes a distance of 851.66 feet to ¾-inch iron pipe, being the northwest corner of Indian Hills addition to the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, as recorded in the Dallas County records; thence south along the west line of said Indian Hills addition 2,117.6 feet to a ¾-inch iron pipe at the southwest corner of said addition in the south line of the McKinney and Williams survey, being also the north line of the E. Gray survey; thence north 89 degrees 34 minutes west along the north line of said E. Gray survey, 63.13 feet to a 1½-inch iron pipe; thence south 0 degree 33 minutes 30 seconds

west along the Old Turn Row 2,683 feet to a 3-inch cedar stake set in the east and west fence on the south line of the E. Gray survey; thence north 89 degrees 34 minutes 30 seconds west along the said south line of the E. Gray survey, 1,557.3 feet to a Bois D'Arc fence corner post of the lower L corner of said E. Gray survey; and thence north 0 degree 02 minutes west along the east line of the W. C. May survey and with old fence lines 138.4 feet to the place of beginning and containing 273.64 acres of land, of which 159.83 acres are located in the E. Gray survey and 113.81 acres are located in the McKinney and Williams survey, except that portion of land containing 40.3 acres and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the northwest corner of the Indian Hills addition (abstract 1045) to the city of Grand Prairie, Texas, as recorded in volume 7, page 368, of the plat records of Dallas County, Texas; said corner being in the south right-of-way line of Jefferson Avenue, and being the northwest corner of lot 1, block A of said Indian Hills addition; thence in a southwesterly direction along the south right-of-way line of Jefferson Avenue, and along a circular curve to the right having a central angle of 17 degrees and 2 minutes and a radius of 2,864.93 feet a distance of 851.66 feet to the point of tangency for said curve; thence south 81 degrees 39 minutes 30 seconds west 721.14 feet to a ¾-inch iron pipe for corner; said corner being in the south right-of-way line of Jefferson Avenue; thence south 08 degrees 20 minutes 30 seconds east 330.0 feet to a point for corner; thence in a southeasterly direction 2016.45 feet to a 1½-inch iron pipe for corner; said corner being the northwest corner of the Indian Hills Park addition (abstract 517) to the city of Grand Prairie, Tex., as recorded in volume 17, page 365, of the plat records of Dallas County, Tex.; and the northwest corner of lot 17, block 9, of said Indian Hills Park addition; thence south 89 degrees 34 minutes east along the north line of lot 17, block 9, of said Indian Hills Park addition 63.13 feet to the southwest corner of the Indian Hills addition (abstract 1045), said point being the southwest corner of lot 22, block U, of the said Indian Hills addition; and thence north along the west line of said Indian Hills addition (abstract 1045) 2,117.6 feet to the point of beginning.

Second tract: All that land lying and being in Dallas County, Tex., and embracing all of blocks Y, 86, 87 and 88 of Dalworth Park and roadways and alleyways within and adjacent thereto, as filed for record in volume 1, pages 546 and 547 of the plat records of Dallas County, Tex., and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the southeast corner of block 87 of Dalworth Park, said point being designated on the ground by a one inch iron pipe, from whence a one-half inch pipe bears south 0 degree 22 minutes 30 second west 60 feet; thence north 89 degrees 37 minutes 30 seconds west along the north line of Galveston Street 600 feet to the southwest corner of block 88 of Dalworth Park; said point being designated on the ground by one inch iron pipe from whence a three-fourth inch iron rod bears south 0 degree 22 minutes 30 seconds west 60 feet; thence north 0 degree 22 minutes 30 seconds east along the east line of Fourteenth Street 424 feet to the northwest corner of block Y of Dalworth Park, said point being designated on the ground by a one inch iron pipe; thence north 81 degrees 28 minutes 30 seconds east along the south line of Jefferson Avenue and being also the north line of blocks Y and 86 of Dalworth Park, 668.04 feet to a point in the west line of the 273.8 acre tract of land acquired by the United States Navy from Lou Foote, et ux., by declaration of taking August 4, 1942; thence south 0 degree 22 minutes 30 seconds west along the west line of the present Grand

Prairie Field (Lou Foote tract) 527.36 feet to a point for a corner; thence north 89 degrees 37 minutes 30 seconds west along the extension of the north line of Galveston Street 60 feet to the place of beginning, containing 7.21 acres, more or less.

Sec. 2. The conveyance of the above-described two hundred forty and fifty-five one-hundredths acre tract of land shall be subject to all outstanding easements and rights-of-way for public roads and highways, railroads, water lines, sewer lines, telephone and telegraph lines, power lines, and such other utilities which now exist.

Sec. 3. All mineral rights, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

Sec. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and the Air National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Texas shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made by the State of Texas during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

Sec. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the State of Texas from leasing or otherwise permitting to the Civil Air Patrol (CAP), an auxiliary of the United States Air Force, the use of a portion of said premises conveyed to the State.

Sec. 6. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Texas, for the duration of such state of war or such emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or such emergency plus 6 months such property shall revert to the State of Texas, together with all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto.

Sec. 7. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Navy or his designee shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of this act.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LAND BETWEEN THE CITY OF EL PASO, TEX., AND THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 2692, House bill 5519.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5519) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain tracts of land in El Paso County, Tex., to the city of El Paso, Tex., in exchange for certain lands to be conveyed by the city of El Paso, Tex., to the United States Government.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is a bill which involves the transfer of property. In my opinion, the Federal Government is really making a good bargain not only because the properties exchanged are of equal value, but because the airport which will result will be of great advantage to the Federal Government in terms of national security. The airport will receive military planes which will use the airport when they need to use it. Judging from the accidents which are occurring lately, because of the lack of adequate maintenance, we should have more airports at which planes can land in an emergency.

Mr. President, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5519) was considered, ordering to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 2694, House bill 9081.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9081) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey 3 acres of land to the State of Texas.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is another National Guard transfer which I think completely complies with the Morse formula, and I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CITY OF ELKINS, W. VA.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2182) for the relief of the city of Elkins, W. Va. 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 pp. 13723-13724, 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. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the bill passed the Senate and the House amended it. In conference the House withdrew its objection to the Senate bill and agreed to the Senate measure. The conference report has been approved in the House, and we are approving what we have already done for the relief of the city of Elkins, W. Va.

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

The report was agreed to.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 2619, House bill 12130.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement, providing for 1 hour on amendments and 6 hours on the bill. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] may offer his amendment to the pending bill notwithstanding the fact that the committee amendments have not been acted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 14, it is proposed to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has 30 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 5 minutes.

First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] may be associated with me in offering the amendment.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the amendment seeks to raise the amount in the United Nations Technical Assistance Fund from \$10 million, as allowed by the Appropriations Committee, to \$15,500,000, as requested by the administration and authorized by both the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This is the same amount as was appropriated for contributions for the U. N. calendar year 1956. There was no controversy regarding the U. N. technical assistance program in either the authorized committee reports, discussions, or the floor debate. Both the authorizing committee reports strongly supported the program.

The proposed U. N. calendar year 1957 contributions to the central UNTA fund, as in 1956, is 50 percent of the total contributions. If contributions of host countries to local projects are counted, the United States contribution is 16 percent of the calendar year 1957 program. The United States percentage of the central fund used to be 60 percent in 1950, and has dropped during the years to 50 percent. The current program employs 1,360 experts in 92 countries. Since the beginning of the program, more than 5,000 experts from 77 countries have worked in the program.

It is my understanding, on the basis of some research, that four citizens of the Soviet Union are working in the United Nations Technical Assistance Program. I might add this is the first program in which the Soviet Union itself has made any contribution of any significance.

So I hope the Senate in its wisdom would see fit to agree to the restoration of the fund, which was approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and about which there was no objection at the time the mutual security bill was being considered on the floor.

Mr. President, I shall withhold the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the sake of the record, I think it should be pointed out why the Appropriations Committee did not restore the \$5 million which had been requested by the administration. It certainly was not because the Appropriations Committee is opposed to technical assistance, because, as the distinguished Senator from Montana knows, in the mutual-aid bill for our own technical assistance, the so-called point 4 program, there are substantial sums provided, and we have, over a period of years, in our bilateral agreements, provided for technical assistance. It is not because there is opposition to technical assistance for the United Nations fund; and it is certainly not because of such a sum as \$5 million in the bill approximating \$4 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall protect the Senator if he runs out of time, by yielding him time.

The basic reason is that the Senate of the United States, on occasion after occasion, has established the policy that we believe the agencies of the United Nations should not be calling upon the United States to provide more than 33 1/3 percent of the cost of these activities.

Even the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and other Senators who have been staunch supporters of the United Nations, and who have been supporters of the various activities of that organization, have felt that we should be directing the attention and the efforts of the executive branch of the Government toward bringing the contributions by the United States down to the 33 1/3-percent level.

So I think that, for the record at least, and for our associates both in that organization and abroad, and for the people of the United States, it should be realized that we are merely trying to have the Appropriations Committee bring the item in conformity with what had been demonstrated to be the policy and the sentiment of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I want to support wholeheartedly what the distinguished minority leader has said, because every statement he has uttered is based on fact. It has been the thesis in Congress that, so far as the U. N. and its affiliated and its subsidiary organizations are concerned, the United States contribution should get down to the one-third limitation as quickly as possible. It just happened that on yesterday the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, was asked by the press about his position so far as the restoration of funds was concerned. As I recall the transcript of testimony, as it appeared in the New York Times, he expressed the hope that the Senate would restore the fund to \$15.5 million, an increase of \$5.5 million over the Appropriations Committee figure; and he also said that we should work toward what the distinguished minority leader has brought out—a gradual decline in the amount appropriated by the Government to the United Nations technical-assistance program, and other programs, to the extent of 33 1/3 percent. I would hope that the distinguished minority leader, with his great influence, would see fit to use it to help increase to \$15,500,000 the amount provided by us this year for the technical-assistance program. And I hope that action will be taken, as a result of representations already made in the Appropriations Committee and as a result of the vigorous representations which all of us hope will be made this year in the General Assembly of the United Nations, where the distinguished minority leader will, along with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], represent this country. Mr. President, I think that when two men of such outstanding caliber are connected, are joined, in this matter as delegates to the U. N., much can be done to achieve the objective which all of us

desire to have achieved. So I sincerely hope that the distinguished Senator from California, with his great influence, will do what he can this year to give this proposal a chance.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield to me, I shall yield myself 5 minutes from the time available to our side, so the time I use will not be taken out of the time available to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that this matter should be thoroughly understood.

In the first place, the United States has carried very heavy burdens since the close of World War II. As the distinguished Senator from Montana is well aware, by means of various forms of mutual aid, we have provided—and it has been in the interest of our own country, as well as in the interest of the countries we have been trying to help—an estimated \$50 billion or more. The pending bill calls for approximately \$4 billion. In large part, this has been made necessary by the fact that we have attempted to build in the world a system of collective security. We have attempted to rehabilitate the war-torn world, and we have made very great contributions.

We are one of the 70 member nations of the United Nations. In view of the fact that 95 percent of the burden of the Korean war, in terms of resources support, was provided by the United States; and in view of the further fact that of the United Nations members who supplied armed forces during the Korean war, the United States supplied 90 percent of the manpower; and in view of the further fact that we have carried very heavy burdens, it seems to me that in this one field of technical assistance the other 69 member nations of the United Nations should be able to contribute sufficient funds so that the United States, in turn, in conformity with the policy established by the Congress, might keep its contribution to this agency at the 33 1/3-percent level, which under all the circumstances it seems to me the other nations should not expect us to exceed. As a matter of fact, I think that in the course of years we should even be able to reduce our contribution below 33 1/3 percent; and I think that opinion has been expressed by other Members of this body.

But for the present, it seems to me to be a reasonable objective not to have the United States contribute, in connection with subordinate agencies of the United Nations, 50 percent of the cost of the total program. I do not think we should expect the United States to contribute 50 percent of the total.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is little fault that I can find with what the distinguished Senator from California has said, although I do not agree with him entirely.

I should like to point out that we should consider the United Nations tech-

nical assistance program in a somewhat different light from the programs of the other subsidiary organizations of the United Nations.

As I understand, in 1950, the United States contribution, percentage-wise, to the United Nations technical assistance program was 60 percent. Since that time it has dropped to 50 percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In how many years?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In 6 years it has dropped to 50 percent.

If local contributions are considered, the United States percentage would be approximately 16 percent. I believe that the contribution of 50 percent—without taking into account local contributions—by the United States is justified, because the program supplements the United States bilateral programs having the same objectives. However, we should keep in mind that in the case of this particular subsidiary organization, if we consider what the host governments contribute, then we find that the United States contribution, instead of being 50 percent, amounts, I repeat, to approximately 16 percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in what the Senator from Montana has said, so far as he has gone, of course he is quite correct. However, I think there is an additional factor which both the Senate and the country should understand, namely, that United States dollars are convertible everywhere in the world, whereas in many cases the contributions made by the other nations, which are "picking up part of the check," are not convertible—even though, as in the case of the Soviet Union, many such countries are reputed to have large stocks of gold. So, Mr. President, in the case of the Iron Curtain countries their contributions can be spent only within the Iron Curtain. In the case of the technical assistance they render—for instance, the training of technicians—instead of having them trained where they can best be trained, there exists a pressure or leverage to have them sent into the Soviet Union for training, and there they can be indoctrinated by the Soviets. That situation exists because the Soviet Union will not allow such currencies to be convertible, whereas in the case of the coin of the realm which can be expended anywhere in the world, there are very few nations which are making a contribution comparable to that being made by the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I cannot disagree with the Senator from California. What he has said only proves that both of us are correct.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SENATOR KNOWLAND TO ACCEPT THE AWARD OF THE CROSS OF GRAND COMMANDER, ROYAL ORDER OF THE PHOENIX

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement which has been en-

tered into, I may now introduce a bill and request its immediate consideration.

Will the Senator from California yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill which I send to the desk; and I wish to request its immediate consideration, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement presently in effect.

Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senator from California, whom I have not consulted about this matter—although I always consult him about matters of this kind—let me say that my request is not made for the purpose of immobilizing him; but I must leave the Chamber, and I wish to have action taken on this bill very promptly, just as we have taken very prompt action on other measures of a similar nature.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 4255) to authorize the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, United States Senator from the State of California, to accept and wear the award of the Cross of Grand Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix, tendered by the government of the Kingdom of Greece, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, United States Senator from the State of California, is authorized to accept the award of the Cross of Grand Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix, together with any decorations and documents evidencing such award. The Department of State is authorized to deliver to the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND any such decorations and documents evidencing such award.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding section 2 of the act of January 31, 1881 (ch. 32, 21 Stat. 604; 5 U. S. C. 114), or other provision of law to the contrary, the named recipient may wear and display the aforementioned decoration after acceptance thereof.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed by the authorities of the State Department that this is the usual measure in a situation of this kind.

Earlier in the year the Senate passed a very similar measure in the case of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. RAYBURN, of Texas.

I am told that the bill is drawn in accordance with the precedents in like matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 4256) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been passed; and the Senator from California may wear about his neck the Cross of the Grand Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix—which, like the proverbial bird, will enable him to rise from the ashes. [Laughter.] The Chair prays that it may not be an albino cross.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of an amendment which I am cosponsoring along with my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. This amendment is to increase the amount of the appropriation to the United Nations technical aid program to \$15,500,000.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, that the amount we are asking the Senate to appropriate is the amount that was authorized by Congress. It is the amount the administration requested. It is the amount that both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported. Again, it is the amount that both Houses of Congress authorized a few short weeks ago.

The amount may seem small to some of us, after voting billions of dollars for some programs. But the effect of this cut is enormous. The decrease of \$5,500,000 is one-third of the total authorization. It means a 20 percent cut in the whole program. Since the money contributed by the United States is matched by the other participating nations, the loss to the program is doubled. This means that the loss in operating funds to the program will be \$11 million.

I am aware, Mr. President, that the basis on which this cut was made was the so-called principle that the United States will not contribute more than one-third to any United Nations' program. The \$10 million recommended by the Appropriations Committee does in fact represent that fraction of the total United Nations budget for this purpose.

But, Mr. President, should we gouge out our eyes with this rule of thumb? Should we cripple a vital program which is so very much in our own interests in order to give emphasis to a statistical ratio? Shall we let a rule be our master, or shall we be the master of the rule?

I think it is a good idea for the United States to insist on greater contributions by other countries to United Nations programs. But we are not dealing with a theory, but with a fact. This coming year's technical aid program is already budgeted. Our Government committed us to contribute \$15,500,000 to the technical aid program. This was done, as I understand, when the United Nations budget was made up some months ago. Our Government, of course, makes its commitments subject to the action of Congress in appropriating the necessary funds. Nevertheless there is a moral obligation on our part to support our Government's commitments. There is no program that, costing so little, means so much in the eyes of the world as this particular program—and no commitment which in the eyes of the world is a

more significant one than the commitment to contribute to the United Nations technical aid program.

If we cut this figure by \$5,500,000 we shall be cutting one-third out of our contribution and one-fifth out of the whole program. It will cripple the program. It will expose us to great criticism in the chancelleries of free nations and it will furnish grist to the Soviet propaganda mill. Above all, it will slow down a very vital program which is helping to build conditions of peace and stability in the world.

Mr. President, the United Nations organization was in the beginning an American idea. It is today an American ideal. The \$5 million that we propose to save by cutting back on our Government's commitment to the United Nations will, I believe, be the most costly \$5 million we ever saved. It will be at the expense of our professed devotion to the United Nations. Our fine words of brief in the U. N. will be measured against our act of parsimony in crippling this vital U. N. program.

Some of my colleagues may want to know why we have to give funds to the United Nations when we have our own technical aid program. The report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee answers that question. It says that the two programs supplement, rather than duplicate, each other.

For my friends on the other side of the aisle who may not wish to take the word of the committee report, I only have to point to the hearings. There the representative of the administration's State Department told how important the U. N. program was to the United States. Before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Mr. Francis Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State, said that "every effort has been made to avoid any duplication or overlapping." The two programs are very carefully coordinated in the field and in the headquarters at New York.

Among the advantages of the U. N. program to the United States is that some nations do not want to accept bilateral aid but are willing to take advice and assistance from the United Nations. Because of that, the U. N. can often bring about results which are in the United States' national interest but which the United States cannot bring about alone. Also, our participation in the multilateral U. N. program has important political advantages to the United States. It shows the world that we are willing to work together with other nations to improve the standard of living in the underdeveloped nations.

Mr. President, I have received many communications from citizens and organizations in my State in favor of the pending amendment. I have heard from high-ranking officials in the State Department. This is not a partisan matter, of course. I am here appealing for support of the administration's position on this matter.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes of the Senator from New York have expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I would like to see us contribute more rather than less to the United Nations technical aid program. I think it might be an excellent idea for us to give greater emphasis to the UN technical aid program and perhaps somewhat less to our bilateral technical aid program. But that question is not before us. The question here is merely the maintenance of the present program at its presently scheduled level.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge all my colleagues to support the pending amendment to the mutual security appropriations bill. For the good of the Nation's foreign policy, I ask Senators to give the U. N. technical aid program the full authorization of \$15,500,000. This may be the cheapest bit of good will we have purchased all session.

Mr. President, yesterday the New York Times printed an editorial which strongly urged the restoration of this cut. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

FOREIGN AID'S STEPCHILD

When the clock ticks off adjournment for this election-year session of Congress there may be time for sober afterthoughts about the erratic handling of appropriations for the United Nations technical assistance program over the last 3 years. The pattern is one which would induce nervous prostration in any businessman devoted to sound principles of operation and planning. Unfortunately, what is affected in this instance is the day-to-day lives of millions of the world's ill-nourished, ill-clothed and poorly sheltered.

In 1954 the administration's request for funds for the program was obliterated. Months passed and a new Congress met before public disapproval and official embarrassment brought remedial action. Meanwhile, cutbacks made imperative on operations already in progress entailed dismissals of personnel, abandonment of urgently necessary plans and indefinite delays on commitments made to governments.

Last year false hopes burgeoned that a new era of steadfast support was at hand. Congress approved without incident the figure of \$24,000,000 stipulated by the administration—for a period of 18 months. It included \$15,500,000 for the 1956 calendar year.

The woefully inadequate program seemed at last to be picking up momentum, inspiring dreams of the possibility of long-term planning. Of 76 participating governments, 32 increased their 1956 pledges over 1955, and 6 others pledged for the first time. The budget reached an all-time high of \$28,940,563.

This past week, as the deadline for action neared, these happy prospects appeared to be shattered. House and Senate concurred in cutting to \$10,000,000 the \$15,500,000 request submitted. Since other nations normally merely match United States contributions, the loss to the program will actually be \$11,000,000.

Whether the cut stands or is restored by last-minute adoption of the Mansfield amendment offered on Monday, the psychological impact will remain. So will the fact that legislative capriciousness makes an unsteady platform from which to preach international good will.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when this question was before the Appropriations Committee, and when the bill was before us for markup, there was actually no formal action by way of a rollcall on this proposal. I am quite sure that, along with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I reserved the right to take individual action with respect to this item, because I was very much interested in it.

The program was established through the leadership of this country back in 1950. I think its accomplishments have been rather impressive.

At one time or another some 5,000 technical experts have been provided, from at least 77 countries. As I recall, there are at present 1,360 technicians on the multilateral program. Ten thousand fellowships for study abroad have been awarded. Of course, that is in the interest of good public relations and good foreign relations.

I wish to emphasize what the distinguished Senator from Montana has said. To be sure, at one time we did contribute 60 percent of the amount pledged. Our contribution had dropped to 50 percent, and I utter the hope now that we can bring it in line with the formula we sought to work out in the Appropriations Committee several years ago.

If we reduce it summarily at this time, there will be some dismay in foreign quarters. There will be some misunderstanding, and certainly we shall weaken the negotiatory powers and the negotiating hands of our people in the subsidiary organizations meeting in Geneva at the present time. If this cut is permitted to stand, it will be equivalent to taking 550 experts off the rolls for a year. It would be equal to the entire amount which has been budgeted for the Middle East. The amount involved here is nearly 70 percent of the entire amount which has been allocated to the Food and Agricultural Organization.

The projects which have been carried on under this program are rather technical in nature; and it is my information that at least 80 percent of the projects are in that category. The net result will be that we shall diminish, in some degree, these technical projects, but along with that, we shall probably chop off every new project which may be underway.

At the outset, some years ago, I was not too happy about this program, but after getting around the world a few times I discovered some circumstances and conditions which brought me into line. I find that there are sensitive countries which are a little alarmed about taking aid directly from the United States technical program. The reason is this: They are within the orbit or the periphery of the Soviet Union. In some cases they have a common border with Red China. So they are afraid to accept aid from us directly, but they would accept it from the United Nations, because the Soviet Union is a component member, and it has been making contributions, even though they have been small.

It is because of the countries which must be sensitive about their integrity and well-being, and which must be

thinking constantly about their self-defense, that the aid in this category must be multilateral. Those countries cannot easily accept aid on a bilateral basis. I should be reluctant, indeed, to see those countries cut off, when there is an opportunity to keep them in the orbit of the free world, and particularly in the orbit of the United States.

If this reduction stands, it will be a propaganda weapon, I am sure, in the hands of the Soviet Union. If it must be related over at Geneva that the Congress of the United States has, by its final action, reduced this appropriation by \$5,500,000, I do not quite know in what persuasive light our own delegates and representatives can present the situation to the entourage which has been assembled from all parts of the world. There will be some explaining to do, of course.

Coming in the middle of these programs, such a cut would not put our country in too good a light. If the amount involved were of astronomical proportions, the situation might be different, but today we are dealing with \$5,500,000. That was the original request. That was the authorization carried in the bill which had the approval of both the House and Senate.

To be sure, an authorization does not mean that the Congress must appropriate up to the authorization. However, because of the peculiar circumstances in this particular kind of operation, I believe that the cut should be restored. I hope that the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] will receive the approbation of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to speak on this amendment because I have had some experience with the subject, having been a delegate to the United Nations Assembly from the United States 2 years ago.

I agree with everything the Senator from California has said about the strenuous efforts which should be made to reduce our percentage participation in the various United Nations programs to one-third. Strenuous efforts were being made in that direction when I was a delegate. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] will be our two representatives during the coming year. They will have the same problem before them.

Mr. President we have two kinds of technical assistance programs. We have the bilateral program, which is costing us in the neighborhood of \$140 million a year. We also have the multilateral program, which we instigated because we felt the program would be sounder if we could so operate it that all the nations in the United Nations could participate in helping underdeveloped countries.

Mr. President, I have made quite a thorough study of the subject of economic and technical assistance and I believe it is one of the most important parts of our foreign policy. It is vitally important that all of us gain an understanding of the underdeveloped nations

and of their aspirations for freedom, independence, and self-determination.

It has been and continues to be my opinion that we should continue to move toward the one-third participation, but that it would be too fast to do it all at once. At the beginning our contribution was about 60 percent. We have moved our contribution down to around 50 percent. In other words, we are moving toward our objective.

With new nations having been admitted last year, and as more nations come in, there will be more than ever a chance for increased participation by other nations and in that way our percentage contribution will be reduced.

I have made a study also of what the percentage actually would be, if we considered what the recipient countries are contributing themselves. I find that if we considered their participation in their own welfare, and considered all the contributions made to this U. N. program our share would be somewhere around 17 percent. It would be as low as that.

The same problem came up with the children's fund, where the contributing countries, whom we are trying to get to contribute to the fund, came in and participated, and in that way made our percentage very much less.

Therefore I feel that in cases like this we are justified in going slowly in arriving at the 33 1/3 percent, which we all desire. In this instance, when we are concerned with only \$5,500,000, it seems to me, in light of the shock that this proposed cut would cause in the other nations who are participating with us, that it will not pay for us to cut this amount so drastically, particularly from a psychological standpoint.

If the United States is to continue to develop a program designed to assist the underdeveloped countries toward a better standard of living and toward fulfillment of their aspirations, we cannot afford, in any way, to recede from our wholehearted support and backing of this United Nations technical assistance program.

Any failure by the United States to encourage and embrace the potentialities of this program will be most disillusioning and discouraging to the peoples of the world, who have so enthusiastically embraced it.

I am told by our representatives at the UN, that these countries are already very much discouraged, not because of the amount involved, but because of the fact that we seem to be receding from the enthusiastic support we have given to the multilateral approach.

Let me add this further word. The way for us to contribute less and less of the total is for us to get more and more nations into this operation. The multilateral approach is making it more and more important for all the nations of the world to work together on these matters, and in that way get away from the idea that Uncle Sam is doing all of it. I believe it is very important that we restore the amount, and I support wholeheartedly the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I fully share the sentiments expressed by the able Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. He has made a very splendid statement, with which I should like to be associated. I realize that our contribution has been a higher percentage of the whole than we would like to have it. However, we have made progress in reducing that percentage, and I have every reason to believe that we will make even greater progress in that direction in the weeks ahead.

I think that this is very important work. The money is a very small amount, but I hope that the Senate will go along with the amendment of the Senator from Montana, so ably supported by one of the ranking members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the majority leader for his kind words.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have listened very attentively to the statements of my colleagues in urging the Senate to appropriate more money for this item. In years past I have been one of those who have supported the item of technical assistance. I have supported it in the past, and I support it again this year.

However, I point out that we have been engaged in trying to bring the United States contribution to U. N. activities down to 33 1/3 percent. It seems to me that when we contribute 33 1/3 percent, we are certainly contributing our bit to a mutual project to which most of the nations belong.

That has nothing to do with whether we approve the project. Of course we are in favor of it. We have been in it for some time. It is accomplishing results.

However, each time when anything like this happens, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], knows, we hear it said, "Well, let us bring the contribution down to 33 1/3 percent on the other items, but let us exempt this one."

At other times the argument is made—and this is an even more frequent one; I have heard it made time and time again—"Let the item go through as it is this year, in the hope that next year we may be able to bring it down to the lower figure." Those are the two lines of argument which are put forward every time an attempt is made to cut the amount.

I grant that those who are favorable to this item are very sincere, and I grant that the work that is done is worth while. I have supported it in the past, and I shall continue to support it. However, we are confronted with the question of whether we will exempt this item and apply a reduction to other items, and then express the wishful hope that it will be reduced next year.

It has been said that the amount has been reduced from 60 to 50 percent. That is very slow progress, Mr. President. That is a reduction of 10 percent in 6 years.

I believe we should let the amount stand as provided by the House. That is a fair amount.

Let us see what Russia contributes. The U. S. S. R. contributes 3.7 percent against a 50-percent contribution by the United States.

Let us see what Great Britain contributes. She contributes 8.3 percent.

Let us see what some of the other nations contribute. Red Poland contributes not 1 percent, but six one-hundredths of 1 percent.

What about Bulgaria? She contributes five one-hundredths of 1 percent.

Let us see what some of the other countries contribute. Some of them contribute one-hundredth of 1 percent. I am not going to pursue this argument any further. Apparently the Senate is drifting in one direction. However, I will say very frankly that we must make a stand somewhere. I hope the Senate will retain the House figure, and that we will not indulge in the wishful and hopeful thinking that a reduction will be made during the next 12 months. On that basis, if we have been able to reduce the amount by only 10 percent in 6 years, the reduction next year will be so small that it will take the next quarter of a century to get our contribution down to 33½ percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The Chair regrets to inform the Senator from New Hampshire that his time has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The only thing I wish to say further is that we must consider our fiscal problems. In committee we have weighed the matter, and I believe the committee recommendation should be backed up. If we make an exception in this case, we might well make it in other cases also. The adoption of this amendment will certainly open the door.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the arguments on this very needed and well-deserved appropriation have been made rather conclusively. I believe we ought to keep in mind one very critical situation in our foreign policy. The Soviet Union has shifted to an economic penetration of the world with its experts and technicians and scientists and by means of cultural exchanges. Their efforts are backed up, of course, by powerful military forces.

We in the United States have attempted to build a strong defense system, through mutual assistance and through our military defenses. We have also created a splendid program of technical and scientific assistance throughout the world. It is a program which is rather indigenous to our way of life. The county agent and the home demonstrator and other men like that are a part of our American way of life and familiar to all of us. Their work has been extended throughout the world by the

point 4 program, in which the United States is cooperating with the recipient nations.

As was pointed out earlier, the technical assistance program was authored by the United States, and sponsored by the United States, and inspired by our leadership.

Last year we contributed to this program \$15½ million. Of course, Mr. President, I recognize the logic of the argument made by the minority leader a while ago, that this is a contribution which is disproportionate as compared with that of other nations, and that we should get it reasonably balanced, at say 33 or 35 percent. But every project which would be stopped by this cut in the appropriation would be a project planned by some country in the backward and underprivileged areas of the world, where the aid is most urgently needed. Some of those countries are on the border of the Soviet, and the Soviet is constantly trying to move in with its economic penetration.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will take the time out of that remaining to my side.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is making a very fine argument on the merits of technical assistance. I do not differ with him on that question at all. I think it is a good program, and I should like to see it expanded, but I should like to see all the member nations of the United Nations carry a little more of the burden. However, considering the fact that we have before us a bill which provides for an appropriation of \$4 billion, primarily devoted to helping other nations defend themselves or to rehabilitate themselves economically, or to help with technical assistance on a bilateral basis, and a very large part of our national defense is in helping to defend the free world, would it seem unreasonable to the Senator from Minnesota that the other 69 member nations of the United Nations might be called upon to increase their contributions to make up this large sum? I do not think we differ as to the merits of the work, but we have had testimony that the economic recovery of Europe has been such that it is in a better condition than it was prior to World War II. So, with the heavy burdens we carried in Korea and the heavy burdens we are carrying now is it asking too much that, among them, they dig up this money?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I think there is much merit in the Senator's argument, but I wish to say, with equal candor, that at this particular time, when the program of technical assistance has been already completed and the projects are outlined for next year, this cut should not be made at this time. The appropriation for mutual security contains \$3 billion for military assistance, at the very time that we hear from the Pentagon, the White House, and the State Department that there may be some rather drastic cuts in our manpower, and possibly some changes in terms of our command in the Pacific, and some reductions in our commitments

to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if the Senator feels that there is a psychological value in showing that this country is not picking this particular item for a cut. Speaking for myself alone, I would be prepared to vote for an amendment restoring \$5,500,000 to the technical assistance fund, with the proviso that of that amount the contribution by the United States would not be more than 33½ percent. That would provide encouragement; there would be no cut in the dollar amount, but it would be noted that Congress was reaffirming its prior statement, which I think is reasonable. It would show that we are not being pennywise and pound foolish, but that we expect that our contribution will not exceed 33½ percent. It might give a little incentive for the other nations to make up the difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that when we take into consideration the efforts of other nations, the participation of the United States is actually cut to 19 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. To about 16 percent, as the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] pointed out.

Nothing would please me more than to see an expansion of the technical-assistance program. Every time the Soviet Union makes one of its grandstand plays we should call her bluff.

I know what the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is going to say. He will say that for every dollar they put up we put up \$5 or \$6.

Mr. BRIDGES. More than that, I think.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I do not care to emulate the Soviet Union. I want to see our own American standards maintained.

I would say, in conclusion, that the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund has done more good in terms of building a solid basis of a stable society than has almost any other program I can think of. We are talking about winning the great struggle against world communism. World communism in many areas is being fought by employing means to eradicate poverty and disease, to improve technical knowledge, and improve economic conditions.

I think it can be fairly said that never did so much come from so little as has come from this program. Never did so many countries benefit from such a small fund. More than 31 territories and countries have had the benefits of the program. There have been benefits in improved standards of living and improved economic conditions. I think it is more important that those things happen than that we receive credit for them. We should try to persuade other nations to step up their contributions. We should ask them to do better.

I trust that my friend from New Hampshire is not encouraging the Soviet to contribute more. I like it better the way it is, where the vast majority of technicians are Americans and the emphasis is on our own foreign policy.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I listened to the amendment suggested by the Senator from California. It is my understanding that the United Nations program is made up on a calendar year basis. What I would suggest would be to go along with the Senator 100 percent, if he would modify his amendment to provide that in making up the 1957 program the United States share shall not be more than one-third. That would give the United Nations time in which to prepare their 1957 program, and would not handicap the activities which are now in progress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to modify my suggested amendment, because in the memorandum of amendments which the Committee on Appropriations prepared, on page 40 there is this statement:

That the calendar year 1957 program will not be approved until late in 1956. It is estimated that the justification of the 1957 program should be similar to that shown in 1956.

So what I would propose would be an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in which he raises the amount to \$15,500,000. I would suggest language as follows:

Provided, That for the 1957 program and thereafter, the contribution of the United States shall not exceed 33 1/3 percent.

That would not bring about a reduction in the current program, as to which the United Nations says it has made some commitments, although I do not believe commitments should be made until they have the approval of Congress. But if our negotiators at Geneva would be embarrassed, I think this would solve the problem. It would restore the entire amount for this year; but certainly in advance of the calendar year 1957 Congress would again be reiterating a policy which has been adopted by substantial votes in the Senate year after year, namely, that the other nations should bring their contributions into adjustment with the 33 1/3 percent contribution of the United States. Mr. President, I offer this proposal as an amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I must regretfully oppose the amendment of the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time does the Senator from Montana desire?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Two minutes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not oppose the amendment because I think the idea behind it is not sound; it is sound. But it is very hard to imagine that some of the programs which have been under way for some weeks, months, and even years can

now be reoriented and revamped in time to meet a situation of this kind.

If the Senator wants to press that particular amendment to the one I originally offered, I should like to have him add something to this effect: "*Provided*, That the base to be determined as the percentage shall include all Government contributions to the technical-assistance program, including those made by the host governments locally in their support of the technical-assistance projects, as well as those made to the central fund."

If the Senator would agree to accept that addition to his amendment, then, of course, there would be a contribution on the part of this Government of something approximating 16 percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I can only reiterate what I said earlier. I think we are prepared to go a substantial distance of the way. The Committee on Appropriations, after consideration of the matter, and for the reasons previously stated, cut the amount to \$10 million. I am proposing that it be increased to \$15 million. I am proposing that there be no dislocation of the commitments which are presently being undertaken for the current calendar year.

But we are also proposing that the other nations be served notice now, so that there will be no further commitments made, that we shall not exceed 33 1/3 percent from 1957 on. There is ample time for the other nations to start picking up a fair share of the burden.

As I pointed out before, I do not think the picture is quite correct, because when we speak of what their contributions are within their own countries, it should be remembered that they have a primary responsibility to their own people to do the things which it is for the benefit of their own people they should do.

Furthermore, the contributions which the United States makes is in currency which is negotiable all around the world, while the contributions of most of the other countries, particularly the Iron Curtain countries, is not negotiable in our areas.

I shall be prepared not only to support the amendment I have suggested, but also to make every effort to support it in conference, because I think the amendment is within the policy of Congress. Otherwise, I should like to have at least a vote on the amendment which I have proposed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the Senator from California is perhaps drawing the line too fine, because we are dealing with a fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, so far as our appropriation is concerned, and are contemplating the placing of our fiscal year in relation to the calendar year 1956, which is the fiscal year for the United Nations.

I seriously hope that the Senator will not press his amendment at this time but would consider placing strong enough language in the conference report to indicate that if at this time next year something has not been done, then Congress intends to take drastic action, and to take it immediately.

Only yesterday the Secretary of State, who is the mouthpiece for the administration in the field of foreign policy,

expressed the hope that Congress would restore the funds from \$10 million to \$15,500,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That will be done under the amendment I have suggested.

Mr. MANSFIELD. He also expressed his hope and anticipation that it would not be long before Congress would reduce the contributions of the United States to all of the subsidiary organizations of the United Nations to 33 1/3 percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is what would be done under the amendment I am proposing.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is true; but it is being done too abruptly and sharply. Why not do it next year? Let us state our policy in black and white; and then next year, if it has not been complied with, let us do something about it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Frankly, I do not go along with the *mañana* doctrine. Year after year I have heard the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] rise in the Senate and make a plea to bring this amount down to a least 33 1/3 percent. I have heard the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—and there is no Senator who is more interested in international affairs and in the exchange of students, I think, than the Senator from Arkansas—argue in favor of cutting the amount down to 33 1/3 percent. I have heard other Senators on both sides of the aisle make the same plea.

Year after year we have established the policy; year after year it has been urged. It seems to me that it is now time for action. It is for us to reestablish our policy. It can be done by the amendment I have offered.

The amendment would restore the entire amount which was requested of the committees by the administration. We are not proposing to embarrass the United Nations by having the cut applied this year, while the meetings are in progress in Geneva; but we are again serving notice that in 1957 they should bring themselves into conformity. We are merely asking the other members of the United Nations Organization, comprised of 70 members, to be prepared to pick up their fair share of the check. I do not think that is an unreasonable request on the part of the American Congress or on the part of the American people.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wonder if the Senator from California would be suggestive to the idea that what might be done this fiscal year would be to cut the contribution from 50 percent to 45 percent. Then next year, if no indication is shown on the part of the United Nations to conform, the amount will be cut down 33 1/3 percent, or approximately that amount. Then we could step in.

Why not make the reduction a little less sharp this time and allow 45 percent, thereby acting on our own initiative and reducing the amount, during the period of 1 year, by 5 percent?

Mr. KNOWLAND. They say they have made some commitments. I do not believe anyone in the executive branch, in the light of what Congress has defined time and time again shall be the policy, should have made another 50 percent commitment. But they say

they have done so. By restoring \$5,-500,000, we will let them keep that commitment, if indeed that commitment has been made, despite the warnings by Congress to the contrary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For fiscal 1957?

Mr. KNOWLAND. For fiscal 1956. They have said in their own report to the committee that the program for their fiscal 1957 will not be made until late in 1956. So we shall be serving notice on them now, before they make up their succeeding calendar of arrangements, that they shall not exceed a program costing more than 33½ percent.

I think that is a reasonable request, and I think it can be taken to conference on that basis. We will have both protected our present commitments and also the dignity of the Senate and of Congress. Time and time again Congress has fixed the policy which it has desired these organizations to follow, so far as the contributions of the United States are concerned.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I to understand that on the basis of the amendment proposed by the distinguished minority leader for 1957, the sum would be restored to the original amount authorized by both the House and the Senate when the authorization bill was considered this year?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Fifteen million and five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For fiscal 1957 so far as we are concerned, or calendar 1957 so far as the UNTA is concerned. In other words, then, they will have to come before Congress a year from now, and to justify a continuation of the program, they will have to cut the figure from 50 percent down to approximately 33½ percent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. They will have to cut the United States contribution down. They do not have to reduce the program. All they have to do is sell the very good program to the other 69 members of the United Nations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Montana will accept the modification of the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Speaking personally, I shall be glad to accept the modification of the amendment.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have listened to the Senator from Montana. I hope we are not misunderstanding each other. The Senator from Montana said there would be \$15,500,000 for fiscal 1957. That is correct. But if I understand the amendment of the Senator from California to the Senator from Montana's amendment, the program for the United Nations is made on a calendar year basis and so from now until December 31 they have time to get up their proposal for the calendar year 1957.

Mr. MANSFIELD. All I wanted to say is that the minority whip has stated far better than I could what I intended to state—that there is that distinction between the United States fiscal year and

the United Nations calendar year, which is their fiscal year, too.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The fact of the matter is that, of course, we are dealing with our own appropriation bill, which we are now considering, in 1956, but on the so-called 1957 appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1957. The bill will cover the current program, on which commitments have been made. We shall be able to fully live up to our commitments. The Department has said that it will not be until late this year that they will make up the calendar 1957 program for the United Nations. It will not affect the one presently under consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But, to repeat and nail this discussion down, if I may, this appropriation, so far as we are concerned, applies from July 1, 1956 to June 30, 1957, inclusive.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as the appropriation bill is concerned.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as the United Nations Technical Assistance Program is concerned, it is from January 1, to December 31, 1957—the calendar year, which is their fiscal year.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Their fiscal year and their calendar year run simultaneously. They are the same.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I understand it is the purpose of the Senator's amendment to propose \$15,500,000 appropriations for the United Nations Technical Assistance Fund for fiscal 1957, with the understanding that in the future appropriations shall not exceed 33½ percent of the total contributions?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct, and to serve notice now that that is our policy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is good.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time does the Senator from Louisiana desire?

Mr. ELLENDER. Three or four minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield three minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe the distinguished Senator from California is being very liberal, indeed, in the amendment he has offered. This matter has been before our committee every year since I have been on the committee, or since the program has started.

We started out furnishing more than 65 percent of the total cost of the program. Today the contribution has been reduced to 50 percent. We gave warning 2 years ago that the United States contribution should be reduced to one-third.

The Senate well remembers that a few months ago efforts were made to increase the contribution for the Food and Agricultural Organization and the International Labor Organization. The Senate went on record as being in favor of providing more funds, but percentage-wise our contribution would remain as it presently is. In other words, as I recall the figures, the International Labor Organization desired \$1½ million more than they had, and at that time we were

contributing 21 percent of the amount. The Senate wrote into the bill that an increase in funds would be made available, but our contribution would remain the same percentage-wise. In other words, we invited other countries to support the program.

We have been dealing with this matter for the past 4 or 5 years. We have reduced United States contributions from 65 to 50 percent. We have warned other nations time and again that we expected to bring the United States contribution down to 33½ percent.

As I have said, I believe the suggestion made by the Senator from California is liberal, indeed.

I should like to suggest that, in addition to the technical assistance program, to which the United States is furnishing at the moment 50 percent of the cost, we have our own technical aid program we are providing for in the bill. I think we are going haywire. I think we ought to act with reason, and get our friends in the United Nations to provide their just share of the contribution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Montana. I ask that it be stated. I think it is in conformity with the understanding I had with the Senator from Montana and other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from California to the amendment of the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 14, it is proposed to strike out the semicolon, and add a colon and the following: "Provided, That the United States contribution to the 1958 calendar year program shall not exceed 33.33 percents of the United Nations program."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana, on page 3, line 14, as modified by the amendment of the Senator from California.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, no action has been taken on the committee amendments, and the bill will be read for committee amendments. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the mutual security appropriation bill for 1957 be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment; provided, that no point of order against an amendment shall be considered to have been waived by reason of this agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret very much feeling restrained to object to any request of the Senator from Arizona, but, in my opinion, the Senate should have a record vote on each item of increase recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. Therefore, I object.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to ask the Senator from Arizona a question, in order to clear up a matter. There is one item in the bill that pertains to ocean freight. The House allowed \$1,400,000, and the Senate allowed \$3 million which is in keeping with the authorization bill, as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee and as passed by the Senate.

Some question has been raised, as a result of the statement made in the Foreign Relations Committee report, on this item. The Senator may remember we considered a \$14 million item dealing with ocean freight, and a \$3 million item in the same paragraph, and we removed the \$14 million item because it related to the shipment of surplus commodities, which were being taken care of in the agricultural appropriation bill. But then we changed the \$1,400,000 to \$3 million, and in explanation it was said there would be an increase in surplus commodities which would be made available to the various voluntary agencies, and therefore we were increasing the item.

Some persons have received from that the idea that we intended the increase to be limited to use for the shipment of surplus agricultural commodities. Of course, that was not the intention, I am sure, of either the Foreign Relations Committee or of the Senate when it authorized it.

I wish to ask the Senator from Arizona if that is his interpretation—namely, that the full \$3 million can be used for all shipments of that nature?

Mr. HAYDEN. Probably the best way to answer the question is to read from page 10 of the report of the Senate committee:

Ocean freight, voluntary relief shipments: This appropriation is used to pay costs of ocean freight on shipments of relief supplies collected by United States voluntary agencies from their members for distribution overseas to those in need.

The appropriation request for fiscal year 1957 is \$1,400,000, a decrease of \$600,000 below 1956. The authorization act authorized an appropriation of \$3 million for fiscal year 1957 and the committee recommends that this full amount be provided.

There is no earmarking.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the surplus commodities constitute only one of many factors in that connection; do they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, one of many; that is all there is to it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 4, after the numerals "124", it is proposed to insert "to remain available until June 30, 1958"; and in line 5, after the amendment just above stated, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,735,000,000" and insert "\$2,300,000,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 2, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,300,000,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$1,735,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Louisiana yield to himself?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a moment ago the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] attempted to have all the committee amendments agreed to en bloc, with the understanding that the bill as thus amended would be considered as the original text, for the purpose of amendment.

However, since there was objection, and since many of us desire to at least attempt to have a vote taken on the amounts voted by the House of Representatives, I have offered an amendment which would strike out the amount recommended by the Senate committee and insert the amount voted by the House, plus \$1. If my amendment is rejected, then, as I understand the parliamentary situation, it will be in order for me to submit another amendment proposing a smaller cut in the amount recommended by the Senate committee.

Mr. President, I shall not discuss the issues involved at great length. When the authorization bill was before the Senate, I pointed out in great detail the reasons why I believe the amounts then proposed to be authorized, and now the amounts proposed to be appropriated, for military assistance should be reduced.

The House committee studied in detail the needs of the military-assistance program. I have before me figures which show that the amount of money on hand, unexpended, and available for use, in connection with the Military Assistance Program, is \$4,992,900,000. That was the unexpended balance as of July 1 this year. Mr. President, of that huge sum of money, over \$2,500,000,000 is the unexpended balance available for the NATO countries in Europe; an unexpended balance of one-half billion dollars is available for other countries of Europe, and for countries of Africa; \$1,162,000,000 is the unexpended balance available for Asia; in the case of

Latin America, the unexpended balance is \$38,600,000; in addition, an unexpended balance of \$604 million which has not yet been allotted on a by-country basis, is available for military aid.

That money is left over from earlier appropriations; it is available for expenditure. I have already stated for the Record what was said with respect to the transferability of these funds. The administrators of this program said that until the military hardware is actually delivered if it is found necessary to change the designation of recipient countries, so as to allocate to other areas the hardware or the money previously destined for the countries of Europe, that can be done.

Mr. President, as I pointed out during the debate on the authorization bill, the industrial progress made in the countries of Western Europe is far beyond the expectations, I am sure, of any of us when we originally voted for the Marshall plan. I am satisfied that if when this program began, we had stated to our friends across the seas: "We are going to assist you to the extent necessary in order to increase your industrial production to 25 percent or 26 percent above that prior to World War II," they would have been more than satisfied. Mr. Paul Hoffman—the original ECA Administrator—stated, when the Marshall plan was before the Appropriations Committee in 1951—and he said it unequivocally—that if we could increase the industrial production of the countries of Western Europe by 25 percent, we could halt our flood of assistance.

Let me state to my friends what the situation is today. For the countries of Western Europe, the 1955 index of industrial production averaged 164 percent of prewar. In other words, the NATO countries of Western Europe, whom we have been assisting so nobly and so liberally have increased their industrial production 64 percent, when measured by the 1938 yardstick. Mr. President, it is my contention that those countries are now well able to help share this burden of preserving the freedom of the free world.

My amendment would simply restore the amount voted by the House of Representatives, plus \$1; that is all it would do. I think that amount should be more than ample. With the amount proposed by my amendment—in other words, the amount voted by the House, plus \$1—the administrators of the military assistance program will have in their hands almost \$7 billion available for expenditure this year.

Mr. President, in the light of past events, in the light of the great progress which has been made by the countries of Western Europe, it is my considered judgment that the amount I am suggesting is ample.

Let me go through the list of some of the Western European countries to show the increase in industrial production which some of these nations have achieved. Take Italy, which is included among the European countries which will receive some of the military aid carried in this bill. Industrial progress in Italy had advanced to 176 percent of prewar in 1955; Turkey's had increased to

253 percent of prewar; Greece, 179 percent, and Austria 193 percent. Of course, Austria would not receive any of the military assistance this bill proposes but Austria has received a great deal of economic aid. Like the other countries which received this aid, her recovery is virtually complete.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have a great respect for the knowledge of the Senator from Louisiana on the subject of appropriations. I think he has a better grasp of that subject than almost any other Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator for the compliment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I listen with a great deal of interest to what he says. I wonder if the Senator has consulted Mr. Dulles and asked for an explanation as to why the Department wants a much larger appropriation, even though there is still \$5 billion available.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, I have my own ideas on that subject. The Senator knows that for the past 2 years we have refused to extend further economic aid to Western European countries, particularly France, England, and others. But, this economic aid has been continued in a different form through the military program—under the offshore procurement program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 more minutes.

The only difference between the offshore procurement program and the original economic aid program is that no counterpart funds are generated via offshore procurement. But American dollars are used to assist industry in France, in England, and even Canada. Imagine that, Mr. President. Offshore procurement—economic aid—to Canada.

Mr. McCARTHY. In other words, even though the Congress has voted to cut economic aid to certain areas, it is being continued by subterfuge.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is exactly correct.

Since industrial production has increased to record levels in those countries, despite the fact that we have still on hand and unspent, almost a third of the amount appropriated to date, I think it must be obvious that things have certainly been made better in those areas, and that further aid—economic or pseudoeconomic, military or civil—can be terminated. Further, as I have already indicated, inasmuch as the administrators of the program can transfer undelivered equipment from one area to another, it strikes me that they can well afford to lop off four or five hundred million dollars, which is the reduction I am seeking, and make up any deficiency in Asia by transfers from the equipment now earmarked for Europe.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I think the Senator's speech is of sufficient importance that many more Senators should be present. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me so that I may

ask unanimous consent to suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to the Senator from Louisiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mr. McCARTHY. I asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana might yield to me in order that I might suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time being charged to him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let us not start that practice. I have time in opposition to the amendment. Let us share equally the time required for a quorum call. In all likelihood fewer Senators would be present after the quorum call than are present now. There is a pretty good attendance of Senators at this time.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the distinguished majority leader thinks that a quorum call would not increase the attendance of Senators I shall be glad to withdraw my request.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have quite a few amendments to offer. I could speak until 12 o'clock tonight, if I wished to do so, but I do not care to do so. I am well aware that the Senate is in the last days of the session.

I shall continue—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator has ample time on the bill. There are 6 hours on the bill, and the time required for the quorum call could be charged equally to both sides.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is not merely a question of talking. If Senators could be present to listen and understand, they might vote the way I shall vote. I know that there is no possibility of compelling Senators to remain in the Chamber. I appreciate the suggestion of my good friend, the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Louisiana will permit it, we can at least make an attempt to see if a quorum call will result in increased attendance of Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be charged equally to both sides.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean from time on the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. From time on the bill.

Mr. McCARTHY. The reason I suggested the absence of a quorum was that I have heard the Senator from Louisiana in the Appropriations Committee, and have been impressed by the fact that he has a great grasp of this particular problem, and I thought other Senators should be present to hear him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 more minutes.

I hope that the Senators present will take cognizance of what I have heretofore stated. I have pointed out that the industrial production of the countries of Western Europe is in excess of 160 percent of prewar. This has come about through the various programs that we have undertaken with our taxpayers' money.

I do not regret that we took that course in 1948. I am sure that any Senator who cast his vote in favor of assistance to our friends across the seas, particularly in Western Europe, did so in the hope that by increasing the industrial and agricultural capacity of those countries, they would be in a position where they could not only carry their own loads but assist us in other areas as well.

But, it has not worked out that way. We are not only carrying our own load at home, in Southeast Asia, and practically throughout the Near East, but we are also burdened with about 40 percent of the NATO obligations of the countries of Western Europe as well. Still, we are being asked to do more—we are being asked to increase this program.

Senators may have noticed in recent weeks that efforts are being made by our allies to reduce their budgets for military expenditures, particularly in Britain. I understand that British arms cuts may ultimately total as much as a billion and a half dollars. France has done likewise. Italy is following the same path, yet we are being asked, notwithstanding the position taken by those countries, to increase our foreign-aid military appropriations by a billion and a quarter dollars—over and above the amounts appropriated last year—in order, I assume, to pay for these arms cuts in European budgets by filling the gap with American dollars.

I repeat that we have on hand and unspent now \$5 billion in arms aid money which can be used wherever it may be necessary. The two-billion-plus dollars in unexpended funds which are presently earmarked for Europe need not be used in that area. Part of that amount can be used in the Near East, in Africa, in Asia, or elsewhere, if the administrators of the program so desire. The countries that we have so liberally assisted and which have fared so well industrially, should be willing at least to carry a little more of their load.

I have already given the figures on industrial increases. They average 164 percent of prewar, with respect to Western Europe.

Belgium—which is included in this program—is better off than we are. That country has increased its agricultural

production by 150 percent of prewar. In our own country, agricultural production has increased over prewar by only 127 percent.

It is true that the debts of those countries have increased, but, Mr. President, so has ours. Actually, they are now better off than they have ever been, and certainly as well off as we are.

Mr. President, I feel that my time is about to expire. However, for the benefit of Senators who may not have been here at the beginning of my remarks, let me indicate what my amendment would do. As Senators know, the executive branch request for authorization for military assistance was \$3 billion. It was cut to \$2,300,000,000 in the authorizing legislation. The House has appropriated \$1,735,000,000. That is the figure I am asking the Senate to appropriate.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator has been consistent in his opposition to the wasteful expenditure of much of the \$60 billion which have been expended by our Government since the end of World War II on military and economic aid. The Senator from Louisiana has made several trips to all sections of the globe and has made personal checks and investigations of many of the programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield myself 5 more minutes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In the light of that extensive experience and in the light of his contacts with this program for several years, both under a Democratic administration and a Republican administration, I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that if this misnamed mutual aid program has been successful—and it has been to a large extent in rehabilitating the economies of the nations receiving the aid—it would seem unnecessary and indefensible at this time to increase the appropriations for military aid, because in the light of the alleged success of the program, should it not necessarily be true that the countries we have aided should be in a strong position now to assume a greater share of the responsibility of maintaining a defense against Communist aggression?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the real burden of my argument. The reason why we made such extensive and costly efforts to assist them in the dark days following World War II was to put them in a position where they could carry their own load.

As I said, we are carrying not only 40 percent of their NATO obligations, plus all of our own global defense program, but we are carrying the whole load in Southeast Asia.

When I make that statement, I do not mean to imply that the South Koreans are not carrying their share of the defense program in Korea; neither am I charging that on Formosa the Nationalist Chinese people are not carrying their fair share of the burden. The point I am trying to drive home is that

those people whom we have assisted in Western Europe and in other parts of the world, and who have, with our help, bettered their economic status to the extent that I have indicated, have as much at stake as we have.

It will be to their ultimate benefit and advantage for them to assist us in this military and economic aid program, because if we continue spending at our present rate, Mr. President, we are going to bring to our own shores the very thing we are fighting against. If initiative in this country is destroyed, the light of freedom inevitably will be extinguished not only in our country, but throughout the world.

Mr. President, I feel every Senator should know that for every \$100 million we add to the foreign-aid appropriation for fiscal year 1957 the income tax payments of 250,000 average American families will be required in order to pay the cost. I have used an average of 3 1/3 persons per family, and an average income per family of \$4,173, which would result in a tax of \$390 per family.

Mr. President, if the amendment which I am proposing should prevail the resultant saving will be equal to the income-tax payments of more than a million and a half families in this country whose income averages \$4,173 and whose annual Federal income tax amounts to \$390.

What I am trying to do is to save a few hundred million dollars, all of which will eventually be reflected in reduced tax payments by our people.

How much more time do I have remaining, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall reserve that time, Mr. President.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

What this bill does has been very well expressed by the committee in its report, an excerpt from which I wish to read into the Record:

The House allowed \$1,735,000,000 in new funds and specifically reappropriated \$195,500,000 of unobligated prior year funds. The authorizing legislation included authority for the appropriation of \$2,225,000,000 for military assistance which together with \$75 million previously authorized for infrastructure totals \$2,300,000,000.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,300,000,000, the full amount of the authorization and in addition the committee recommends language included by the House continuing \$195,500,000 of unobligated balances from prior years. The amount of new funds recommended by the committee is \$565 million in excess of the House bill and \$700 million under the budget estimate.

Language has been included in the bill making the funds for military assistance available until June 30, 1958.

The reasons for making this kind of an appropriation were very well stated by Admiral Radford in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee when he said:

This military-aid program is designed to generate and maintain forces to add to the security of the United States. In other words, this is a self-serving program all around the world. We are not helping peo-

ple just for the pleasure of helping them. We are helping them because we need their military strength just as they need ours.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield at that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has very clearly outlined specifically what is in this mutual security bill. We are getting more for dollars appropriated for this program because of the cheaper manpower, for instance, in Korea, which has an excellent army, as well as the manpower which has been developed in the European armies allied with us under the Mutual Security Act. For that reason we must bear in mind that what we are endeavoring to do is to maintain military strength in the cold-war period which we are standing as a free people allied with other free peoples in resisting Communist efforts, whether through ideology or by infiltration, to undermine and destroy the Nation.

Through our mutual security program we have obtained strength from the support we have received from other nations allied with us, which most certainly helps us to maintain bases in foreign countries without which, if war should come, we would be too far distant from the heart of the enemy country.

Mr. HAYDEN. The bases which the Senator mentions are surrounded by friendly people. They are primarily defended by the men of those nations. In other words, if we should get into trouble it would not be American soldiers only who would be fighting and dying, but soldiers of other countries as well.

I should like to bring out one other point. The United States military expenditures for all forms of national defense, the Army, Navy, and Air Force, during the past 2 1/2 years, have been as follows:

We have spent on our own Armed Forces \$93,500,000,000. For North Atlantic Treaty forces, where most of our military assistance money has gone, we have spent \$5,900,000,000. If we put the two sums together, we find we have spent 94 percent on our own forces, and 6 percent on our allies.

On the other hand, what have they done?

The expenditures derived from the budgets of the North Atlantic Treaty nations amounts to \$30,300,000,000. Our foreign military assistance, as I stated before, amounts to \$5,900,000,000, which means that the other nations have put up \$6 out of their treasuries to \$1 put up by the United States. Any businessman who could get 2 for 1 for his money would be happy. We are getting 6 to 1 for our own national defense.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement in connection with what the chairman of the committee has said.

The Senator from Louisiana seeks to reduce military assistance by \$565 million.

The Senate committee has recommended \$2,300 million. The House figure was \$1,735 million. The amendment of the Senator from Louisiana would reduce the Senate Committee figure to the House amount, with the exception of one dollar.

If Senators will refer to page 4 of the committee report, they will note that the largest proportion of the money goes to Asia. The next largest proportion goes to Europe; then to the Near East and Africa, and finally to a nonregional program, with a small amount for Latin America.

If the cut recommended by the Senator from Louisiana should prevail it would mean that no money would be available for the NATO organization and NATO countries. Programs planned for Korea, Turkey, Taiwan, Pakistan, Japan, Greece, Iran, and Vietnam total approximately \$1,500 million. Other costs which must first be met total an additional \$255 million. Therefore, if the amendment should prevail, nothing would be available for Europe.

The argument is made that all this money cannot be used in a year, and that a very substantial amount of unexpended balances remains. I call attention to the fact that the unexpended balances in 1956 were reduced by \$400 million, and that the unexpended balances have been taken into consideration in the proposed program for 1957.

The program for 1957 contemplates expenditures of \$2,900 million. As Mr. Hollister pointed out, actions already taken and to be taken will bring the expenditures substantially above the \$2,500 million estimate. Therefore, if the appropriation is reduced, it will be necessary to give up or substantially curtail our programs in NATO countries, or to cut down programs in the Far East.

We rely on what we have done to help Turkey and South Vietnam to enable them to help us. The same is true of Formosa, or Taiwan, as it is called, of Japan, and of Korea. If we cut down on those programs as substantially as the proposed reduction would require, then all we have done in the past will, to a great extent, have been wasted, because, while we are furnishing arms, we are also training men. So, for the time being, we must continue to furnish arms if the people in those countries are to be of assistance to us.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will not prevail.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I have time, I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator believe the United States should continue to supply military aid to Yugoslavia, after Tito has said, "We will march arm in arm with Russia in war and in peace"?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe we have left that decision to the discretion of the President. I think the amendment concerning Yugoslavia will be called up shortly. I shall be glad to join in debate with the Senator from Wis-

consin on that question based on the provisions in the authorization bill which leave the matter to the President's discretion and require the making of a report to Congress. Under the provisions in the authorization bill, I think it is safe for us to give aid to Yugoslavia.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Certainly.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know the Senator from Massachusetts has much confidence in the President. I have a great deal of confidence in the Senate at times. When the Senator urges that money be appropriated for Yugoslavia, I simply wonder whether he himself wants to notify those who administer the bill that the United States should not give aid to a country whose dictator says, "We are in favor of Leninism. We will march arm in arm with Communist Russia in war and in peace."

I simply wonder what the Senator's attitude is. I do not believe that question should be ducked by saying, "We will let someone else decide the question." Each Senator represents in part a sovereign State. We are spending the money of the people. I think the people of my State and the people of the Senator's State of Massachusetts should know how we feel about spending money for the benefit of a Communist country.

I think the Senator from Massachusetts should answer my question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I have 30 seconds in which to answer the question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I said a moment ago, I expect that subject to be debated. I am perfectly willing, as one Senator, to give all the money which is provided in the bill into the hands of the President and to let him send some to Yugoslavia under the conditions expressed in the authorization bill.

I know the Senator from Wisconsin does not agree with me in that view; so we must agree to disagree.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. In order to save time, I shall not endeavor to say what my impressions are, because the Senator from Massachusetts, relative to the appropriations to Asia for military assistance, so ably stated them that I could not state them any better myself. Therefore, I wish to be associated with the Senator from Massachusetts in his remarks relative to the military assistance which we are granting, not only to Korea, but also to Vietnam, Thailand, and the other countries in the Indochina area.

SAM H. RAY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming as much time as he may need in which to submit a conference report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1637) for the relief of Sam H. Ray. 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, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1637) for the relief of Sam H. Ray, 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 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the figures "\$5,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,500", and the Senate agree to the same.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
E. L. FORRESTER,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

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. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senate amended a House-passed bill by reducing the amount from \$10,000 to \$5,000. In conference, both sides agreed upon the amount of \$7,500. It is a minor matter.

I move that the conference report be agreed to.

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

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore.

S. 3073. An act to grant a franchise to D. C. Transit System, Inc. and for other purposes; and

H. A. 5337. An act to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I think I understand the pending amendment. It is virtually the House figure of \$1,735,000,000, on page 2 of the bill.

I rise in support of the amendment and I desire to make my position clear. I understand—I am so advised by the sponsor of the amendment, and I think it is beyond question—that there is provided in this item of the bill, money for Yugoslavia and other countries that are not at the present time showing, in my judgment, friendliness and the right attitude toward the free world. I cannot vote to give money to such countries, I cannot tax our people, and to spend indiscriminately, as I regard it, the money thus raised to supply arms to countries which are not, in truth and in spirit, our allies, and which would not be on our side, fighting with us, if the chips were down.

They have not only indicated that by their action; they have repeatedly stated their neutralism, and one of them, Yugoslavia, has gone so far as to say recently that she will march arm in arm or shoulder to shoulder with the Communists both in war and in peace.

I cannot vote to contribute a dollar of the taxpayers' money to any nation or government which, at this hour, takes such an attitude. I do not know what attitude other nations may take 10 years from now, or at some other time; but so long as we do not have reasonable assurance that a country is with us against a potential enemy, I cannot vote to strengthen that country's military power, at the risk of fighting the very force we create or help create—a force to be used against us if a real crisis should come.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator for yielding me this time, and I sincerely compliment him upon offering the amendment.

While I have the floor, I may state further that I cannot support the bill so long as it indiscriminately provides money to those countries as to which we do not know whether they are on our side, or as to which we have no assurances, or as to which there is no reason apparent at this time why we could expect them to be allied with us in the event of another world struggle.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe I have been recognized for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am quite sensible of the controversial nature of the whole foreign-aid program. It is evident in the press, it is evident over the radio, and it is also evident in letters which come to the desks of Members of the House and Senate. I feel, however, that in approaching this question I do have the responsibility of exercising an independent judgment; and that I seek to do, in the face of a highly controversial issue.

I am of the opinion that the greatest duty any administration has, indeed, I regard it as a sacred duty, is to keep the country at peace. This afternoon I had occasion to examine a few figures which indicate that, even as of now, there are 130,000 veterans in our hospitals, there are 3½ million veterans and their dependents on the Nation's compensation rolls; we have hospitals scattered all over the country, and they are manned by 178,000 civilian workers.

I think back, and, by interpolation, conclude that in the wars which have confronted this country, more than 600,000 young Americans have lost their lives. I think of the million and a half or more who were wounded. Then I think of the immeasurable concomitants—the agony, the bruised hearts, and the dislocation of our economy.

All these considerations fortify the conclusion that the foremost and the prime consideration of any administration is to keep the country at peace.

That presupposes the question, From what source may danger come? I think Admiral Radford summed it up very well in committee: "Whether it is immediate or remote, you have a global danger on the one hand and, on the other hand, a peripheral danger." The global danger is the Sino-Soviet bloc operating not only in the Pacific and Europe, but doing their best, by economic penetration and infiltration, to further the doctrine of Leninism and to destroy the free capitalist system of this country, if they can. That is what is referred to as the global danger.

When we consider the question from the standpoint of manpower and material resources, certainly they have those on their side. I saw a figure recently indicating there were in the whole Pacific orbit on the Communist side probably 175 million able-bodied men between the ages of 14 and 50, as against some 49 million on the side of the free world. So the manpower balance is on the other side.

The essential military and critical material reservoirs are outside the domain of our own country. So, in case of a global war, we must necessarily depend upon the Armed Forces of this country, and particularly on our Strategic Air Command.

It is not my intention, however, today to talk about global conflict. I desire to talk about the other matter, namely, the danger of being sucked into global war through a peripheral conflict.

I remember very well, as a student, the headlines which appeared in June, 1914, when a very obscure student by the

name of Princip murdered the Archduke of Austria as he was coming down the mountainside in his carriage at Sarajevo. That was only a small beginning, but before the end, we were drawn into a world conflict, and the cost was enormous.

I think it can be said that World War II began as a peripheral struggle, because, first of all, of certain meetings at Munich. There was the hope that, at long last, peace had been achieved. Then there were declarations of war, one way and another, and in a short time the Panzers and Stukas were going across the boundaries of Poland; and in a little while we were in that gigantic conflict.

Then, in our generation, came Korea. I recall the headlines when General Hodge and his troops were withdrawn from Korea. The story was that 500 officers and men were to be left there. It was only a year later that we found ourselves sending troops to Korea, and before we got through that sanguinary struggle, more than 33,000 men came back to this country in wooden boxes, and 107,000 carried the marks of that conflict on their bodies. That came about as a result of a peripheral struggle. Not too much attention was paid to it; but, little by little, we were sucked into that conflict.

So the program that is before the Senate today does not deal essentially with global war. That is the business of grand strategy. That is the business of the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, and the Marine Corps. But in this case we are dealing with the avoidance of peripheral conflict which could very well draw us into global conflict. That is the essential reason for the mutual security program and for the bill presently before us.

Mr. President, during the course of the hearings I took special pains to ascertain how the program is set up.

In the first place, there is a meeting of all the military leaders, to see what must be done in the interest of the security of our country. That matter is also refined by the National Security Council. Then our so-called military assistance groups go into the field; they go to the various countries and ask the leaders there to evaluate the situation and ascertain what is needed in order to bring those countries effectively into the orbit of the free world, what is needed to help build up their defensive forces for the very purpose of avoiding peripheral struggles and for the purpose of energizing initial resistance. I think the program in its outlines is quite that simple.

So a tremendous amount of effort and a tremendous amount of refining go into the figures and the distribution of the funds and the functions which are included in the pending bill.

Now my friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], wishes to cut back to the amount voted by the House of Representatives, plus \$1, the amount the Senate Appropriations Committee has voted.

I think I should point out that, in the first instance, this amount was rather materially cut. The President requested

\$3 billion. In the authorization bill, that was cut to \$2,225,000,000. That means that the Congress, in making the authorization, reduced by \$775 million the ceiling for these funds. But that was not the end of the story. The House of Representatives reduced the appropriation for this purpose to \$1,735,000,000; in other words, a cut of another \$490 million.

So in the Senate Appropriations Committee, we were dealing with a reduction from \$3 billion to \$1,735,000,000, or a cut of \$1,265,000,000. I would defy the most astute and capable administrator—whether civilian or military—to distribute such a cut and still preserve an efficient and effective program in the interest of the defense of the United States of America.

The fact of the matter is that \$1,500,000,000 of this money will go to Korea, Vietnam, Turkey, the Philippines, Pakistan, Greece, and Iran. If that part of the program were kept intact, there would not be a dollar for advanced weapons; and there would not be a dollar for the European program; and there would scarcely be any money for the fixed charges, which amount to approximately \$250 million.

Regardless of the number of troops we may have abroad or the number of civilians we may have abroad, when we operate on the basis of lead time and on the basis of a pipeline, there are certain fixed charges which go with the program; and they are rather close to one-quarter of a billion dollars.

I could think of nothing more wasteful than such a cut as that proposed, which is made on the basis of sheer guesswork.

Following the careful study and the carefully prepared figures which have been submitted by those who have been dealing for a long time with this matter and those who are trained in military tactics in global terms, I submit that such a reduction certainly would not be conducive to the defense of the United States of America.

Mr. President, today the picture is not a very happy one. I suppose there are several hundred thousand ROK troops in Korea. They must be supported; they must have weapons and supplies and defense support. I am delighted that they can be kept in uniform and kept intact, and that their training can continue, in an area where there is an armistice, although at the present time it is rather slender and rather tenuous.

I had a chance to observe it when I was there a few years ago. I also had a chance to observe the situation in Taiwan. I know something about the airfields that are being built up and down the coast of mainland China. I saw all the photographs which had been taken by the reconnaissance details. I was on Quemoy very soon after it was shelled. The shelling is constantly in progress. I have taken note of the efforts being made by Chou En-lai and his advisers to capture Formosa, whether or no. Of course, today Formosa is one of our defensive bastions in the Pacific. The people there are confined to a very small area, but they are definitely on our side. I can think of nothing better for our country and its security than to

embrace the opportunity to use the troops of another country, troops already organized. However, they must be supplied. Those countries are not industrial countries. They have never been schooled or skilled in the business of manufacturing industrial supplies. So, Mr. President, weapons must be placed in the hands of those troops, and those countries must receive the kind of defense support which will enable them to support and maintain their own defense.

I remember my visit with the Prime Minister of Vietnam, now the head of state of that country. I went out to inspect the troops. I was there when the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] was there. In my judgment he did a superb job. They are trying to provide a defense establishment against the Red horde above the 17th parallel, against the forces which obtain their supplies from Red China and from the Soviet Union. The least we can do in connection with our defensive periphery in the Pacific is to help those troops stand on the side of the free world. Proportionately, those countries ask very little from us, because their own contributions are sizable, indeed, not only in terms of manpower, but also in terms of the percentage of their total budgets which they devote to their defensive budgets.

Mr. President, what would be the effect of a very substantial cut in the military assistance program funds? First, it would have a very bad tactical effect. Either certain parts of the program would have to be eliminated entirely, or the program would have to be reduced all along the line. I have no doubt that in that event, the military leaders would have to go into the field and obtain new advice from their leaders there. To reduce the program in line with the cut proposed by my very genial friend, the Senator from Louisiana—a cut from \$2,300,000,000 to the amount the Senator from Louisiana has proposed—is no easy undertaking. Furthermore, a very substantial study would be involved before such a reduction could be applied to the program.

I think that such a cut, if made, would have a tremendously unfavorable psychological effect on the world. Such a cut, if made, would indicate that, at long last, the United States was relaxing in a very big way, almost to the point of threatening the defensive establishments and the security of the other countries that have contributed to our security. In my judgment, the psychological impact would be enormous; and the other countries would be fully justified in saying, "If the United States makes this cut when it is in an almost excellent position"—as we seek to interpret the ferment behind the Iron Curtain—"and if the United States is going to relax, why should we take the stand on freedom's defensive line?"

Another effect might be to eliminate almost entirely the advanced weapons program. Recently we have seen in the newspapers some items regarding an estimate, as made by Admiral Radford—an estimate which he said was speculative and in the advanced stage—about a substantial reduction in the manpower

strength of our armed forces. Of course, the whole idea behind it is that it would be offset by the very best of weapons. In this program it was hoped to go ahead with some of the best scientific talent in the world, to go forward with an advanced weapons program. Must it be eliminated? That would almost be the effect of the amendment before us at the present time.

I do not know how effectively to distribute this cut. It seems to me that this kind of curtailment would be more wasteful than anything else, because of the fixed charges inevitably involved in a program of this kind, quite aside from its dimensions.

In this whole program we, of course, have been making an effort to secure strategic bases everywhere in the world. An airplane is as good as nothing, no matter what its speed, no matter what its bomb load, unless there is a base from which it can operate. There must be a place for one of these corsairs of the sky to start, and there must be a place to which it can repair, not only for fuel, but for additional bomb loads. We have procured effective bases in many areas of the world as a result of this program. Are we now to relax, when we are in this position, and more advantageously situated than we have been for a long time? I think to do so would be pennywise and pound-foolish.

I conclude this brief observation by saying that, after listening to high level testimony day after day for a long time, from men who have been trained in the business for a lifetime, I prefer to take their evaluation and their judgment in this respect.

One thing further, and then I shall conclude. Some months ago I asked Admiral Radford to give me a letter with respect to what he thought would be the impact of a very substantial cut upon our own military program. He said in writing, to be quoted anywhere—and I think his letter is in the file somewhere—that if we were to undertake to pursue that course, it could mean only that we would have to augment our own military establishment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I read from the letter from Admiral Radford, dated February 7, 1956. He says:

My answer is as follows: The military aid program is part and parcel of the United States Defense Department program. This fact may not have been too apparent when the program of furnishing military supplies and training to our allies was in its infancy. Now, however, it is clear that the expenditures abroad in support of our alliances do not differ in purpose, scope, or objective from our own military expenditures. I can assure you that were it not for the strength which has been generated in the past 5 years by our allies—and in most instances made possible by our military aid programs—the requirements of our own defense program would be much larger.

I prefer to stand by this program. I think it has been expertly and skillfully handled. I think it receives its military direction from the best military minds at the command of our country today. So

I trust that the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Louisiana will be voted down.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not think I shall consume that much time, but such time as I do not consume may be yielded back.

I fail to find any justification anywhere in the proposal to start increasing foreign aid appropriations, after they reached a leveling-off period in 1953, and have come down from that year until this.

The arguments which are made each year in favor of these appropriations, and of the increases which are requested this year, might well have been played from a phonograph record of the arguments in connection with the first program which was ever submitted to the Congress. We were told then that this program was necessary in order to mobilize allies who would fight by our side. There was painted the same gruesome picture of the sickness and suffering which have been brought to America through our participation in two great World Wars and in the Korean war. If I had had the slightest opinion that increasing these appropriations would enable us to avoid war, there would be no ceiling to which I would not go in the appropriation of funds, if such appropriations would really contribute to the prevention of war and the preservation of world peace. There is nothing in the history of any of these appropriations, or in the bill before us today, that would justify such a conclusion.

This program originated as an economic aid program, to rehabilitate the countries of Europe which were so badly damaged by World War II. We finally rehabilitated those countries. We have exceeded the objective we sought, that of bringing their economies up to their pre-war level. We have now embarked upon this military-aid program.

I favor a military-aid program of reasonable proportions. I would even vote for a military-aid program of the same size as that provided by the Congress for the fiscal year 1956. In the face of the facts of life as we know them today, every argument in favor of increasing these appropriations fails.

Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has been cited as an authority for the reasons for increasing these appropriations, to increase the military strength of the free world. Yet when the story was published that he favored decreasing the Armed Forces of the United States by some 800,000 men, Admiral Radford did not deny it. He says that the changes in warfare and nuclear weapons make such large forces unnecessary. But I assert today that practically all the appropriations which have been made heretofore, and those included in this bill for military assistance, are for weapons which are only a slight improvement over those used in World War II.

Why is it a good thing from the standpoint of the national defense to reduce American military strength because of new weapons, but at the same time to

increase the military assistance we extend to those who are associated with us?

I point out further that this program tends more and more to be a continuation of economic aid. Congress has said, "We are going to cut down on economic aid." Therefore, it has been given some new names. In this bill it is called development assistance. The item for development assistance has been increased by the Senate Appropriations Committee from \$70 million to \$293 million, for economic aid. Wrapped up in every line of the military program there are items which are really economic aid. What is offshore procurement, which costs millions of dollars, other than economic aid? When we give a contract to one of our associates to build ships which are not suited to atomic warfare, and which cost vast sums of money, that is a form of economic aid, although it is called military aid. We have contracts with at least three of the countries associated with us in NATO, for the construction of large numbers of airplanes with American dollars, to be constructed abroad. It is called purely military aid, but it is a form of economic aid. Those countries vie with one another in their effort to secure such contracts.

Mr. President, we are gradually weakening the military strength of the free world by continuing to increase the military appropriations. Why do I say that? There are countries in the world with a proud record of military history. They are nations like France and nations like Western Germany. They are failing to rearm because of their dependence upon us. The countries associated with us are becoming more and more dependent upon American dollars and upon American resources.

Mr. President, people who make no effort to help themselves will not help us very much, even if we give them the means to do so, when the hour of crisis comes.

To show the way this program has been conducted until this year, I point out that in the fiscal year 1953, Congress appropriated \$6,011,900,000. In that year, let me say, many of the Senators who sponsor the increases this year were calling it a Democratic giveaway program. They were assailing it as waste by a Democratic administration.

When they assume office, it suddenly becomes the epitome of statesmanship to increase the appropriations by \$2 billion for the fiscal year 1957.

Mr. President, it all goes to show what changes are wrought in the minds of able men by a change in political administrations.

For the fiscal year 1955 Congress appropriated \$2,804,500,000. The trend was down. For the fiscal year 1956 we did not reduce it much. We appropriated \$2,703,500,000, which was a modest reduction from the preceding year.

Mr. President, I had hoped that the proposed appropriation this year might be slightly reduced. Instead of that, the administration requests an increase of \$2 billion. So far as I have been able to ascertain, and in the light of the vast carry-over, such an increase is not justified.

We have neither a legal nor a moral responsibility to continue to increase the program.

We are told that we have been committed to this appropriation, and that it would be a breach of faith and would frighten our allies and associates if we did not allow these vast increases this year. Who is authorized to commit the Congress of the United States to any program of this nature in advance? Where or when has Congress said to anyone, "Go forth and promise all that you feel you want to promise, and answer every international question that arises by promising American aid; and we will follow along and meekly appropriate the money in order to keep faith with all the promises you make?"

There is nothing in our form of government which permits any official of the executive department, from the President on down, to promise in advance what Congress will do. When we follow that theory with servility, we relinquish the power of the purse, which is one of the proudest possessions any parliamentary body can have.

This year Congress authorized \$4,115,000,000. For the first time that I can recall since this program has come into being, we are asked to appropriate, in the bill reported to the Senate, the full amount of the authorization. Oh, there was a little decrease of some seven or eight million dollars, but that has been made up on the floor.

I was astounded to hear Senators in the Committee on Appropriations saying, "How much can we appropriate for this item? What is the top authorization?" They spoke almost in sorrow because they could not appropriate more than the authorization allowed.

I ask, Mr. President, where is reason in this land of ours? How long is this tremendous burden to be affixed to the backs of the American taxpayers under the guise of military aid? A large proportion of it is really a means of supplementing the treasuries of the nations which are associated with us in the various agreements all over the earth. It can but lead to our eventual destruction.

Mr. President, it is said by some, who say it very frankly, that the purpose of this program is to bring the standard of living of the rest of the world up to the standard we enjoy. I say that that effort can never succeed; but we may succeed in dragging the standard of living of the American people down to the level of the rest of the world.

Mr. President, for my part, I do not propose to participate in such a program.

For several years I have endeavored to reduce the program to proportions which were somewhat reasonable. When we were able to effect a reduction—inasmuch as I favor some kind of program—I would vote for the total authorization or the total appropriation.

I have finally decided that, when I did not believe in a program of that magnitude, I was stultifying myself by voting for the entire amount. Therefore, henceforth, I intend to vote against the entire authorization and against the

entire appropriation, unless it is brought down to some kind of reasonable size.

Figures mean very little in this country today. Men speak of billions of dollars as glibly as they speak of millions. In this program, since the end of hostilities in Europe, since Americans had so generously given of their blood and natural resources and dollars and created a debt which is perhaps twice as large as the debts of all the other countries of the world combined we have furnished through appropriations for foreign aid, both expended and unexpended, the sum of \$62,400,000,000.

That is sixty-two thousand million dollars. Perhaps stating it that way will make a little more impression than saying \$62 billion.

How much does that amount to? According to the most recent census figures, there are 167,858,000 people living in the United States today. That means that every person in the United States has contributed \$371 to the program, and that the average family of 5 has had taken from it by the Federal tax collector \$1,855, which has gone into this program.

Oh, it is said that it is only approximately \$4,200,000,000 we are asked to appropriate. That means \$24 for every American, from the babe who is still in its swaddling clothes to the aged man who has one foot in the grave and who is exempt from taxes. That means that \$24 is taken from every American. That is what the bill means. It means \$120 to every family of 5 in this land.

That is what is taken by the tax collector and sent to all parts of the world to pay for the imaginary and visionary schemes which are embraced within this measure.

We have heard talk about reducing taxes. The Senate had a great to-do about the effort to reduce taxes in the amount, I believe, of \$20 for each taxpayer. Here we casually, and with little debate, and with only a handful of Senators on the floor, appropriate a sum that will run as high as \$35 or \$40 for each taxpayer, to go into some of the chimerical schemes which are conceived by those who operate this program.

I would if I could discuss other aspects of the program.

Mr. President, I wish I could give to the Senate full information concerning the American dollars wrung from American taxpayers to pay for arms which are stored in German stocks today awaiting the time when West Germany will keep its commitment to produce an army to provide for its defense. Unfortunately, the sum is classified.

Mr. President, the Senate does know, however, that this year, as a part of this scheme whereby we meet every challenge or demand made upon us by our allies by putting a burden on American taxpayers, we have reduced to almost nothing the amount of deutschmarks which the Germans contribute to us to help maintain our forces in West Germany to defend the people of West Germany. We know that the Russians have armed forces in East Germany that could overrun West Germany more quickly than the North Koreans overran the South Koreans. We maintain armed forces in West Germany to enable West Germany

to found a republic which we hope will endure, while our State Department, against the advice of the military, is making it more difficult for us. What have these deutschmarks been used for? They have been used to pay labor for maintaining equipment for the benefit of the German people. That burden is now being transferred to the backs of the American taxpayers.

I often wonder how long, O Lord, how long will the American people consent to seeing this program stepped up by leaps and bounds as a result of our failure to have a foreign policy worthy of our great Nation. We should be able to give some better answer, somewhere along the line, to the problems that arise over the world than to say, "We promise you two or three hundred million dollars of tax money," and then someone comes before the next Congress and says, "We are committed to this," because some ambassador or the Secretary of State or someone else has promised these dollars before Congress has authorized them. Then the whip is put to our backs and we are told, "The promise has been made. Therefore, you have got to appropriate whatever has been promised."

It makes us a servile group groveling at the feet of the executive branch of the Government.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has made some very sound and profound statements about this program, and I commend him for it.

There are some resulting evils which are dangerous to our country. One of them is that so long as we have the program of spending and giving away money abroad there is not much chance to have a program of frugality in the domestic affairs of our Government, because certain groups are going to say, "If such and such a foreign country receives X dollars, why can we not have the difference?" And they usually get it. That is one evil.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will permit me, I have thought of that a thousand times. We appropriate vast sums of money, and there is not a Member of this body who does not pick up letters saying, "If you appropriate so much for foreign aid, you should do something for the people at home."

Mr. CURTIS. The second point I would suggest is that as this goes on and on, the economy of this country becomes dependent upon it, the economies of the recipient countries become dependent upon it, and the chances of curtailing expenditures become harder and harder each year.

I would not be so foolish as to suggest that the spending of dollars abroad does not do some good. It would be impossible to do it without doing some good. But the point is that if our sole dependence on world leadership is Uncle Sam's checkbook, we had better look at his bankbook.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska could not be more correct. The program has proceeded for so long that there are many groups in this country which have a vested interest in it, name-

ly, those who administer it and the bureaucrats who go about trying to expand it. We have even reached the stage where those who are stationed overseas, both in the Army and in the State Department, fight with each other over securing funds, just as the heads of departments in Washington fight with each other to secure funds for the administration of our domestic affairs. It is placing us in a position from which we will never be able to extricate ourselves. If we do not somewhere along the line show the fortitude at least to hold these appropriations at a level and not continue to increase them by billions of dollars as lightly as we would take a drink of water, we shall be in a bad situation.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. How can we face up to the fact this administration has refused to give enough money to our own military services for the proper maintenance and operation of our military forces, to the point where some of the leading military commanders in our Defense Department have testified that, as a result there have been more accidents and more deaths. Why this unwillingness on the part of this administration to give adequate money for the maintenance of our own planes and other equipment, to keep them in proper shape. Now, under those circumstances, can Members of this body vote military aid for countries such as Yugoslavia?

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot speak for other Senators. I can only say to the Senator from Missouri that I do not propose to do so.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Georgia for his terse, clear, factual explanation of the figures with reference to mutual aid spending and his impressions with reference to this military program. I think the Senate ought to be impressed and that the people of the Nation should be impressed with the fact that the Senator from Georgia is very familiar with the program, since he was one of those who helped to start it and one of those who knows what it is doing. He has appraised the program as it is now and has projected it into the future as he sees it. It has been very impressive to me, and I feel that it is impressive to others.

It is not natural for the Senator from Georgia to be an alarmist, and he is not inclined to throw out scare-clouds of any kind, but he feels impelled to give his conclusions to us, and I know it has been unpleasant for him to do so. My feelings coincide with his.

I have reached the conclusion, with all due deference to the other nations involved, that the money is so easy to get from us year after year it is actually causing them to defer their military programs rather than to speed them up. I believe that so long as we continue lavishly to throw out billions of dollars,

that will continue to be their attitude and will be the trend of our program.

I believe we must wake up to these facts. We are not realizing the situation. We are postponing every year the time when things will get better. I have voted for these appropriations every year with the expectation that things would be better by the next year.

I have been examining the figures, thinking we were really reducing our military aid from year to year. In 1 year we dropped from \$7.2 billion to \$6.1 billion; in the next year, to \$4.7 billion; in the next year to \$2.8 billion; and last year to \$2.7 billion.

But when we examine the amount we have spent, we find it has been going up, because we have not used up the reserves in the pipeline.

This makes me realize more and more that we shall have to call a halt. I think, with all deference to other nations, that the power to call a halt rests with those who have the power to appropriate the money. My feelings in this matter are becoming stronger and stronger.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I completely share the views he has expressed.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I recall that the junior Senator from Georgia has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations for many years, including the period since 1948, when the Marshall plan was initiated. In the early years of the foreign-aid program, the junior Senator from Georgia vigorously and consistently demand the efficient administration of the program. He criticized the softness which was displayed on many occasions in the administration of the program by a Democratic executive department.

It may be said to the credit of the Senator from Georgia that he has maintained the same consistent position in being critical of the Republican administration, because the record shows that there has been as much inefficiency and waste in the administration of the foreign aid program during the past 3 years as there was under the preceding administration. Is that not true?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in my opinion, there has been no change in policy; no tightening up of expenditures. I appreciate the Senator's absolving me of partisanship. I should have perhaps pointed out that I have sought to reduce the appropriations to reasonable levels in Democratic administrations, and that I have been highly critical of some types of projects for which American funds were spent. I have before this time, on the Senate floor, been critical of our ambassadors in their foreign policy of pitting themselves one against another to see who could get the most money for himself to be used in the country in which he was located.

Mr. DWORSHAK. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations and as the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the Senator from Georgia, I feel certain, realizes that increasingly heavy demands have been made for greater appropriations for the ad-

ministration of the misnamed Mutual Security Program; and that instead of strengthening the countries which have been the recipients of billions of dollars over the past 8 or 9 years, we are witnessing a gradual decline in the ability of many of those nations to contribute militarily to the aid of the free nations of the world.

As a result of this soft policy and our failure to insist upon an equitable participation by those countries in the so-called mutual defense programs against Communist domination, we are now confronted with the peculiar situation that countries in South America, which were not included in the program in its early years, are now demanding that the United States share its lavish distribution of dollars with those countries, to demonstrate that we are friendly to them, so long as we contribute money to countries like Yugoslavia and India, and other countries throughout the world. So, in fact, we are actually weakening the defense of the free nations, instead of strengthening them.

Mr. RUSSELL. The more we make those countries completely dependent on us, to that extent we weaken their will to resist. That, in my opinion, is largely responsible for the widely discussed increase in neutralism which is sweeping over western Europe and other areas of the world today.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I congratulate the Senator from Georgia for his typically wise and thorough observations on this particular matter. It is one I have tried to study for years, to the best of my ability, and one on which my position is changing at least until we have a long overdue reappraisal.

I received from the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] a letter which I believe he sent to all Senators requesting that this administration bill be supported. In the letter in question, he pointed out, perhaps inadvertently, that \$6,800,000,000, or 17 percent of a 10-year program, was actually, as of now, in the pipeline. Never have I seen such a percentage of a total program in a pipeline, either in private business or in government. It is almost unbelievable.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Georgia, a great authority in this field, if he does not believe that there might be a hiatus for just 1 year, so that this pipeline situation could be straightened out, in order to determine whether the American taxpayer could be helped to the extent of action taken as the result of a businesslike investigation.

Mr. RUSSELL. A hiatus might in some small areas defeat some of the minor purposes of the program; but if Congress did not appropriate one dollar this year, adequate funds already are available and already appropriated to run a successful program for 2 years.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Georgia. The point he has

expressed so well is the point I was trying to make.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much time remains on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 5 minutes remaining. All time of the opposition has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate adopts the amendment I have proposed. I was somewhat amused when the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois was speaking a while ago and said that our allies would be disappointed if we did not continue to give them as much as we have given in the past, or some words to that effect.

If this amendment should be agreed to, the amount of our contribution for military assistance will be almost three-quarters of a billion dollars more than Congress allowed for the same purpose last year. To my mind, this is more ample. Now is the time for us to at least stabilize and gradually reduce this program. We cannot afford to increase it. It seems that whenever we go into a program of this kind, we are always sucked in for more than we have bargained for.

I can well remember how the British, during World War II, were crying aloud: "Give us the tools. We have the men. The tools are all we need."

I shall never forget the statement which Prime Minister Churchill made over the radio when Singapore fell. He said, "Singapore has fallen, but we have America on our side today."

Before that time our allies were crying only for the implements of war. They said tools were all they wanted. But everyone knows that we ended up carrying most of the economic burden, spilling much of the blood, and by occupying, with our own troops, almost two-thirds of the line in Western Europe.

As I pointed out a moment ago, I am sure that all of us originally voted for economic aid in the hope that we could place our Western European friends on their feet and, by so doing, they would be in a position to help us carry this enormous burden.

As I pointed out a moment ago, through our assistance, agricultural production in the countries of Western Europe has increased an average of 126 percent over prewar. In the case of industrial development, as I indicated a while ago, the average for the countries of Western Europe in 1955 was 164 percent of prewar.

Yet, with all of that improvement, Mr. President, we are now being asked today, not to reduce or even continue this program on a stable basis, but increase it. As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has just pointed out, it does not make any sense that, when things are so much better in Western European countries, we should continue to increase the amounts of aid over those we provided last year.

Mr. President, even if my amendment is adopted—and its adoption would

mean that the amount suggested by the House be adopted—we would still be providing over \$700 million more for military aid than we appropriated last year. In addition, we now have in the pipeline over \$5 billion; and that amount, as I said, can be shifted from one area of the world to another up until the time it is actually delivered.

The fact is that Western Europe is so much better off now than it has ever been. That area has in the pipeline today \$2,687,400,000, and that whole amount could be transferred to southeast Asia if our planners saw fit to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREYS of Kentucky in the chair). The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator yield me 2 or 3 minutes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield the Senator from Louisiana 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to make one final point. If my amendment instead of the Senate committee proposal, is adopted, it will mean a saving to our taxpayers of \$565 million. What does that mean? Let me tell the Senate.

Mr. President, the median income of American families, averaging 3.3 persons, is \$4,173. Considering the usual exemptions and deductions, the average tax on that amount of income amounts to \$390. If we divide \$390 into the \$1½ billion my amendment proposes to save, we have the number of American families whose income tax could be put to more beneficial uses than what appears to be an almost endless attempt on the part of our planners to fill foreign rat-holes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

All time on the amendment has expired.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ELLENDER. I join in the request for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Chair state the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment, on page 2, in line 5. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 2, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,300,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$1,735,000,001."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. On this question a vote "yea" will be a vote to substitute the amount voted by the House of Representatives, plus 1 dollar; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. A Senator who is opposed to the figure reported by the Senate committee will vote "yea", in favor of the figure voted by the House of Representatives, plus 1 dollar; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Georgia restate his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I inquire whether Senators who oppose the large amount of increase reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee, and who desire to retain the figure voted by the House of Representatives, will vote "yea" on this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Senators who desire to sustain the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee will vote "nay" on this question; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has offered to the committee amendment an amendment providing for only \$1 in addition to the amount voted by the House of Representatives; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator

from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate, on official business as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Idaho, [Mr. WELKER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—42

Anderson	Gore	McCarthy
Barrett	Hill	McClellan
Bible	Hruska	Monroney
Bricker	Humphreys,	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ky.	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Russell
Chavez	Jenner	Scott
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Curtis	Kerr	Stennis
Dworshak	Laird	Symington
Eastland	Langer	Williams
Ellender	Long	Wofford
Ervin	Magnuson	Young
Frear	Malone	
Goldwater	Mansfield	

NAYS—46

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	George	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bridges	Holland	Payne
Bush	Humphrey,	Purtell
Butler	Minn.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Ives	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kuchel	Thye
Douglas	Lehman	Watkins
Duff	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	

NOT VOTING—8

Daniel	Millikin	Potter
Green	Murray	Welker
Kefauver	Neely	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Ellender amendment was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Would not an amendment which would increase this appropriation by one more dollar be in order?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly. I have another amendment to increase it by \$200 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an amendment would be in order after the disposition of the motion to reconsider.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to reconsider the vote by which the Ellender amendment was rejected.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,925,000,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not expect to argue this proposal at great length. However, I am hopeful that Senators will remain in the Chamber for a little while.

The purpose of the amendment is to increase for military aid the House figure by \$200 million. The House amount is \$1,735,000,000, and the amendment I propose would increase that sum to \$1,925,000,000. I believe that amount is more than liberal. We would provide by this amendment almost a billion dollars more than was voted for the same item last year.

As I pointed out during debate this afternoon on my amendment which was just defeated by a few votes, last year we voted \$1,022,000,000 for military assistance; this amendment would reduce the amount recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee, but would still represent an increase of almost three-quarters of a billion dollars more than the amount of money we appropriated for similar aid last year.

For the benefit of Senators who are present, as I pointed out earlier in the debate, at the moment we have, in unexpended funds for this purpose—that is, for military assistance—\$4,992,900,000. That represents materials now in the pipeline—material which can be shifted from one area to another, until such time as actual deliveries are made.

I do not need to review all the various figures, but today the countries of Western Europe are better off than they have ever been. Industrial production in Western Europe for 1955 was at 164 percent of prewar production. As I have indicated, through the aid we have made available to the countries of Western Europe, since 1948, their industrial capacity has increased by 64 percent over the 1938 average. Their agricultural production has increased to 126 percent of prewar. It is my contention that those countries are now well able to help us carry a little bit of the load.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tables showing the increase in industrial production of Western European countries as a whole, and their agricultural and industrial production individually, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Index of industrial production—OEEC countries combined

Year	Index 1950=100	Index 1938=100
1938.....	84	100
1948.....	80	95
1949.....	92	110
1950.....	100	119
1951.....	109	130
1952.....	110	131
1953.....	116	138
1954.....	127	151
1955.....	138	164

Comparison of pre- and post-war agricultural and industrial production in selected countries

Country	Industrial production (1938=100)	Agricultural production (Prewar=100)
	1955	1954-55
Italy.....	176	121
Turkey.....	253	156
Greece.....	179	126
Switzerland.....	139	119
Austria.....	193	105
Germany.....	145	123
Denmark.....	170	130
Netherlands.....	175	134
Belgium.....	150	127
France.....	147	125
United Kingdom.....	157	135
Portugal.....	(1)	126
Spain.....	141	104
Egypt.....	(1)	115
Syria.....	(1)	203
Lebanon.....	(1)	175

¹ Not available.

² Based on 1950=100.

Sources: OEEC Statistical Bulletin, November 1955, and January 1956. ICA and Department of Agriculture estimates.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out also, in the case of Europe, we have \$2,687,400,000 in unexpended balances for military aid as of July 1 of this year. That is material in the pipeline. Until that amount is delivered, it can be shifted from one area of the world to another.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We have helped them to such an extent until it has really hurt us in the sale of our agricultural products. Is that not correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course. That is on the economic side.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have increased their agricultural production to the point where we have lost many of our markets.

However, that deals only with the economic aspect. What I am trying to point out is that we have today, ready for use if necessary in any part of the world, in the pipeline, over \$5 billion, which can be spent for military assistance.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. By giving them the amount that I am now suggesting, it will provide as much military aid as they had last year.

As I pointed out a little while ago, we would still provide by my amendment almost a billion dollars more than was made available last year. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to say, first of all, as one who has served with the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana on the Committee on Appropriations for many years, that I wish to commend him publicly for his continuing efforts in the direction of economy.

I speak as one who has just voted against an amendment, and as one who has voted against a number of other cuts, because I thought they were too severe. I want our mutual assistance program to have the money it vitally

needs to preserve the peace—but I am also one who believes some cuts in the proposed figure are both possible and desirable. However, I do believe there is considerable merit in the argument the Senator makes, that a little tightening of the belt along the line might result in a program that will be equally effective and which can gradually work toward a period when other countries can assume a greater share of their burden.

I am wondering whether the Senator from Louisiana would consider modifying his amendment to call for a cut which would leave the figure at \$2 billion even, in which case I assure him I will support him, and I know of 1 or 2 other Members on my side who will go along with a cut of that size.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, to be frank and candid, it was my original intention to do just that. The reason why I substituted the present figure was to put in the bill the amount the House authorized. That is \$1,925,000,000.

Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking the figure "\$1,925,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "\$2,000,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. With the amount my modified amendment proposes, the administrators of the program will have in excess of \$7 billion they can spend next year for military aid. The fact that this amount can be transferred from one area to another, in my humble judgment, makes it more than ample.

Mr. President, I am not going to repeat all the arguments which I advanced previously. I do hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I make a plea to Members on both sides of the aisle to realize fully the implications of the amendment.

The program which has been recommended by the President of the United States—and I emphasize the fact that this deals with the military phase of the program alone—based on the recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, called for \$3 billion for the military aspects of the mutual-defense program.

What we would do if we were to adopt the pending amendment in my judgment, would be to undermine the military aspects of the program.

In the Republic of Korea we have a cease-fire arrangement, not peace. On one side of the line of demarcation there are an estimated 650,000 or 700,000 Chinese Communists and North Korean Communist troops, facing on the southern side of that line approximately 450,000 or 500,000 troops of the little Republic of Korea and of the United States and United Nations command.

We have in the program a provision for the support of the Republic of China on Formosa, facing the mainland of China, where the Chinese Communists during the past few months have been building up jet airfield after jet airfield, extending from Shanghai in the north to Canton in the south, at a time when

the representatives of the Chinese Communist Government have been making threats that they will take not only the island of Formosa but the offshore islands as well, by force if necessary.

We have in the bill a program for the Republic of Vietnam, which is the key to southeast Asia, where President Diem has been carrying on his effort to bring freedom to the people of Vietnam.

This covers the military aspect of the program, I remind the Senators.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana has mentioned the fact that there is material in the pipeline. That is correct. But those allocations have already been programmed, and they are necessary for carrying out the military aspects of the program.

All of this is being done in the interest of mutual security.

In my judgment, we should not provide so much as a penny's worth of this program if it were not mutually beneficial to the United States in the protection of our vital interests. I submit there is a heavy responsibility upon Congress, and upon the Senate this evening, not to undermine a program which might encourage, on the other side of the line, acts of aggression against Korea, against the Republic of China, in southeast Asia, or anywhere else in the world.

The original program recommended by the administration, based upon the unanimous recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are the professional group charged with the military defense of this country, was \$3 billion. That is what they felt was necessary for this program. We have already acted adversely on that recommendation for the Committee on Appropriations has cut the figure down to \$2,300,000,000.

I submit, Mr. President, that in the normal course of events, in the legislative program of the Congress, the bill will have to go to a conference with the House of Representatives, and in the conference a figure will be arrived at which will be somewhere between the Senate figure and the House figure.

I plead with the Senate not to make this reduction from the military aspects of the program, because it would do great damage to our own vital national defense interests.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield time to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield half an hour to the Senator from Nevada.

WORLDWIDE COMPETITION FOR UNITED STATES MARKETS FINANCED THROUGH FOREIGN AID

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in my remarks of July 18 on the Senate floor I said that we are financing worldwide competition for our own markets and doing it with our own taxpayers' dollars.

If the directors of a private corporation were to use the stockholders' money to finance 47 low-wage competitors, I think the stockholders would hold a meeting and I doubt if the directors responsible would work there any more.

If the directors also equipped the competitors with the most advanced tools, machinery, and equipment and gave them the money to buy or develop

their own raw materials, I think the stockholders probably would bring along a couple of psychiatrists to look the directors over before they were thrown out.

If the directors also had paid out good company money to hire expert engineers and technologists to show the competitors how to out-produce and out-sell the company, the stockholders might also bring along several strong guards and straitjackets.

STOCKHOLDERS' DOLLARS SQUANDERED ABROAD

And if the directors had then sold the company's goods in the markets they had lost at prices far below production cost and at or lower the prices of the competitors they had financed, the stockholders would just give up, say the directors were crazy, and elect a new board of directors.

Mr. President, I might say at this point that that is what I think the Congress of the United States is. It is a board of directors for the people of the United States, and that is what I am talking about.

What I have described above is precisely what has happened to the stockholders of America with respect to foreign aid.

PEACETIME AID NOW EXCEEDS AID TO ALLIES IN TWO WORLD WARS

Mr. President, peacetime aid to foreign countries since World War II has cost the taxpayers more than all our war aid during two world conflicts.

Great Britain and our other World War I allies, which include two that fought against us in World War II, left the stockholders of America holding the sack for \$17 billion. We are still holding it.

Foreign aid in World War II, including \$10.7 billion to Soviet Russia and \$1.3 billion to countries which are now Soviet satellites, set our stockholders back another \$41 billion. That is a total of \$58 billion.

Our peacetime aid, we are told, now totals \$65,172,000,000. Some of it we call economic aid and some of it we call military assistance, but, Mr. President, there is no war on.

MILITARY AID READILY TURNED TO COMPETITIVE PEACETIME USES

A foreign plant that can build war planes can build commercial planes. A factory that can build tanks can readily be converted to produce trucks and automobiles. A manufacturer who can make parts for war equipment can make parts for other machines or the machines themselves. A mine producing metals or a plant producing chemicals for war uses can produce them for peacetime uses. Any going-concern industry is part of the economy.

Most of the war material these foreign plants are producing with American taxpayers' money is obsolete anyway, but the plants are there, the machinery is there, and trained labor is there ready to go to work making goods to compete against our own industries at any time.

Most of our foreign aid, however, has gone for peaceful uses to begin with. It has gone to finance foreign resource development, irrigation, reclamation and foreign power development; agricultural

development and industrial development, in other words to build up competition against us in both our domestic market and in our former foreign markets.

UNITED STATES IS DUMPING GROUND FOR FOREIGN SURPLUSES CREATED BY OUR OWN TAX DOLLARS

We not only provide our potential competitors for our markets with the facilities, raw materials, machinery and equipment, but we supply them with technical assistance and management experts. We even provide them this assistance in several different ways, directly, through the United Nations technical assistance program, through the international food and agricultural organization, the international labor organization and other one-world agencies.

When we have developed production to the point in any country where they have exhausted their own market, created a surplus, and become exporters of a given commodity themselves we do one of two things.

We invite them to dump their surpluses in our own market by lowering or removing the tariffs.

Or we reduce prices on the commodities we wish to export below the prices our own consumers pay, and compel the taxpayers or shareholders in our Nation to make up the difference so that our producers can continue to produce.

BARE SUBSISTENCE WAGE RATES ENABLE FOREIGN COMPETITORS TO UNDERSELL UNITED STATES

There always is a difference to be made up if we are to meet the world price and sell abroad because these countries we are aiding keep their wage rates at rock bottom levels which may be only 10 percent to 40 percent of ours.

We make up the difference on foreign industrial goods by lowering tariffs, reducing the valuations on their goods exported to the United States or accepting fictitious values, and by foreign aid.

We make up the difference on agricultural products by buying up the bulk of basic farm commodities, paying a parity or support price, and then selling them, or trying to sell them, on the world market at a price far below what our own stockholders and consumers have to pay.

SHIP FARM PRODUCTS TO CUBA AT WORLD PRICES; BUY CUBAN SUGAR AT LOW WORLD PRICE

Mr. President, as a case in point, when the sugar bill was before the Senate Finance Committee, I asked a simple question of a State Department official as to the price we received for agricultural products we sold to Cuba, when he said they wanted to buy more sugar from Cuba so they would buy more grain from us.

I asked him about the trade, whether it was the support price or the world price that Cuba paid for the grain. Of course, it was the world price. I asked what price we paid for sugar when it was sold to us by Cuba, whether it was the world price or the support price, and the answer was that it was the support price. Of course the world price is always lower than the support price. So we are whipped both ways.

The State Department thought that was profitable foreign trade—it simply divides the wealth.

We have to make up the difference on agricultural products, or our farmers would go broke. They are not in a good position now, and we must maintain our agriculture or face national economic disaster.

FOREIGN AID USED TO INCREASE FOREIGN FARM PRODUCTION

We have to do that because we have built up, through foreign aid, the agricultural resources of foreign nations to the point where they now have substantial surpluses which they must export themselves. And agriculture in foreign countries enjoys lower labor, machinery, fertilizer, and other costs than does any farmer in the United States.

Having used the stockholders' money to build up agriculture in foreign countries, the directors now seek more of their dollars to enable us to meet foreign low-cost competition in the world markets we once enjoyed.

The directors put a tax bite on the farmer for foreign aid and then put a tax bite on him to meet the competition that aid has cost him. It is a vicious circle.

Mr. President, we have been squandering the taxpayers' money around the world to increase foreign production of foods and fibers, to open up new foreign farm acreage through irrigation and reclamation, and to build foreign TVA's.

INDIA, EGYPT, AFRICA BENEFIT FROM UNITED STATES FARMERS TAX DOLLARS

We have spent millions in this endeavor in India, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Egypt, and other African and mid-east areas; in Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam and other east Asia countries; in the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and the French colonies; and in the mother countries of these colonies themselves, to increase their agricultural production. Now this production is competing against our own, as I shall presently bring out. The chickens are coming home to roost.

In addition to the \$2,525,000,000 authorized by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for military assistance, which was \$400 million under the administration request but \$600 million above the House authorization, the bill would provide \$1,167,700,000 for defense support.

What is defense support?

DEFENSE SUPPORT MERELY ANOTHER NAME FOR ECONOMIC AID

Defense support is economic assistance designed ostensibly to enable a country to support a larger military establishment than would otherwise be possible. Actually it is extended to some countries which receive no military assistance at all.

The Senate report states:

In these countries such as particularly Pakistan and Iran, the purpose is in fact more economic than military.

The report continues:

So far as the practical effect of the assistance is concerned, it does not make very much difference whether it is called defense support or development assistance.

It merely sounds better and makes the aid more palatable to call it military support, than it does to call it economic aid.

INDIA GETS \$80 MILLION JACKPOT IN NEW FOREIGN AID BILL

Next we have development assistance which totaled \$243 million in the authorization bill. This is to aid the Near East, Africa and Asia to develop such projects as irrigation surveys, grain elevators, power developments which can pump water for irrigation or supply energy for industries, and roads to link agricultural producing areas with markets.

Eighty million of this will go to India, and \$63 million to Egypt, Jordan, Libya, and other Near East and African areas, most of which are either neutral or flirting with the Kremlin.

The \$243 million includes \$100 million for the Middle East and Africa, to be expended by the President as he chooses.

UNITED STATES TECHNICIANS TO BOOST FOREIGN FARM PRODUCTION

The authorization bill as reported by the Senate provided another \$157,500,000 for technical cooperation, to be divided between 44 countries and overseas territories of the empire-minded nations. Of this \$31,828,000 is to be spent on expanding agriculture and natural resources, \$15,836,000 on industry and mining, \$7,411,000 on transportation, \$3,233,000 on labor, with health and sanitation, education, public administration, community development, social welfare and housing making up the remainder.

The program provides that we will send 4,389 American technicians abroad and bring 5,731 foreign trainees to the United States to be trained in American skills and methods so they may become as smart as we are and increase the production of agricultural and other commodities in their home countries.

We also are contributing \$15.5 million to the United Nations technical assistance program and \$3 million to the international food and agricultural organization, which has its headquarters in Rome, Italy.

MORE UNITED STATES DOLLARS FOR FOREIGN FARM EXPANSION; FEWER MARKETS FOR UNITED STATES PRODUCTS

Having made these contributions to the economic agricultural development of foreign countries, it is necessary to provide funds to finance the export and sale for foreign currency of surplus agriculture commodities of the United States, which have largely been made surplus by the foreign agricultural production we have built up by previous foreign aid. As we pour more taxpayers' dollars into foreign agricultural expansion, we naturally have fewer and smaller foreign markets for our own farm commodities, and our exports of these commodities has consequently been dropping.

As Senate report 2273 puts it:

The reason for this declining trend lies in the continuing shift in emphasis of the mutual-security program from Europe to Asia. The less developed countries, now recipients of the greater part of United States assistance, are largely agricultural, and some of them are themselves looking for markets for their own agricultural production.

In other words, Mr. President, we have put them in the farm export business so

they may compete against our own farm products.

The report continues:

These countries, moreover need aid for other purposes which cannot be made through surplus commodities. Inasmuch as the emphasis of the aid program will remain on underdeveloped areas, there will be fewer opportunities to use agricultural commodities.

So we are cutting off our own foreign market for our farm products.

NEVADA YOUNGEST COTTON-PRODUCING STATE

Mr. President, I shall cite a few examples of what has occurred, and I will use as my first example cotton.

Some of my colleagues may not be aware that the senior Senator from Nevada represents a cotton-producing State. We would like to produce more cotton than we do, but our allocation is very small compared to the acreage of many States.

Nevada is perfectly willing to compete with the other cotton-producing States, and it would be much happier if there were a substantial world market left in which all such States could compete.

The world market for domestic cotton is gone. It has been destroyed by free trade and foreign aid, particularly the latter.

COTTON EXPORTS 7 MILLION BALES PER YEAR BEFORE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Prior to the passage of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, exports of cotton for 14 years had averaged more than 7 million bales a year. We have not had a 7-million bale year since that act was passed.

The all-time peak in cotton exports was in 1926, when 11,281,000 bales were shipped abroad, more than five times out 1955-1956 exports.

During the depression years of 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933 our cotton exports totaled 7,048,000, 8,989,000, 8,647,000, and 8,366,000, respectively. This was, of course, before the free trade theory was adopted, and before foreign aid commenced.

Mr. President, the exporters got full pay for this cotton. The taxpayers of America did not make up the difference.

COTTON EXPORTS DROP SHARPLY SINCE GATT, TRADE ACT, FOREIGN AID

Now let us examine what has happened to our cotton exports under free trade, GATT and foreign aid.

In the 1951-52 season we exported 5,515,000 bales; 1952-53 exports were 3,048,000 bales; 1953-54 exports 3,761,000 bales; those in 1954-55 were 3,446,000 bales, and for the 1955-56 year ending July 31 they will be 2,200,000 bales, according to the Agriculture Department.

Of the 1954-55 exports 43 percent were Government-financed under the International Cooperation Administration, Export-Import Bank, or Public Law 480 enabling support commodities to be disposed of abroad for foreign currencies. During the 1955-56 season about 80 percent will be so financed.

Foreign countries, Mr. President, always, without exception, value their currencies in terms of the dollar, and we take their valuation. Therefore, there was another hitch taken in the belt of the taxpayer.

UNITED STATES COTTON TO SELL AT OR BELOW
WORLD PRICE AFTER AUGUST 1

During the year beginning August 1, all of our exported cotton will be sold at or under the world price, which is approximately 8½ cents per pound below the support price. Section 23 of Public Law 540, the Soil Bank Act, or farm bill, explains this export sales program for cotton.

In effect, the program provides that export cotton cannot be sold at a price of more than 25 cents, and the Agriculture Department says it may have to go below that.

The present support price on Middling fifteen-sixteenths is now around 33½ cents per pound, but will be reduced under the flexible support program to around 31 cents.

UNITED STATES TEXTILE INDUSTRY TO PAY MORE
FOR COTTON THAN FOREIGN COMPETITOR

The American textile manufacturer, therefore, will have to pay more for his cotton than will his foreign competitor, but he already has been dealt successive blows by the State Department and GATT through tariff reductions, and again this week by Congress' enactment of the so-called Customs Simplification Act, which I opposed. This differential in the cost of raw materials is just another cost he will have to bear if he survives.

Right now our interest is in disposing of our surplus cotton, and not in liquidating the American textile industry, as is being done, so I will proceed on the matter of raw cotton. Cotton exports, we should remember, were among those we were expected to increase—but did not—when we passed the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

FOREIGN COTTON PRODUCTION INCREASES AS
FOREIGN AID GOES TO PRODUCING AREAS

Why have we now found it necessary to make these concessions to foreigners in order to export any cotton at all?

The answer lies, partly, with foreign aid. As we pour taxpayers' dollars into foreign countries, they expand their cotton acreage and production.

In the 5-year period of 1945-49, foreign cotton production averaged 13.6 million bales. In the 1950-54 period, foreign production rose to an average of 21.5 million bales annually. The upward trend since 1950 has continued at a rate slightly higher than 1 million bales annually. Production for the 1955-56 season is expected to exceed 25 million bales.

With all the development and technical assistance our foreign competitors will be provided in this bill, production should go still higher.

MIDEAST, AFRICAN PRODUCTION MORE THAN
DOUBLE PREWAR OUTPUT

Cotton production in Iran, Syria, Iraq, Turkey, and Afghanistan, all of which have received foreign aid in the past, and which will receive more foreign aid under this bill, has increased from a 470,000-bale average in the 1934-38 period to 1,129,000 bales in 1950-54 and 1,377,000 bales in 1955-56.

India and Pakistan production declined from an average of 5,168,000 bales in the 1934-38 period to 4,684,000 bales

per annum in 1950-54, but has bounded back to 5,300,000 bales in 1955-56.

Africa, excluding Egypt, has increased its cotton production from a 891,000-bale average in 1934-38 to 1,467,000 bales in 1950-54, and 2,050,000 bales in 1955-56.

Mexico does not receive foreign aid, but does have an investment climate that seems to attract American investment. It has increased its cotton production from an average of 317,000 bales annually in the 1934 to 1938 period to 1,333,000 bales per annum from 1950-54, and to 2,050,000 bales in 1955-56.

COMMUNIST PRODUCTION UP 3 MILLION BALES
SINCE BEFORE THE WAR

The Iron Curtain countries also have increased their production from a 6,131,000 bale average in the 1934-38 period to 7,759,000 per annum in the 1950-54 period, and to 9,355,000 bales in 1955-56.

Total foreign production increased from 14,200,000 bales in 1934 to 18,800,000 bales in 1940 and to 25,500,000 bales in 1955, or an increase of 11,300,000 bales.

Egypt, the only country in the world which allocates its cotton acreage with the exception of the United States, is the only country in the world which has suffered a decline in production, which may be one reason it is so eager to build the Aswan Dam with our dollars or Russian rubles. United States production has increased from an average of 12,712,000 bales in the 1934-38 period to 14,092,000 in that of 1950-54, and 14,663,000 in 1955-56, while our exports have declined.

Now let us take a look at the world export picture. Here we have some interesting facts prepared by the International Cotton Advisory Committee in Washington. Its last review of the world situation in cotton is the April-May, 1956, issue.

FREE WORLD EXPORTS GAIN WHILE UNITED STATES
EXPORTS FOR YEAR AMONG LOWEST ON
RECORD

Free world exports for 1955-56 were estimated to total 8,200,000 bales, a gain of a million bales over the previous year. In contrast, the review states that "from the viewpoint of United States cotton exports, the 1955-56 season is likely to be one of the worst on record."

Export records for major cotton producing countries for the August through January period of the 1954-55 season and those of the 1955-56 season were compared.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table prepared by the International Cotton Advisory Committee showing this comparison.

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

Cotton exports
[1,000 bales]

Country	August through January	
	1954-55	1955-56
United States.....	1,960	742
Mexico.....	881	1,317
Brazil.....	562	315
Egypt.....	545	777
Pakistan.....	184	359
Peru.....	191	1,230
Sudan.....	105	275

¹ Preliminary.

MEXICAN, PAKISTAN, EGYPTIAN COTTON EXPORTS
BOOM

Mr. MALONE. The committee reports that exports from Mexico during the first half of the season had already passed last season's total, and for the full season will set a new record for this country.

For the first time in history—

It adds—

Mexico may ship as much cotton as the United States.

The report continues:

Cotton endorsed for shipment from Pakistan for the first 6 months of the season was over double the comparable 1954-55 figure. Pakistan has received \$205 million in foreign aid.

Egyptian type cottons have been in very heavy demand and exports this season are expected to increase substantially in Egypt, Sudan, and Peru.

Egypt's trading position this season has been favorably affected by more extensive exports to the Communist countries. Egypt has received some \$41 million in United States foreign aid, and is scheduled to receive \$3.8 million more under the pending bill.

Over the first 7 months of the season, exports to these (the Communist) countries were significantly higher than during the whole of last season and sales are continuing.

Over the first 7 months of the season, exports to these countries from Egypt were already some 328,000 bales against a quarter of a million for the entire 1954-55 season.

Pakistan's exports to the Communist bloc have been exclusively to China—

Red China, that is—

India has exported a sizable volume of cotton to China this season.

INDIA NOW WORLD'S SECOND LARGEST COTTON
TEXTILE EXPORTER; JAPAN FIRST

Mr. President, India has received \$400 million under previous foreign-aid bills, and many millions more through other giveaway schemes. She is slated to receive another \$80 million through the bill we are considering today.

India, incidentally, Mr. President, has become the world's second largest exporter of cotton piece goods. Japan is first. The United Kingdom is third. The United States is in fourth place.

American industries have gone to Japan, have invested in the foreign mills, and are shipping goods to this country under virtually free trade arrangements, resulting in the shutting down of American textile plants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from California whether I may have an additional 20 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I regret that, under the time schedule, I do not have that much time to yield. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Senator from Nevada is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. MALONE. I lost 5 minutes in the uproar on the floor.

COTTON PIECE-GOODS EXPORTS FOR SEVEN
NATIONS GIVEN

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table, prepared as the same source as the previous table, and showing cotton piece-goods exports in 1954 and 1955.

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

Cotton piece-goods exports
[Million square yards]

Country	1954	1955
United States.....	605	542
India.....	861	773
Japan.....	1,278	1,139
United Kingdom.....	637	555
Federal Republic of Germany ¹	230	240
France ¹	538	400
Italy ¹	108	101

¹ 1,000 quintals.

² Partly estimated.

JAPANESE TEXTILE EXPORTS DOUBLE THOSE OF
UNITED STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it will be noted here that cotton piece goods exports by all the above-listed countries except the Federal Government of Germany have declined. In the case of the United States, they have declined by 63 million square yards in just 1 year.

They have even declined 8 percent in Japan. The reason, as given in this report, is that there has been a development "of excess capacity in the Japanese textile industry." The report adds that, as a result, "stocks of cotton goods have been reduced appreciably and textile prices have risen." Japan's exports, however, are still double those of the United States and lead the world, with India second. Mr. President, I may say that most of those exports are coming to the United States of America.

UNITED STATES PRINCIPAL IMPORTER OF JAPANESE
COTTON GOODS; IMPORTS ALMOST TRIPLED IN
PAST YEAR

Japan has received \$2,518,000,000 in foreign aid.

Mr. President, much has been made by proponents of freer trade of the fact that in the 1954-55 season, the United States exported 653,000 bales of cotton to Japan, of its 3,446,000 bale export total. This was the lowest export amount since 1948-49.

Japan's total imports from all countries was 2,046,200 bales, Mexico, Brazil, and Pakistan being her next heaviest suppliers in that order. The United States, in turn, was the greater importer of Japanese cotton textiles, taking 140,300,000 square yards off her hands in 1955, almost triple the amount during the previous year. Indonesia and Thailand were Japan's second and third largest textile markets, respectively.

JAPAN CUTS COTTON PURCHASES FROM
UNITED STATES

During the 1955-56 season, the Department of Agriculture first thought the Government had arranged with Japan to take 650,000 bales, part of it to be paid for in foreign currency. Japan, however, has accepted only 450,000 bales.

Mr. President, there are some other interesting facts in this review prepared by the International Cotton Advisory Committee.

Western Europe last season imported 300,000 bales of cotton from behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, what is the outlook for future cotton production in the foreign countries to which we shall continue foreign aid under the bill now before us?

Nigeria, which increased its production from an average production of 48,000 bales in 1945-49 to 180,000 bales in 1954-55, has set an increased production goal of 720,000 bales. Uganda, Tanganyika and the Sudan, all in British Africa, are increasing production rapidly.

INDIA PLANS DOUBLING COTTON OUTPUT UNDER
5-YEAR PLAN

Turkey, Syria, Iran, and Israel all have cotton acreage and production expansion plans. India and Pakistan have vigorous programs for expansion of their cotton production. India plans to increase production to 5.8 million bales by 1961, under her latest 5-year plan—more than double her production of 2.6 million bales in 1949-50, and 1.5 million bales more than last year. Pakistan plans to increase her output to 2.5 million bales, from her present 1.4 million. We, through our foreign aid, are helping them to do it. The pending proposed legislation will help them to do it.

UNITED STATES COTTON ACREAGE LOWERED;
FOREIGN FREE WORLD ADDS 3 MILLION ACRES
A YEAR

Meanwhile, America's cotton export program declines. Our cotton acreage is reduced—from 28,400,000 acres, in 1934, to an allotment of 17.4 million acres now. Parity supports for our cotton have been lowered, which will mean a reduction of about 2½ cents per pound. Average yield per acre in the United States would have to be lowered to less than 300 pounds per acre, to limit production to the marketing quota of 10 million bales.

In contrast to the 2,400,000 acreage reduction imposed on United States cotton growers since 1954, free world acreage outside the United States has increased 3 million acres a year for the last 2 years. Foreign aid has helped these nations achieve that increase. Yet foreign aid goes on. If we do not give it in this bill, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development will. We started it with \$3 billion, some years ago. It has just loaned \$80 million to Rhodesia, in British Africa, for power development.

DEMOCRATIC WHIP YIELDS TIME TO NEVADA
SENATOR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, does the distinguished Senator from California have any more time that he can yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the allocations, I have no additional time now to yield.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the calling of the roll, following the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, would merely take time. I am not prepared to yield time from the time available on the bill.

Mr. MALONE. Perhaps time will be yielded to me by the other side.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time required for the quorum call not be charged to the time available to either side, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. 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. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is recognized for 15 minutes, on the bill.

THE TRADE AGREEMENT HOAX IN 1934

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in 1934 the big argument in 1934, was that exports were declining—and they had declined from 11,281,000 in 1926 to 8,366,000 bales in depression-ridden 1933—and that the reason was that our tariffs were too high. So we lowered the tariffs and cotton exports declined still further. We lowered them again in 1947 and they declined still further. We lowered them again last year and again they declined.

So that argument was out the window. A new argument had to be invented to lower tariffs further and to continue foreign aid.

The next argument was that there was a terrible dollar shortage, which was the reason exports of basic commodities were declining. We would have to give them the dollars to buy our goods. So we voted foreign aid.

DOLLAR SHORTAGE DISAPPROVED

Gold and short-term dollar assets of foreign countries in the so-called free world then totaled \$15 billion. Now it is up to \$31.4 billion and is increasing at a rate of \$2 billion a year. Actually, Mr. President, there never was a dollar shortage and there is none now. There is enough gold and dollar reserves in these foreign countries now to buy up all of our surplus commodities if they chose to do so. Obviously, they do not.

The dollar shortage was just another catchword or phrase invented to mulch American taxpayers of their money and send it to foreign countries. There are two ways to have a dollar shortage. We all can have it by spending more money than we earn. The second method only a nation can have, and that is to fix the price on its currency higher than the market price in terms of dollars, so that no one will buy it except the silly Congress; and we have proceeded to do that for 10 long years.

Mr. President, I commend to the attention of the Senate a recent publication by the Department of Agriculture, Competitive Position of United States

Farm Products Abroad, dated March 1956.

EMPIRE PREFERENCES USED TO CURB UNITED STATES FARM IMPORTS

It states that since the 1930's preferential tariff arrangements have become important in many foreign countries and territories, and adds:

The most important of these arrangements are the empire preferences granted to each other by members of the British Commonwealth, but those between France and members of the French Union, as well as those between Portugal and her overseas territories are also important.

The Department then refers to the increases in dollar earnings of these foreign countries, which I referred to above, and states:

These dollar earnings have risen because of much larger United States imports, greater spendings by United States tourists and soldiers abroad, increased United States Government expenditures for overseas troops and military installations, and gold reserves have been increased by a larger flow of newly mined gold.

Mr. President, we have foot soldiers in 73 nations. If a war started tomorrow, in a week they would all be dead or on the way to the salt mines, because we could not get them home or feed them.

UNITED STATES-AIDED NATIONS TIGHTEN RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTS OF UNITED STATES PRODUCTS

The report continues:

As agricultural production expanded in the importing countries, political pressures developed in these countries for maintaining controls (originally imposed for balance-of-payments reasons) as a means of protecting their producers against competition from imports. These restrict exports of United States agricultural products to a number of important markets.

At the same time, strong vested interests developed in the maintenance and further expansion of preferential, bilateral, and regional trading arrangements among the non-dollar countries.

Industries in the countries which are major importers of agricultural products have found assured markets in agricultural exporting countries under the shelter of these arrangements. Some of these countries claim that their ability to maintain and expand sales abroad (particularly manufactured goods) depends on continued preferential treatment for the agricultural products imported from their partners under terms of these arrangements.

REPORT LISTS OTHER FOREIGN SCHEMES TO LIMIT UNITED STATES SALES

Mr. President, all of these countries to which we are extending foreign aid seem to have their own partners, and we are not among them, despite the \$65 billion in foreign aid we have poured out.

The report continues:

These arrangements have improved the competitive positions of a number of countries which export agricultural products, particularly Turkey, Greece, Argentina, Brazil, French overseas territories, and British Commonwealth areas.

Mr. President, the report refers also to special credit and exchange arrangements between these foreign countries, subsidies, preferential treatment, currency devaluation, export bonuses, and so on. Most other countries also maintain price supports in the same man-

ner that we do, and the Department admits that there is widespread use of state trading monopolies to regulate trade in grain, tobacco, dairy and livestock products and fats and oils. These are the countries to which we are voting billions in foreign aid.

What has happened to cotton exports also is happening to grain, with wheat and rice the most important among food grains and corn among the coarse grains.

EXPORTS OF UNITED STATES FOOD GRAINS, RICE, ALSO SUFFER

Grain exports averaged annually the product of 30,030,000 acres during the first 5-year period following World War II, we are told, but the product of 21,887,000 acres in 1954-55.

All of our grains are being offered in world markets at competitive prices, substantially below United States support levels in most cases. The United States still is the leading exporter of wheat, 29 percent, although more than half moves out under special Government programs, and at prices substantially lower than the support price.

Canada supplied 27 percent of the world export market, Argentina 14 percent, Australia 10 percent, followed by France, Russia, Uruguay, French North Africa, Turkey, Sweden, and Syria, with France challenging Australia for fourth place.

PRICE SUPPORTS ON WHEAT HIGHER IN MANY COUNTRIES THAN IN UNITED STATES

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table prepared by the Department showing price supports for the 1955-56 wheat crop in 33 specified countries, and which shows that in 23 of these countries the support price is higher than our own. Could it be that through the foreign aid we have been extending through the years to at least 17 of these foreign nations, we have been contributing to higher support prices than we pay our own wheat producers?

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

TABLE 3.—Price supports for the 1955-56 wheat crop in specified countries

	Price per bushel (dollars)
United States.....	2.08
Canada.....	1.40
Argentina.....	1.18
Australia.....	1.46
France.....	2.64
Turkey.....	2.91
Uruguay.....	2.51
Algeria.....	2.64
Morocco.....	2.56
Tunisia.....	2.64
Syria.....	2.20
United Kingdom.....	2.31
Norway.....	3.43
Ireland.....	2.06
Belgium.....	2.56
Germany.....	2.73
Switzerland.....	4.03
Spain.....	2.86
Italy.....	3.05
Yugoslavia.....	2.99
India.....	1.53
Iran.....	1.43
Sweden.....	2.21

TABLE 3.—Price supports for the 1955-56 wheat crop in specified countries—Continued

	Price per bushel (dollars)
Mexico.....	2.05
Brazil.....	2.85
Egypt.....	1.98
Japan.....	2.59
Portugal.....	2.86
Austria.....	2.63
Chile.....	2.49
Finland.....	4.04
Greece.....	2.84
Pakistan.....	1.34

¹ October 1955 guaranty. Price advances as the season progresses.

² Support price for soft wheat. The support price for hard wheat is \$2.08.

ASIATIC RICE PRODUCERS UNDERCUT UNITED STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I shall touch only briefly on the problems of our rice exporters. States the Department report:

Asian countries are now offering rice from 1955 crops at prices below United States prices in virtually all Asiatic deficit producing countries, especially in Japan. * * * Further adding to the problems confronting United States rice exporters is the continued difficulty in moving surpluses into export channel in the face of numerous and intricate impediments to trade imposed by governments in most of the rice-importing countries, and in the face of special subsidies and other aids granted to exporters by governments of most competing surplus-producing countries.

Almost 65 percent of the world's exports (5.5 million tons) in 1955 was moved by competing exporting countries under special government-to-government agreements, including barter deals. In addition, 92 percent of all the rice moving into international trade is subject to some degree of control by governments of the importing countries.

Yet, Mr. President, we not only supply the importing countries with millions of dollars to buy their food from other foreign countries, but are spending other millions to aid the exporting countries to expand their production.

FOREIGN TOBACCO PRODUCTION NOW THREE TIMES PREWAR AVERAGE

Mr. President, I turn now to a commodity which is, as it should be, one of our most important export crops—tobacco.

Tobacco exports in 1955 were about 19 percent above 454 million pounds exported in 1954.

That would seem to present a picture much brighter than those we have been discussing. But does it?

The Department of Agriculture tells us this:

Increased United States exports in 1955 were due largely to sales for foreign currencies under the Public Law 480 program.

Further on it states:

The most important hindrance to larger United States exports is the widespread and growing use of discriminatory trade barriers.

United States production of flue-cured tobacco in 1955, under Department preliminary figures, was set at 1,514,043,000 pounds; that of burley at 506,990,000 pounds, that of Maryland at 35,700,000 pounds.

The Agriculture Department reports that foreign production of flue-cured totaled 1,212 million in 1955 or 3 times the 1935-39 average, and 55 percent above the 1947-51 levels. Foreign burley production increased from 23 million pounds prewar to 95 million pounds in 1955. Foreign production of oriental or Turkish type tobacco increased from 344 million pounds in the prewar period to 575 million pounds in 1955.

EUROPE BUYING LESS TOBACCO FROM UNITED STATES; MORE FROM AFRICA, INDIA

Western Europe, which takes about 75 percent of our tobacco exports, in 1954 bought only 42 percent of its tobacco from the United States, while in the 1947-51 period it bought 50 percent.

What caused this decline?

This is the Department's answer:

The decline has occurred chiefly because of: (1) Larger supplies of cigarette tobaccos from Rhodesia, India, Canada, Turkey, and Greece; (2) preferential import duties; (3) discriminatory bilateral trading arrangements; and (4) increased domestic production in Europe.

All of these suppliers, with the exception of Canada, are beneficiaries of our foreign aid program.

UNITED STATES SHARE IN IMPORTANT FOREIGN TOBACCO MARKETS REPORTED

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a short summary on the United States share of total tobacco imports in important world markets, as given on pages 49, 50, and 51 of the above-referred-to report:

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

United Kingdom: The United States share of our most important market, the United Kingdom, declined from 75 percent in 1935-39 to 51 percent in 1954. This decline was due mainly to increased shipments from southern Rhodesia, India, and Canada, because of preferential duties (about 21.5 cents less per pound), long-term guaranteed purchase agreements with southern Rhodesia, the United Kingdom policy of limiting dollars for importing tobacco and, to some extent, foreign prices that are lower than those for United States leaf. The United States share in the United Kingdom market is likely to continue to decline as output in Commonwealth areas increases further.

Western Germany: The United States now supplies a larger share of Western Germany's imports (now the second-largest United States customer) than before World War II. This share, however, has declined sharply from 54 percent in 1947-51 to 41 percent in 1954. Western Germany's domestic production of flue-cured and burley has increased greatly. But most of the decline in the United States share of total consumption has been due to increasing imports of Oriental leaf from Greece and Turkey. The larger imports from these two countries are, to some extent, due to lower prices but are also partly in response to efforts to increase German exports of manufactured products to these areas.

Netherlands: The United States share of imports by the Netherlands (third most important United States foreign customer) declined from 50.2 percent in 1947-51 period to 37 percent in 1953 and 1954. Most of this shift was due to increased imports of dark tobaccos from Indonesia and Brazil.

Australia: The United States share of Australia's tobacco imports (fourth largest

United States market) declined from 97.7 percent prewar to 64.2 percent in 1954 as a result of increased competition from southern Rhodesia and Canada. Lower prices, lower import duties on Rhodesian leaf, and the fact that purchases from southern Rhodesia are for sterling, are chiefly responsible for this shift.

Philippines: Since World War II, the Philippines has been the fifth largest importer of United States leaf. Unless, however, there is a change in Philippine tobacco legislation, imports from the United States will be drastically reduced in the future. This legislation provides that tobacco can only be imported if the Government issues a certificate of deficiency in domestic production.

The same legislation provides for very high price-support levels on production of flue-cured leaf, and guarantees the purchase of total production regardless of quality. Largely because of these laws, output of flue-cured tobacco in the Philippines rose from 2.4 million pounds in 1953 to 15.5 million in 1955. The 1956 crop is estimated at 33 million pounds. The import duty of 60 cents per pound, which went into effect January 1, 1956, will also further deter purchases from the United States. The full duty rate of \$2.40 per pound will become effective progressively over the next few years.

UNITED STATES NOW IMPORTS MORE RED MEAT THAN IT EXPORTS, REVERSING HISTORIC PATTERN

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this report goes into similar detail on our other farm exports, butter, poultry products, meat, lard, wool, fats and oils, and so forth. I wish I might have the time to go into each one of them, but this is a long day, we are near the close of this second session of the 84th Congress, and I know that many of my colleagues are eager to vote and have made up their minds well in advance of this debate.

I think I should touch briefly, however, on the export problem as it pertains to meat and meat products.

Except for lower priced cuts of pork and beef, little United States meat is exported, although some activity continues in the so-called variety meats and offal products.

In Western Europe, which once was considered our best foreign market for meat products, meat production has increased steadily and is now 24 percent higher than prewar.

The United States, once a large meat exporter, has now become a net importer of red meat. Some European countries are now exporting double the amount of meat they did before the war, while imports into Europe have declined greatly.

AMERICAN CATTLE, SHEEP INDUSTRY STIFLED BY IMPORTS

So far as the cattle industry and the sheep industry are concerned, there will never be any stability until the Congress has the guts to take back its constitutional responsibility to regulate the foreign trade and the national economy.

Shipments of live beef come in by the shipload. In that way the price can be regulated by imports, not by production. Then the American market does not belong to Americans. There is no apparent effort to get back to that constitutional principle.

As a matter of fact, so far as wool is concerned, no one in his right mind will put any money in the sheep business, because of the difference in the cost of production as between Australia and the United States. In Australia it is possible to produce a sheep unit, which is a ewe and a lamb, for 20 percent of the cost in the United States.

In that way the sheep business is utterly destroyed, and will remain so until Congress takes back its responsibility.

The same is true of textiles and tobacco and cotton, and 5,000 other products which I would discuss if I had the time to do today.

HOW FOREIGN COUNTRIES CURB UNITED STATES MEAT IMPORTS

What has put the freeze on imports from the United States? The Department of Agriculture tells us, under the subhead "Barriers to Exports":

In several European countries, Latin America, as well as Canada imports are limited by high tariffs, taxes, import quotas, exchange controls, dollar shortages, and inspection regulations. Restrictions are imposed by several countries on pork products from the United States.

Bilateral trade agreements, subsidies, and protectionist measures to encourage costly domestic production are also resorted to by many countries.

FOREIGN NATIONS PROTECT OWN FOREIGN MARKETS; DIVIDE UNITED STATES MARKETS THROUGH GATT

Mr. President, we lose through the goodness of our hearts by allowing 34 foreign nations, with the United States making 35 nations—and with each nation having 1 vote—to divide our markets under GATT. The other countries are simply protecting their own markets. I hope that in due time we will have the gumption on the floor of the Senate—and I hope it will begin in January 1957—so that instead of going to the Committee on Finance and calling in the Chairman of the Tariff Commission and asking him to make a 9-month investigation to find out what is the matter with textiles, we will take back our responsibility.

Everyone knows what is the matter with the textile market in this country. The trouble lies with imports from Japan, where our American producers have invested in the construction of plants, built with money taken from the taxpayers of America. In that way our markets are being flooded with goods produced by cheap labor.

In other words, we are merely displacing American labor and American investments with foreign cheap labor and foreign investments.

FOREIGN NATIONS RETAIN, INCREASE, TRADE BARRIERS WHILE UNITED STATES LOWERS TARIFFS 70 PERCENT

Mr. President, what the Department is talking about is foreign countries. The United States has, of course, reduced tariffs 70 percent since 1934 under the trade-agreements program. It is not reciprocal as the evidence from the Department of Agriculture attests above. Other countries have retained their same old trade barriers; many of them have increased them.

The Department lists, for example, factors which restrict the sale of American farm products in the British Commonwealth countries. They include:

First. Competition from production in one or more of the dominions.

Second. Widespread use of production incentives, including subsidies, without limitation on acreage or volume production.

Third. Use of a coordinated system of trade policies—especially lower import duties on products originating with the commonwealth—to discourage competition from noncommonwealth sources of supply.

BRITISH BOARDS EXERCISE MONOPOLY OVER IMPORTS, EXPORTS

Foreign exchange controls still exclude or greatly limit the imports of United States products—

The report continues.

Empire tariff preferences for products originating in the British dominions or territories still tend to exclude or handicap products from noncommonwealth areas. Since 1948 there has been no significant reduction of the margin of preferences for products originating in the commonwealth, and in several instances the preferences have been increased. Marketing boards, having a monopoly over imports and exports, promote intracommonwealth trade even though commonwealth prices may be higher than those of noncommonwealth suppliers.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Nevada has made that statement on the floor of the Senate many times during the 10 years he has served in this body. This time it is not he who is making that statement, but the Department of Agriculture. It is the first honest presentation of the facts of foreign trade that I have witnessed emanating from the department of our Government.

Every year we have a foreign-aid bill. Every year officials from the State Department and from whatever agency is handing out our dollars to foreign countries, appears before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

I am not a member of that committee. If I were I think I might ask them a few questions. Oh, I might ask that the Department of Agriculture appear and present some concrete facts, such as those revealed in this report.

BRITISH BUYING LESS UNITED STATES COTTON, FRUITS, VEGETABLES THAN BEFORE WORLD WAR II

Here is a departmental comment on our trade in agricultural commodities with the United Kingdom:

The United States share of United Kingdom imports of agricultural products, especially cotton, fruits, vegetables, and tobacco is well below prewar.

This despite the fact that the United Kingdom has been the principal beneficiary of both our peacetime foreign aid and our wartime assistance.

The demand for United States products in the United Kingdom is strong—continues the report—

But United States competition in the market is limited by the subsidization of domestic production and the trade barriers mentioned above.

British Africa also comes in for attention in the report. That is where a con-

siderable amount of the foreign aid we are voting on today is intended to go.

Programs in progress in British Africa call for increased production on fiber and foodstuffs for export and of foodstuffs for domestic use. Increased production of crops in competition with United States agricultural exports is now being emphasized in many African areas.

NEW FOREIGN AID PROGRAM TO INCREASE AFRICAN COMPETITION

Mr. President, we are financing it. This bill intends to keep on financing this increased competition with United States agricultural exports being "emphasized in many African areas."

Exports of South African deciduous fruits set a new record volume for 1954-55, with 87 percent going to the United Kingdom. Exports of oranges from South Africa increased from 93.5 thousand tons in 1938 to 144,000 tons in 1953, principally to the United Kingdom. Exports of canned fruit from South Africa, principally from the United Kingdom, have increased from 2,000 tons in 1938 to 42,200 tons in 1953, of which slightly less than one-third is peaches and one-fourth is pineapples.

Mr. President, our foreign aid is financing much of the import competition against our farm products. We are being very gracious when we call it competition. When countries produce foreign goods, and then bar American products, it is not competition, it is monopoly.

BRITAIN, FRANCE TAKE AMERICAN TAXPAYERS FOR A RIDE

Britain, France, all of Europe's empire-minded nations, have been taking the American taxpayer and the Congress of the United States on a long, long ride.

When we do not lend to the mother-countries, we loan to the colonies. When we loan to the Colonies they not only shut off their markets to our goods but so does the mother country because it can then import the products from the Colonies and not from the United States.

So we put our own producers or millions of our production acres out of business unless we tap the American taxpayer to make up the difference between the domestic price and the foreign price. Even if we make up that difference and sell our agricultural products at the world price, foreign countries block off our products with restrictions.

FOREIGN AID INCREASING ENMITY AMONG NATIONS, NOT AMITY

We are not only building up competition against ourselves but competition and cutthroat competition between the nations we are aiding. When we finance expanded cotton acreage in one country or technical assistance in growing cotton in one country, another country attempting to find a market for its own surplus cotton becomes an enemy instead of a friend of the United States.

How many friends have we made in India with our half a billion in handouts? How many friends have we made in Indonesia; in Egypt, in Africa, and the Middle East? We are making enemies, not friends.

We are making enemies of foreign agricultural producers also when we attempt to dump our farm products or barter them off for foreign minerals. When we unload wheat, or cotton, or corn, or any other surplus farm com-

modity on a foreign country as a free gift paid for by our taxpayers, we force the foreign producers' prices down. How would we like it, Mr. President, if Soviet Russia would suddenly try to dump some of her cotton surplus or her wheat surplus or any other farm surplus on the United States? Of course, we would not permit her to do that.

Or would we? Sometimes I am not sure that we would not permit Russia to do that. Perhaps, under a fluctuating foreign policy, we might.

EXCHANGE OF FARM PRODUCTS FOR FOREIGN MINERALS HARMS BOTH MINING INDUSTRY AND AGRICULTURE

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act prohibits such practices. We protect our basic agricultural producers by quotas. If we did not there would be an uprising and many of our Members would be out looking for another job.

Then how can we expect the farmers and agriculturists in other countries to welcome our efforts to give away our farm products in exchange for minerals and metals? The simple fact is that they do not. So this program is a sham. It makes enemies, not friends. It has hurt, not helped our farm, livestock, and dairy producers. It is destroying many of our minerals producers. It is putting miners out of work. By cutting down on acreage it also is putting farmhands out of work and liquidating many farms. The American consumer, whatever his occupation, is the best and only sure market for our farm products. If we take away his job we take away our market.

At the beginning of my address, Mr. President, I said that if the directors of a private corporation did or sanctioned the things this foreign-aid bill proposes and previous foreign-aid bills have done, the stockholders would rise and change their board of directors.

AWAKENED CITIZENRY WILL CHANGE DIRECTORS WHEN AWARE OF 22-YEAR SELLOUT OF NATION'S ECONOMY

When our people wake up and when the stockholders of this Nation wake up and realize what the board of directors, the Congress of the United States, has been doing to this Nation for 22 years, with the division of our cash and markets—\$65 billion in cash since World War II—and dividing our markets with the low-wage nations of the world, while we are living on a war economy, I have an idea there will be some new faces in Congress.

EDITORIAL CALLS FOR END OF AID TO TITO

I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point an editorial published in the New York Journal-American of July 13, 1956.

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

LET'S END IT

The people in our Government who have the power to continue bolstering the Tito regime in Yugoslavia with American money have now announced the release of \$13 million in counterpart funds for the support of housing projects in 11 Yugoslavian cities.

The so-called counterpart funds come into being through the complicated financial hocus-pocus, whereby the money of countries receiving American assistance, gift, or

loans, is set aside for our use within those countries.

No matter how the thing is juggled, the money comes out of the resources of the American taxpayers, and the hole it leaves is in their pockets.

It apparently means nothing to the people who have done this thing that the Tito Government is once more in full alliance with Soviet Russia, and will be on the Communist side in any future war.

It apparently means less to them that the \$1 billion we have already given Tito will be used against us in such a war, and that any additional American funds put in his hands will go the same way.

It would be interesting to know who these people are, and we think the American people are entitled to know. The announcement that the American Government has done such a thing is too broad.

Who is it in the Government that has such power, and such unconcern and even open contempt for American security that the power is used to the detriment and peril of our country?

The Congress has substantially cut the new authorizations for foreign aid, largely in consequence of its disapproval of past aid to Yugoslavia, with particular expression of its disapproval of any additional aid.

The American people are shocked and outraged that we have pursued our folly in this matter so far and at such cost in the past, and that we continue to persist in the same folly.

Neither the Congress nor the people should any longer be content with broad announcements in this field that are little better than concealment.

Let there be a naming of names, and a placing of responsibility, to the immediate end that the country may know who is to be held accountable for this disservice to America, and to the ultimate end that our pursuit of folly will terminate.

SENATOR RECALLS 1948 WARNING ON FOREIGN AID

MR. MALONE. Mr. President, in 1948 when the Marshall plan was first sprung on an unsuspecting public, I said on this Senate floor that—there is never any difficulty in privately financing production or processing plants when there is a market for the product.

The administration was flooding the Nation with this propaganda that all we had to do was increase the production capacity of the European nations.

I said that they were already overbuilt for their own consumption—that if we financed greater production capacity either they would have to sell to us or to our potential enemies.

Any industrial engineer could have advised Congress of this well-known and indisputable fact.

Mr. President, through this \$4 billion gift we are continuing to divide the wealth of our taxpayers while the 34 foreign nations at Geneva continue to divide our markets among them and we are living on a war economy. I think it is high time that the Members of this Congress go home and find out what the folks think of what they are doing—the folks who are still making a living the hard way and paying the backbreaking taxes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had

passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 4256) to authorize the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, United States Senator from the State of California, to accept and wear the award of the Cross of grand commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix, tendered by the Government of the Kingdom of Greece.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3820) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

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. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9593) to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6040) to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, Mr. GREGORY, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 258) accepting without cost to the United States copies of the recording "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag" and providing for distribution of such copies, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CURRENT ATOMIC BOMB TESTS IN THE PACIFIC

MR. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

MR. ANDERSON. Mr. President, this morning the newspapers carried an interesting statement to the effect that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission announced the results of the current atomic bomb tests in the Pacific. The announcement was carried in the newspapers without any indication as to whether it was an official announcement of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Since the Chairman of the Commission is the spokesman of the Commission, I would assume that it was an official announcement of the Commission.

It is always interesting to read these things in the newspapers, and never have an opportunity to find out about them, regardless of the law that provides that the Atomic Energy Commission shall keep the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy fully and currently informed.

So far as I have been able to find out, no member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has heard one word about this. The Joint Committee has been trying to find out the results of these bomb tests in the Pacific; but no member, so far as I know, knew a thing about this statement when it was released to the press. A copy of the statement got to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy about noon today, approximately 18 hours after its release to the press. I think that is too bad.

I can only say that it is things like that that bring upon the Atomic Energy Commission the sort of attack that was contained in the report on the supplemental appropriation bill in the House of Representatives.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was set up so that Congress could be constantly advised as to what was going on. I think it was too bad, a short time ago, that programs were announced and things were done without any consultation whatever with members of that group.

I have been particularly disturbed at the possibility that members of the Commission themselves might not have known that this statement was being made. I believe it would be proper to have a hearing, if time permits, to find out if all members of the Commission were advised that this statement was being made.

I say that no member of the committee was advised. It would certainly be interesting to find out if all members of the Commission were so advised.

I think it would also be very much of interest to examine the last paragraph of the Chairman's statement, which reads:

We are convinced that mass hazard from fallout is not a necessary complement to the use of large nuclear weapons.

That is a most interesting statement to the members of the committee; and I am sure it is of equally great interest to the scientists of this country.

I say that because if the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Chairman of it, are convinced that mass hazard from fallout is not a necessary complement to the use of large nuclear weapons, then perhaps we ought to have some new policy stated to us by the Atomic Energy Commission itself.

We have had a statement on fallout hazard, which was issued in February 1955, entitled "The Effects of High Yield Weapons." So far as I know, that announcement of policy has never been either repudiated or canceled.

It seems to me that if the Atomic Energy Commission has learned something in these new tests which they are not in a position to communicate to the Joint Committee, but which they can frankly announce to the public in a short paragraph like that, then we might be informed of it, and a new statement on fallout hazards ought to be issued to replace the one issued in February 1955.

The earlier statement on fallout hazard attracted a great deal of attention around the world. It certainly stirred up some people in Japan. My information is that it stirred up some people in Germany, in Belgium, in France, and in

other areas like that, who saw the possibility of fallout resulting from atomic warfare between two opponents, perhaps separated by those areas, who might drop bombs, and that the fallout might drift back and forth across some of those countries in a very dangerous fashion.

If we have discovered that that is not true, if there is no mass hazard from fallout, then I think it is time the people of the world knew about it. I think it is even time the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which is supposed to know about these things, might learn about them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I would also invite attention to the fact that this so-called atomic power race and the number of kilowatts to be developed seem to be stirring up a little interest. There was a statement issued a few days ago by the Whaley Eaton Service, which has been doing an extremely fine job of keeping abreast of these questions. That service, for July 10, noted several deductions. First, it said that Great Britain has cut capital costs per kilowatt for nuclear power stations by almost half.

It also said that other technical advances promise to make a significant reduction in operating costs. It further stated that the first central electricity authority stations are likely to be twice as large in output as those contemplated when the 10-year program was laid down, but that their cost will be no greater. Great Britain's coming atomic power stations are expected to produce twice as much power as the existing Calder Hall Station at no extra cost.

It also pointed out that these developments mean that last year's nuclear energy White Paper is already completely out of date, and that Great Britain is the only country in the world in a position to build economic power-producing reactors.

I do not know whether that is of any interest to the people of this country, but I think it should be. It would be too bad if the reactors which are being built would develop atomic power long before we even started to build one. I think it lends emphasis to the vote which the Senate took several days ago in saying that we wanted to try some new types. Most people recognize that the plants now under construction offer no promise of producing economical power, when we are building at Shippingport a plant which is calculated to produce electricity at a cost of 52 mills, when it must be obvious that electricity generated from coal and gas costs 7 or 8 mills at the most. But Great Britain is starting to produce economical power. The conference which was held at Vienna was told that British industrial groups are now in a position to quote firm prices and give a guaranty of output efficiency, plus a guaranty to time scale in the erection of atomic powerplants. I think Congress should not lose sight of that possibility.

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1957

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12130) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel very much concerned that we are asked to cut \$300 million more from the military program, when we are told by our Chiefs of Staff that the money is needed to take care of the situation in the world today.

I am also much concerned about the expression "foreign aid giveaway." There is no such thing in this military program as any foreign-aid giveaway. It is for the security of the United States of America and our allies abroad. Equipping our allies is vital to the security of the United States of America.

As the Senator from California pointed out earlier in the debate, \$3 billion, in round numbers, was asked for the military program. A \$2 billion appropriation which is now asked for would mean that a third of the military program has to be eliminated. It means that such vital and critical areas as Korea, Formosa, and Vietnam, where we have native troops doing the work that our boys otherwise would have to do, would be deprived of aid. If we do not realize that it is part of our own defense, I am afraid we are losing our perspective. I challenge those who want to cut the amount any further. We have already cut it from \$3 billion to \$2,300 million.

In Korea the ROK's are working under our instructions and with our equipment, and they need to be sustained if we do not want to lose Korea and threaten Japan and the entire Far East.

In Vietnam we have an army which is being trained and equipped against a possible invasion from North Vietnam or Red China. If Communist forces are allowed to take over the rest of Vietnam, we will lose all of Indochina.

In critical areas in the Far East we are training native troops with modern weapons, and we cannot continue to do so if a cut is made in this appropriation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a moment?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the point has been made that beyond these emergencies—and I do not see any way to avoid them—we have \$5 billion in the pipeline. At the session of the Senate just before we adopted the authorization bill, I inserted into the RECORD a very careful study of unexpended balances. There was less than \$200 million not definitely committed, less than we had in years past. We cannot rely on funds in the pipeline. We

have got to have a new appropriation if we are going to carry on our responsibility in connection with the security of the United States by giving our allies equipment and supplies.

I add my voice to that of the Senator from California, our minority leader, in saying that we must maintain the \$2,300 million and vote against a further cut of \$300 million.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of our time if the Senator from Louisiana is prepared to yield back his time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to make a statement, first.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Then I withhold my offer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on the last vote taken by the Senate my amendment lost by four votes. Senators have the opportunity at this time to vote for an increase over what it voted for the last time. The amount of money we would make available through this amendment will be a billion dollars more than was made available in last year's appropriation.

When Senators say, or insinuate, that we are not giving as much now as we did last year, they should know better.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the Senator from Louisiana say that if we put this cut into operation there will still be a billion dollars more available than was available last year?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Should we cry about that?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I should like to know. Senators have been crying about it. Instead of \$2 billion, they want to make the amount \$2,300,000,000.

Mr. President, Senators will have an opportunity to vote on this matter. The issue is a clean-cut one, and I am sorry that I had to modify the amendment as I did. I wish we had been able to adopt the amendment which was originally placed before the Senate—the amendment to restore the House figure.

I hope the Senate will vote favorably on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Louisiana prepared to yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I will yield the remainder of my time on the amendment, since the Senator from Louisiana has done likewise.

I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time for the quorum call being charged to neither side; and that when either the order for the quorum call has been rescinded or a quorum has been developed, the Senate proceed to a vote on the pending amendment.

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

Has the Senator from Louisiana yielded back his time?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have yielded back my time, with the understanding that all

debate on the amendment has been completed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that when the quorum has been developed or when the order for the quorum call has been rescinded, the Senate will immediately proceed to vote on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. 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 amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we again have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, in lieu of "\$2,300,000,000", it is proposed to insert "\$2,000,000,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, Mr. President, the amendment would reduce the appropriation recommended by the committee from \$2,300,000,000 to \$2 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. It increases by \$265 million the figure approved by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. On this question the yeas and nays having been ordered, and all time having been yielded back, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ERVIN (when his name was called). On this amendment I have a pair with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MONRONEY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. 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.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. KERR. I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. McCARTHY (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER]. 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 Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission, and his pair has been previously announced.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—37

Anderson	Gore	Robertson
Barrett	Hill	Russell
Bible	Hruska	Schoeppel
Byrd	Jackson	Scott
Capehart	Jenner	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stennis
Clements	Long	Symington
Curtis	Magnuson	Williams
Dworshak	Malone	Wofford
Eastland	McClellan	Young
Ellender	Mundt	
Frear	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—44

Alken	Fulbright	Martin, Iowa
Allott	George	Martin, Pa.
Beall	Hayden	McNamara
Bender	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Neuberger
Bush	Humphrey	Pastore
Butler	Minn.	Payne
Carlson	Ives	Purtell
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kuchel	Thye
Duff	Laird	Watkins
Flanders	Lehman	Wiley

NOT VOTING—15

Bricker	Kefauver	Potter
Daniel	Kerr	Welker
Ervin	Mansfield	
Goldwater	McCarthy	
Green	Monroney	
Humphreys,	Murray	
Ky.	Neely	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay

on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment on page 2, line 5, to strike out "\$2,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,100,000,000."

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,300,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,100,000,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. On this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity—

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to express my opinion about this matter. I have voted for both of the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana. I have done so, first, because we are dealing with military expenditures. There was recently released a statement that under this program there are being sent to Marshal Tito several hundred jet planes which are already under contract as a result of appropriations heretofore made—and this in spite of the fact that Marshal Tito recently returned from a visit to Moscow.

There is no person in the State Department, there is no person in the Defense Department, there is no person in the administration, there is no person in the Appropriations Committee who can explain why the United States Government is sending jet planes to Yugoslavia.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We are not sending jet planes to Yugoslavia at this time, as I presently expect to explain.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from New Jersey says we are not, but I have seen reports that we are, and I have seen the Senate vote down an amendment to require the administrators of the program to tell the truth to the authorized committees of the Senate. I see no reason why any Member of Congress who is sworn to defend the United States should be voting money for military purposes to satellites or near satellites of Soviet Russia. I am willing to give wheat; I am willing to give other agricultural commodities; I am willing to give technological aid. But to give military power at the very moment when we pretend to be working for world peace, is beyond my understanding.

We know now that the people of Iceland have elected an administration which has been opposed to the establishment of American airbases in Iceland. We know that the airbases we have built in North Africa are now in danger of being taken away from us. How we can be willing to put blindfolds on our eyes, in view of what is happening to the

world, and to vote military power to governments which we do not know will be our allies a week hence, is beyond my understanding.

In the Senate Appropriations Committee an amendment was submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and myself, providing—as a limitation upon this appropriation—that it would be the duty of the officers and employees administering this money to report, by answering the questions asked by authorized committees of the Congress; and when, upon report of such committees, the Congress by joint resolution should send to the General Accounting Office a report that a refusal to answer such questions had been made, the appropriation would be cancelled by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. President, why should we vote money for military aid to foreign countries whom we do not know to be our allies?

Let us not vote in blindness; let us not vote in folly.

Let us vote only when the elected representatives of the people of the United States know for what purpose the military equipments that we send are going to be used.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment will be adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the able Senator from Wyoming whether we shall not have a chance to deal with those issues later on. I understand there is a resolution—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How can we deal with them later on?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just a moment, please.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I anticipate the Senator's question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that there will be an amendment cutting off aid to Tito? I supported such an amendment the last time. I intend to support such an amendment this evening. Similarly, the amendment of the—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just a minute, please.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois is taking my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time yielded to the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Just a minute, please; I wish to use this time myself.

Mr. President, I cannot possibly vote to grant this military aid, without knowing how it is going to be used, upon the prospect that an amendment against aid to Yugoslavia may be adopted later on. I can consider these amendments

only as they are before us. I cannot guess about the future.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Wyoming knows that when the amendment to cut off aid to Tito is brought up, many Senators will say, "Oh, the Senate cannot handle the matter in this way. The Senate should have voted to reduce the amount of the authorization or the overall amount of the appropriation, if it wished to do that." And under those circumstances, we would get nowhere again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. President, the Congress is the parliamentary body governing the United States. Members of Congress make the laws and the appropriations. Yet we would be voting the money blindly. Who does not know that?

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, will testify how the agents of the Government have appeared before his committee and have refused to answer. How they equivocated and backed away! They do not tell the Congress of the United States, the representatives of the people, how they are going to spend this money; and we learn, after the fact, what has been done.

Mr. President, I think it is a shocking development that we should be willing to cast our votes now upon hope—hope which has been deferred.

There is already \$6 billion in the pipeline. The administration has asked for \$4,900,000 more. The amount has been cut down by the House of Representatives. Yet Senators would do their best, by securing pairs with absentees, to bring about the casting of a majority vote for this military expenditure.

Mr. President, we work for peace. But we cannot obtain peace by placing arms in the hands of foreign peoples, whose use of those arms we are not able to dictate.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the committee amendment will be adopted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to point out to the Senate that on the first amendment I submitted to the committee amendment, I proposed to restate the amount voted by the House of Representatives. That would have made a difference of a little over half a billion dollars in the amount voted by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

By means of my second amendment to the committee amendment—and my second amendment was just defeated—we sought to make this appropriation for foreign military assistance \$2 billion—in other words, to increase by \$265 million the amount voted by the House of Representatives.

The pending amendment to the committee amendment would increase by \$365 million the amount voted by the House of Representatives, and would be only \$200 million below the amount of the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. President, I do hope that the Senate will vote in favor of this amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana very heartily for the efforts he has made to get a realistic appropriation made. I have supported each and all of his amendments, and I shall support this one.

I commend him for the way in which he has carried on this fight, despite the fact that it is very evident that a majority of the Senate is panting in its anxiety to vote for the last dollar that has been authorized in this case. If that occurs, it will be the first time the Senate has ever voted for the full amount of the authorization.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Louisiana, but I hope he will not offer too many amendments. Let our colleagues go back to their constituencies and tell them of their achievements at this session of the Congress. When they do, and when their constituents ask, "Were you able to get us a tax reduction this year?" those Senators will have to reply, "Oh, no; we could not get you any tax reduction."

Then when their constituents ask, "Well, if we are paying these high taxes, I am sure you have brought down the staggering national debt which will be placed on our children and on our children's children."

But those Senators will then have to reply, "Oh, no; we had to increase the limitation on the national debt which will be passed on to your children and your children's children."

Then their constituents will ask them, "Well, what did you do?" Each one of those Senators will have to reply, "I followed the administration and the leadership. I voted to give away \$24 for you and \$24 for every one of your children and \$24 for your wife—a total of \$120 for your family of five."

So I ask the Senator from Louisiana not to deny our colleagues the high privilege of going back to their constituencies and saying to them that they voted for a pig in a poke, at the cost of \$24 to every person in the United States, including every child in the cradle and every old man with a foot in the grave; and then our colleagues would have the privilege of saying to their constituents, "Of course, under those circumstances we did not succeed in lowering your taxes or in decreasing the national debt."

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Louisiana; but I ask him not to make things too trying for Senators who oppose him. Instead, let them have an opportunity—before they wake up—to go home and tell their constituents of the great effort they have made. [Applause.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Georgia that in the past 36 months, no American has lost his life by enemy gunfire on some battlefield. I think when we go home and make our report to the mothers and fathers, and to the young men who, to the number of 17 million, served in a war

that was not of our making, this argument will commend itself to our constituents.

I rose only for the purpose of dissipating an error. I ask the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN] whether I have his permission to read the last three lines of the letter addressed to him by the Secretary of State on the 19th of July.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no point in reading all of this letter. I read the last three lines, for the particular edification of my friend and associate, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]:

To give you some idea of what that might entail in the military field, I may say that during 1955 no jet fighter planes were sent to Yugoslavia, while in 1956 there have been only two planes shipped.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary.

Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. O'MAHONEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have been recognized to make a brief statement.

The fact of the matter is that the original recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of the National Security Council, and of the President of the United States with respect to this military item which we are discussing was \$3 billion, which they believed was essential for the mutual defense of our own country and those associated with us in systems of collective security. This deals with the military aspects of the program.

Who are the allies to whom the bulk of these funds are programmed?

First, the Republic of Korea, where today there is only a cease fire in existence, with more than 600,000—estimated at 800,000—Chinese Communists and North Korean Communists north of the line of demarcation, being held by the Republic of Korea and our own forces, and the forces of those associated with us, to the extent of 500,000 along a truce line, a cease-fire line.

Next, the Republic of China, along the Formosa Straits, where, as I pointed out earlier, Chinese Communists have been acknowledged to have built a whole series of jet airstrips, running from Shanghai down to Canton, threatening to use them at some time of their own choosing.

In Southeast Asia there is Vietnam, where Premier Diem is fighting with his back to the wall to build a system of freedom in that country, to prevent the Communist forces of Ho Chi Minh from coming down from North Vietnam.

Then there is Turkey, which has been a stout ally in the Middle East, whose soldiers stood shoulder by shoulder with our own men at the time of the Korean operation. The Turks had sent one of the largest contingents.

Pakistan is an important part of the program in that area of the world.

The bulk of these goods will go to those allies. I pointed out earlier that even if we appropriate the full amount recom-

mended by the Committee on Appropriations, we still must go to conference with the House of Representatives.

We are all interested in the solvency of the Government, but we are equally interested in the national security of our country. It was the testimony before our committee of the responsible military officials who are charged with the defense of our country from a professional point of view, that if we had not this collective system of defense in the world, we would be spending not \$4 billion under this appropriation bill, but perhaps \$8 billion or \$10 billion in trying to build a fortress America, with all the rest of the world, perhaps, behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

If this program is purely a program to aid someone else, there is no justification for our voting a single penny. The justification for this program, among men of good will on both sides of the aisle who recognize the problem confronting us in the world of a serious Communist menace, is that it is for our mutual protection. That has been the basis of the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, and the President of the United States.

I plead with my colleagues not to make the proposed reduction in the item dealing with our collective security. I wish to pay tribute, as I have done publicly and privately, for the fine support, both in the matter of authorization legislation and in the foreign policy program, to the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who has rendered such outstanding service to this country.

In this matter there should be no center aisle. It is true that there are Members on my side of the aisle who honestly differ. There are Members on the other side of the aisle who honestly differ. But I can say to the Senate that it is the considered judgment of the President of the United States, who certainly has had as widespread experience in matters dealing with the vital security interests of this country as any other living man, and it is the unanimous recommendation of his Joint Chiefs of Staff, men who are selected to give their best professional advice, that this amount is needed for our Mutual Security program.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana will be defeated.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did not the President and all the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of State, and everyone else, urge us not to cut off aid to Yugoslavia?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. And yet the Senator favors cutting it off?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do.

Mr. RUSSELL. He should permit us a little leeway in dealing with these other matters.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator that men may honestly differ on that subject. There is no money in this particular item for jets for Yugoslavia or for heavy military equipment for Yugoslavia. That material is in the pipeline; but I have an amendment which I hope will reach that

program. However, in the item we are discussing there are no funds for Yugoslavia.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, that represents one of our previous mistakes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Speaking personally, I should say that the Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Was it not the Senator from Georgia who initially opposed aid to Yugoslavia?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; and I think the Senator from California had opposed it in the past.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute in order to make a correction in the statement of the distinguished Senator from California. I do not think it was intentional. However, I desire to point out to the Senate that if the amount proposed by the Committee is adopted, there will be some money for Yugoslavia. I have the figures in my possession, but I cannot give them out. The amount is classified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a comment to my distinguished and pleasant friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who waved in front of him a letter from Secretary Dulles saying that there have not been shipped to Tito more than a few planes in 1955 or 1956.

That is no answer to my charge. My charge lies in the words of the minority leader, the Senator from California, who says he is going to offer an amendment to make it impossible to ship from the pipeline the jets which have been contracted for Yugoslavia. So I appeal from the letter of the Secretary of State to the amendment of the Senator from California to prove my point, that the jets will be on the way unless we stop them; and the best way to prevent repetition of the mistake which the Senator from California would like to correct is to cut these appropriations for military aid to nations which may or may not be our allies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in 1949 I had the honor of serving as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

At that time we had a very able staff assistant, who had served as an assistant in the Veterans' Administration. He helped draft the Reclassification Act of 1949, which is now the basic law with respect to all Federal employees—their pay, their status, and everything involving their employment. He is a very able man.

That young man today is employed in the Philippines with a major American corporation. He came to me and asked that he have some chance to participate in this study of foreign aid. He said that all the money we are spending in the Philippines is making us a laughing stock there; that we are spending our money to make a joke out of America.

For example, he points out things that happened. We sent some jeeps. As Senators know, a jeep can traverse the most primitive kind of highways. The jeeps were supposed to carry doctors to administer help to sick people. So the

jeeps were shipped there. Who drives the jeeps? The county politicians drive them. There are very few doctors driving jeeps in the Philippines. But we sent jeeps to be driven by doctors, who would help sick people.

Then we sent tractors and tractor plows. However, we did not send the gasoline and the oil. So, he said, as a man who works in the Philippines, he watches a team of oxen pull a tractor plow across the fields, while the tractor rusts. These are typical of many items in our foreign aid program. In many ways it is the silliest thing the mind of man has ever invented.

Here we go again, with \$4 billion more for the pipeline, to be given to other countries. Item after item has been received, but with no thought, no study, no nothing. Much of it is just a matter of appropriating money and giving it to other nations. In some respects we are just throwing it away. If those who have received the \$20 billion worth of weapons we have given them would maintain those weapons properly they would not need \$5 billion more. In many respects we are just throwing money away, giving it away, wasting it.

It would seem that some Senators wish to expend our funds as rapidly as they can. Apparently we are not listening to anyone. We are not studying the question.

If anyone proposes that the subject be studied, it is suggested that the administration appoint 4 or 5 people, or a few businessmen, who do not know what the whole thing is about, to travel abroad and take a little look, and be briefed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. Will my colleague yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 1 more minute to my junior colleague.

Mr. LONG. To any colleague who has not been briefed, I would suggest that he get briefed. He will be told what he is supposed to find, which is exactly what they have said all the time. Anyone who gets briefed does not have to work to find out anything for himself.

He is briefed. He has it. There it is. I say to my colleagues, "It is all wrapped up for you, and you come back all briefed with a report, which is exactly what they handed you in the first place. It is not necessary to do even so much as 5 seconds of work."

So here we are. It appears that the majority of this body is prepared to vote to give the whole thing away at \$5 billion a throw.

Thank God, there are a few Senators who go forth, look and learn for themselves and say, "My friends, do not throw it all away. Let us do a little economizing."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I did not think that the day would ever come when I would get into a debate in trying to cut down on mutual aid. But I recall that it has been a long time since we first started on this program. I believe that I am one of the few men in this Cham-

ber who sat in the Cabinet meeting when we started the program of Greek and Turkish aid.

I remember the very able senior Senator from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg, saying, when the proposal was made that we could carry on with other things, "No, I will take this one step at a time. I am not sure that we will ever give aid beyond Greece and Turkey."

Any attempt which was made at that time to commit so much as a nickel beyond that aid was resisted by Senator Vandenberg as vigorously as he could.

I say to Senators frankly that I have in public and in private praised him as one of the truly great men of this Nation; and what I have said just now is no reflection upon him, because in my book he was a great and fine American, who did a magnificent piece of work. I only say that away back then he was cautious when it was suggested that this aid program might go on.

Mr. President, I was in Paris as chairman of the Combined Food Board at the Paris cereals conference, when the Marshall plan was being announced to the nations of the world. At that time assurances were to be given that for a brief time we could extend some help to other countries of the earth, and give them a little bit; and then the aid was to taper off gradually, and in a very few years we would be through with it.

That was in 1947. Here we are planning how much further we are going to go year after year after year.

I started tonight to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana, because I thought we had gone far enough. I voted the other night in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to cut off aid to Tito. Why should I not?

As chairman of the Food Board, I had been asked by UNRRA to help send some materials to Yugoslavia, particularly wool. That was years and years ago. I was asked to help send wool to Tito, so that the Yugoslavs could weave it into garments for their children. It was a hard battle to send that wool to Tito, who was a Communist; but we sent the wool, finally, for the poor children of Yugoslavia.

Every pound of that wool was woven into fancy dress uniforms for his army, so that he could parade them back and forth in front of the American troops in the corner of Italy where he was surrounding them at the time.

Do Senators think it is not time some day to call a halt to supplying aid to that individual, when he announces that the Reds are going to stay together from here on out?

I hope that a few Senators, before they vote on this amendment, will consider how they voted on some proposals to extend social security. Some of them voted against some proposals because they involved a few million dollars more than the Treasury could stand. Oh, the Treasury can stand aid for Tito, but it cannot stand aid for grandma, as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] pointed out. Grandma may get along as best she can, so long as Tito has a new plane to fly to Russia. I say to Sen-

ators, "Go home and tell that to a few people, and then compare it with some of the other things which have been taking place." This is the time to get so-called mutual aid on a decent basis. Let us not make it impossible for some Members of the Senate to vote for this bill. Let us try to put it in such shape that it will represent a decent adjustment.

Year after year after year this program has been in effect, although those who planned it thought it would be all over in 4 years. There are men on the floor tonight who made statements as to when it would stop, and statements that they would not vote for any more large foreign aid bills. Yet, year after year it has been going on. Some day we will have to cut it down. I hope this is the time. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana, by any standard, is a sensible amendment, and it should be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I almost feel like shouting "hallelujah" because on this floor for 12 years I have been pleading with Senators to take a good look at the whole proposition of foreign aid.

Not many days ago I appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations and asked them to adopt any kind of amendment which would appropriate any amount of money they wished to appropriate to our own military, to spend as our military thought best.

I said, whether it was \$1 billion, \$2 billion, \$4 billion or \$5 billion, I was willing to turn the protection of my country over to the military. I said I was opposed to appropriating any money for national-defense purposes except to our own military people because they know best whether we should have bases outside the United States, and they should decide what we should do.

Mr. President, I tried very hard to get that kind of amendment adopted by the committee. I can stand on the floor tonight and say that I am one who has never voted in favor of any so-called giveaway. Therefore I feel like shouting "Hallelujah!" I am glad to see Senators on the other side of the aisle getting religion. I am delighted to see them coming around to the same conclusion that many of us have held on this side of the aisle for many, many years, when we have said, "Stop, look, and listen." The other day before the Committee on Foreign Relations I offered an amendment providing not to give away money, but to lend money on long terms; yes, that we lend money to these nations and give them an opportunity to pay it back some day.

I have never been against helping our allies. I have been against the method of helping them. I have always wanted to turn over the money to our own military authorities to spend. I wanted to make loans. Think what it would mean today if all the money we gave to Western Europe—and I think it did a lot of good—were returning to us at the rate of \$500 million a year in repayments. How wonderful it would be if the billions

of dollars we gave away were now coming back, even if only at the rate of \$500 million a year.

I am delighted that Senators on the other side of the aisle are coming to my way of thinking. But where were they when we gave away approximately \$91 billion since World War II ended? Why have they changed their minds all at once? Is it because we have a new President? Is it because they are seeing the light? I hope it is because they are seeing the light, and I think that must be the reason.

But, Mr. President, let us loan the money and get it back some day. Let us appropriate to our own military the money we are going to appropriate for military defense.

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

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does not the Senator realize that the dollars we gave to nations in Europe we could have loaned and could have made them pay back? We could have loaned money again and again, but we kept giving the money, and it is not coming back to us. We keep giving it and giving it out of our own pockets.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Senator from Louisiana remembers, I introduced a substitute for the original Marshall plan, which would have accomplished that very thing. I think it received 29 favorable votes.

Mr. President, I grew up in southern Indiana, in a good old Methodist section, where they held revivals, and I say hallelujah tonight because Senators on the other side of the aisle are getting religion. They are coming around to sound thinking. I congratulate them upon that fact. The unfortunate part of it is that they did not so many years ago. If they had, the story would be different tonight.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, what we have before us this evening in this bill is a committee recommendation submitted to the Senate. It is not only the recommendation of President Eisenhower, but of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Secretary Dulles, the Under Secretary of State, Under Secretary Allen, and the Ambassador to Yugoslavia. All this testimony is to be found in the committee hearings. Every one of them supported a larger appropriation than that recommended by the committee.

Mr. President, if we review what has been accomplished by mutual security appropriations it will be found that a great deal of good has been done. I was a Member of the Senate when we appropriated and made available assistance to Greece and Turkey.

I was a Member of the Senate when we went through the debate on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. What would be the situation today if we had not assisted France, Italy, and England when their own legislative bodies were threatened with a majority of Communist members? What would have been the situation in the South Pacific today had we not given aid in that sec-

tion of the world? What would be the situation in Korea today if it were not for the ROK troops?

Mr. President, far more security is obtained by the amount we are appropriating in the mutual security bill than if we put the money into our own military defense in the United States.

We have confidence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and we know they recommended more than is in this bill. President Eisenhower, one of the greatest military leaders in the world, has recommended more than is in this bill.

Think well before we cast our votes, or we may be instrumental in helping to bring about a nuclear war. If that should come, God help us all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill for the reason that I have tried to keep before me during the past 8 years the fact that we have saved the lives of our boys by building up other nations to help our security here in the United States.

Let us never forget, in spite of some of the arguments we have heard tonight, that this bill is an effort to help save the sons of American parents, our own neighbors and friends.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wished to ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. The Senator knows my respect and admiration for him. His argument a few moments ago was a challenge to us to trust the President and his Joint Chiefs of Staff. Does the Senator from Minnesota not know—does not every Senator on this floor know—that the Joint Chiefs of Staff from Admiral Radford down are now in disagreement over our own military policy? If they are now in such disagreement as they are over the reduction of our Armed Forces by 800,000 men, why should we take their advice to contribute military aid to foreign nations who may turn out to be our enemies?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I would say to my distinguished friend that I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and have sat through military hearings. The only disagreement is that they want more money, not less.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. For foreign countries.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay";

were I permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PORTER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—42

Anderson	Frear	McClellan
Barrett	Goldwater	Monroney
Bible	Gore	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Hruska	Robertson
Capehart	Jackson	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Jenner	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Long	Symington
Eastland	Magnuson	Williams
Ellender	Malone	Wofford
Ervin	McCarthy	Young

NAYS—44

Alken	Hayden	Martin, Pa.
Allott	Hennings	McNamara
Beall	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bender	Holland	Morse
Bennett	Humphrey,	Neuberger
Bridges	Minn.	Pastore
Bush	Humphreys,	Payne
Butler	Ky.	Purtell
Carlson	Ives	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Knowland	Thye
Douglas	Kuchel	Watkins
Duff	Laird	Wiley
Flanders	Lehman	
George	Martin, Iowa	

NOT VOTING—10

Daniel	Mansfield	Scott
Fulbright	Murray	Welker
Green	Neely	
Kefauver	Potter	

So Mr. ELLENDER's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 5, to strike out "\$1,735,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,300,000,000." [Putting the question.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I demand the yeas and nays on the adoption of the committee amendment. I want the RECORD to contain full proof of the votes of all our colleagues.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the committee amendment is adopted will that foreclose the offering of amendments to cut off aid to Yugoslavia? Will it foreclose the amendment previously offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that it will cut off amendments to this particular amendment only.

The yeas and nays have been ordered on the committee amendment on page 2, line 5, to strike out "\$1,735,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,300,000,000," the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

On the vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—50

Alken	Hayden	Millikin
Allott	Hennings	Morse
Beall	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bender	Holland	Neuberger
Bennett	Humphrey	Pastore
Bridges	Minn.	Payne
Bush	Humphreys	Purtell
Butler	Ky.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Ives	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Case, N. J.	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Ruchel	Sparkman
Douglas	Laird	Thye
Duff	Lehman	Watkins
Flanders	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin, Pa.	
George	McNamara	

NAYS—39

Anderson	Frear	Mansfield
Barrett	Goldwater	McCarthy
Eble	Gore	McClellan
Bricker	Hill	Monroney
Eyrd	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Robertson
Chavez	Jenner	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Curtis	Kerr	Stennis
Dworshak	Langer	Symington
Eastland	Long	Williams
Ellender	Magnuson	Wofford
Ervin	Malone	Young

NOT VOTING—7

Daniel	Murray	Welker
Green	Neely	
Kefauver	Potter	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 3955. A bill to authorize research by the Fish and Wildlife Service to determine methods of, and to provide for grants to the States to assist approved research or other projects for, control or extermination of sea nettles and jellyfish in marine waters of the United States (Rept. No. 2701).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 2128. A bill to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls (Rept. No. 2704);

H. R. 8110. A bill to incorporate the National Music Council (Rept. No. 2705);

H. J. Res. 317. Joint resolution designating the week of November 16 to 22, 1956, as National Farm-City Week (Rept. No. 2702); and

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to establish a national motto of the United States (Rept. No. 2703).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H. R. 9348. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act incorporating the Archeological Institute of America" to increase the value of real and personal property that such institute may hold (Rept. No. 2706).

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

S. 2915. A bill for the relief of Peter Panos (Rept. No. 2707);

H. R. 1971. A bill for the relief of Leila Park (Rept. No. 2708);

H. R. 2121. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2709);

H. R. 2325. A bill for the relief of Joseph Santo (Rept. No. 2716);

H. R. 2712. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Mathes (Rept. No. 2717);

H. R. 3561. A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "an act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries" (Rept. No. 2718);

H. R. 3882. A bill to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2719);

H. R. 5417. A bill to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps (Rept. No. 2720);

H. R. 6081. A bill for the relief of Patricia May Stevens (Rept. No. 2721);

H. R. 6247. A bill to amend subdivision a of section 66—unclaimed moneys—of the

Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision b of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (Rept. No. 2722);

H. R. 6403. A bill to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," of the United States Code, to provide a criminal sanction for the embezzlement or theft of the property of Indian tribal organizations (Rept. No. 2723);

H. R. 7121. A bill to validate payments of mileage made to United States Army and Air Force personnel pursuant to permanent change of station orders authorizing travel by commercial aircraft, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2724);

H. R. 8617. A bill to validate certain payments made to members and former members of the naval service (Rept. No. 2725);

H. R. 8971. A bill for the relief of Hamazasp Psakian, Mrs. Varsenick Psakian, and Nune Nona Psakian (Rept. No. 2726);

H. R. 9029. A bill for the relief of John L. Hughes (Rept. No. 2727);

H. R. 9314. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Illinois and Wisconsin to enter into a compact relating to interstate public-school districts where an educational community extends into both such States (Rept. No. 2728);

H. R. 9956. A bill to amend subdivision e of section 58, Notices, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended (Rept. No. 2729);

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 (Rept. No. 2730);

H. R. 11636. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, relating to animals, birds, and fish (Rept. No. 2731);

H. R. 11653. A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2732);

H. R. 11706. A bill for the relief of Kim Chung Hi (Rept. No. 2733);

H. R. 11821. A bill for the relief of Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel (Rept. No. 2734);

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935 (Rept. No. 2735); and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2736).

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

S. 2786. A bill for the relief of Yi Nyong Suk (Rept. No. 2710);

S. 3476. A bill for the relief of Ljerka Zagar (Rept. No. 2711);

S. 3908. A bill for the relief of Peter Jocher Webb (Rept. No. 2712);

S. 4197. A bill to waive the \$1,000 limitation on the authority of the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy with respect to the settlement and payment of claims arising out of the crash of a United States Air Force airplane at Minneapolis, Minn., on June 5, 1956, and a United States Navy airplane at Minneapolis, Minn., on June 9, 1956 (Rept. No. 2713);

S. 4238. A bill to waive the \$1,000 limitation on the authority of the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy in the settlement of claims arising out of the crash of a United States Air Force aircraft and a United States Navy aircraft near Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn., on June 5, 1956, and June 9, 1956, respectively (Rept. No. 2714);

H. R. 5274. A bill extending to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States (Rept. No. 2737); and

H. R. 11207. A bill for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer (Rept. No. 2738).

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

S. 2627. A bill for the relief of Hermengildo V. Santos and his son, Felipe Cruz Santos (Rept. No. 2715);

H. R. 3062. A bill for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr. (Rept. No. 2739);

H. R. 10092. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation (Rept. No. 2740);

H. J. Res. 662. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens (Rept. No. 2741);

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2742);

H. J. Res. 681. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2743); and

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 2744).

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF SEPTEMBER 3, 1954—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CARLSON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6888) to amend the act of September 3, 1954, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 12170) to remove the present \$1,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a naval aircraft at the Wold-Chamberlain Airfield, Minneapolis, Minn., was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 20, 1956, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 277. An act for the relief of Jean Pfeiffer;

S. 1627. An act for the relief of Alexander Orlov and his wife, Maria Orlov;

S. 1708. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest M. Kersh;

S. 1893. An act for the relief of Harold D. Robison;

S. 2846. An act for the relief of Don-chean Chu;

S. 3073. An act to grant a franchise to District of Columbia Transit System, Inc., and for other purposes;

S. 3150. An act for the relief of Sgt. and Mrs. Herbert G. Herman;

S. 3473. An act for the relief of Kurt Johan Paro;

S. 3498. An act to extend authority of the American Battle Monuments Commission to all areas in which the Armed Forces of the United States have conducted operations since April 6, 1917, and for other purposes;

S. 3579. An act for the relief of Elizabeth M. A. de Cuevas Faure; and

S. 3705. An act to require periodic survey by the Secretary of Commerce of national shipbuilding capability.

RECESS TO TOMORROW, SATURDAY, AT 10 A. M.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have conferred with the minority leader.

We have had a rather long day; and it does not appear to me that we shall be able to complete our action on this bill at a reasonable hour this evening.

All Members have been very cooperative. We have had several ye-and-nay votes, and we probably shall have several more before action on the bill is finished.

Mr. President, if acceptable to the Senate and agreeable to all Senators, I shall move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 10 o'clock.

So, Mr. President, unless some Senator wishes to address the Senate or make an insertion in the Record, I so move.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, July 21, 1956, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 20 (legislative day of July 16), 1956:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Morocco.

Christian M. Ravndal, of Iowa, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ecuador.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo, Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to be also a member of the Mississippi River Commission, vice Rear Adm. Lee Otis Colbert.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Col. Charles H. Schilling, O23707, for appointment as professor of military art and engineering, United States Military Academy, effective August 1, 1956, under the provisions of Public Law 449, 79th Congress, and section 520 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. George William Hickman, Jr., O16420, United States Army, for appointment as the Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Army, as major general, Regular Army, and as major general (temporary), Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 208 (c) and 308, Army Organization Act of 1950, section 249, Selective Service Act of 1948 and section 515 (c), Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Rldgely Gaither, O15970, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Joseph Howard Harper, O15083, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Peter Conover Hains, 3d, O15657, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Lawrence Russell Dewey, O15575, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Richard Givens Prather, O15698, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Milchrist Cannon, O16163, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Thaddeus Sexton, O15777, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Raleigh Raymond Hendrix, O15897, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Murphy Willems, O16176, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, O15952, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Paul Alfred Disney, O17004, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Highman Booth, O18093, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Louis Watson Truman, O18755, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Bruce Douglas Rindlaub, O17513, United States Army.

Col. Paul Goodrick Hollister, O29547, United States Army.

Col. Irvin Louia Allen, O29810, United States Army.

Col. George Waite Coolidge, O17599, United States Army.

Col. Richard Allen Ridsen, O19278, United States Army.

Col. Thomas Ralph Yancey, O42256, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

The officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954, Public Law 773, 83d Congress.

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Harold Arthur Doherty, O2270961, National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Frank Edwin Fraser, O222901, National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Ward Henry, O1293051, National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Jacobson, Jr., O102326, National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Fred William Makinney, O998010, National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Daniel Joseph Manning, O307848, United States Army Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Murray Mayfield, O168962, United States Army Reserve.

Brig. Gen. John Martin McGreevy, O278060, National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Edward Josephus McGrew, Jr., O265015, United States Army Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Richard King Mellon, O902002, National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Joe Nickell, O246192, National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Maxwell Evans Rich, O323746, National Guard of the United States.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Frederick Henry Garber, O385526, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Frank Smith Hummel, O225597, Artillery, National Guard of the United States.

Col. Clark Hungerford, O171068, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Franklin Martin Kreml, O909816, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.

Col. Everette Herbert Qualls, O216229, Transportation Corps, United States Army Reserve.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve Commissioned Officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Congress), as amended:

To be major generals

Col. Albert Dermont Sheppard, O190904, United States Army Reserve, Retired Reserve.

Col. J. J. Bethurum Williams, O5202, Regular Army, retired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be colonels, Medical Corps

Aronson, Roland S., O29206.
Avner, Saul L., O41701.
Bambace, Felix S., O56797.
Blair, John D., O41736.
Bonsignore, Marco R., O29237.
Bruce, Charles O., O20542.
Byrne William H., O29244.
Cameron, Joseph M., O29180.
Canada, Charles C., O29257.
Carow, Theodore M., O20527.
Carpenter, George R., O51147.
Cavenaugh, Robert LaT., O20090.
Conrad, Harold A., O39654.
Dehne, Ernst O56790.
Dietrich, Sterrett E., O58681.
Domke, Delmar E., O22788.
Draper, William B., O29176.
Duke, Raymond E., O20110.
Faison, Thomas G., O29254.
Fenton, Bryan C. T., O20088.
Glass, Albert J., O29247.
Gordon, James H., O29227.
Goyette, Edwin M., O20530.
Hanson, Lawrence B., O56783.
Hirschmann, Victor R., O20081.
Hoagland, Robert J., O20516.
Inman, James G., O41734.
Iseman, Joseph W., O39651.
Jastremski, Bruno, O20526.
Jobe, Louis H., Jr., O22777.
Kelley, Robert R., O20984.
Kendrick, Douglas B., Jr., O20511.
Lerro, Santino J., O20540.
Mantell, Louis K., O20035.
Marx, Ralph L., O22262.
McBurney, Harold S., O29248.
McCoy, George W., Jr., O19685.
Meador, Clark B., O20395.
Mitchell, Charles H., O41731.
Moseley, Charles H., O20402.
Mowrey, Fred H., O19687.
Naimark, Max, O19303.
Orth, Gottlieb L., O20509.
Paden, Paul A., O20981.
Pappas, James P., O21017.
Peterson, Donald B., O20535.
Salley, Colvin W., O29205.
Scheele, Andrew F., O21475.
Shiflet, Albert W., O20507.
Simmons, James Q., Jr., O41720.
Spaulding, William L., O19704.
Strode, John T. B., O19709.
Stryker, William B., O19691.
Taber, John H., O20987.
Taylor, Harlan H., O58748.
Thomas, Lucius G., O19688.
Van Auken, Howard A., O20096.
Van Valin, James C., O20080.
Van Wagoner, Frank H., O20095.
Wernitznig, Edward R., O20505.
Williams, Raymond McK., O20399.
Zimmermann, Edward A., O29230.

To be colonel, Medical Service Corps

Belanger, Gerard A., O19333.
Blasingame, Floyd J., O51175.
Bunn, Ralph W., O41762.
Bynum, Robert M., Jr., O39649.
Cannon, Alfred R., O41725.
Coddington, Harvey W., O29316.
Fletcher, Maurice J., O41727.
Freeman, Monroe E., O56826.
Galvin, James D., Jr., O29263.
Hage, Gunnar H., O29313.
Karpen, Raymond J., O41764.
Kuhn, Ludwig R., O41752.
Pennepacker, Russell O., O52005.
Quarton, Reginald R., O39663.
Reed, Kenneth H., O29203.
Richhart, Earl A., O29210.
Schlaak, Melvin V., O29253.
Stoltz, Ray E., O29225.
Taylor, Harold W., O39661.
Tennies, Leslie G., O41715.
Wintersteen, Joseph O., O51168.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

To be first lieutenants

Carey, Milton G., O68333.
Cole, William W., O73304.
Connolly, William J., O68963.
Connors, James P., O73307.
Cooper, Hamilton A., O73308.
Cowley, John F., Jr., O73310.
Damon, James A., Jr., O73314.
Donahue, Robert J., O73318.
Dunn, James F., Jr., O73320.
Gallher, Kay D., O73332.
Gillespie, John T., O73335.
Graham, James A., Jr., O66945.
Harlan, John R., O73342.
Heath, Arthur M., O73501.
Imhoff, Maximilian, O73347.
Jordan, Donald R., O73351.
Leszczynski, Joseph J., O73366.
Mays, Robert, E., O73372.
McKay, William L., O73374.
Mountain, Benjamin, O73379.
Thomas, Giles R., Jr., O73413.
Ton, James G., O73417.
Woolaver, Philip A., O73432.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Ellis, Janet M., L483.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Radke, Myron G., O73479.

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Beitzel, Barbara A., J83.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), section 201, title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 37, 83d Congress, and Public Law 294, 84th Congress:

To be captains

Horton, Warren H., JAGC, O1117881.
Marubayashi, Stanley T., MC, O4014036.
Sandison, Richard L., MSC, O1848912.

To be first lieutenants

Arrieta-Pla, Jose R., MC, O1924379.
Didlock, Mary E., ANC, N901397.
Duncan, Tommye J., AMSC, J100290.

Ekberg, Helen I., ANC, N804852.
Galloway, Marie E., ANC, N900100.
Greene, Hazel L., Jr., MSC, O2050490.
Huntsman, Howard A., Jr., MSC, O995793.
Kressler, Alta, ANC, N797604.
Pritchard, Mary L., ANC, N900190.
Simons, Elizabeth A., ANC, N804339.
Smith, Roy R., MSC, O1941537.

To be second lieutenant

Capitolo, Phillip G., MSC, O4019462.
Carroll, Elizabeth A., ANC, N902098.
Evans, Billy W., MSC, O2272437.
Glenn, Dwight W., MSC, O4004858.
Hubert, Alexander A., MSC, O2271540.
Knox, Alice I., ANC, N902127.
Larson, Arnella J., ANC, N902483.
Nichols, Glennadee A., ANC, N901488.
Piper, Donald R., MSC, O4002504.
Russell, James L., Jr., MSC, O2270349.
Stiles, Peter W., MSC, O4006300.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service, in the grades specified:

To be captain

Newbold, William M., O37538.

To be first lieutenants

Lewis, Alfred E., O70406.
McDonald, Billy A., O71939.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 201, title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, subject to completion of internship:

Schoenfeld, Jay B.
Tidmore, Thomas L., Jr., O4043600.

The following-named person for appointment in the Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 201, title II, Public Law 365, 80th Congress, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress, upon receipt of DDS degree:

Gerhard, Roy C., O2089481.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Congress):

Butler, Elbert L., Jr., O1876460.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Davis, Warren L. Holt, Richard L.
Delandro, Donald J. Siegel, Lewis A.
Hermes, Alfred M. Whaley, Cole B., Jr.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 20 (legislative day of July 16), 1956:

UNITED NATIONS

Paul G. Hoffman, of California, to be a Representative of the United States of America to the 11th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

Kermit H. Hansen, of Iowa, to be Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration.

IN THE ARMY

To be retired

Gen. Alfred Maximilian Gruenther, O12242, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the pro-

visions of subsec. 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President (sec. 504 of Officer Personnel Act of 1947) to rank as lieutenant general:

Maj. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500, United States Army.

Maj. Gen. Francis William Farrell, O12784, United States Army.

Maj. Gen. John Francis Uncles, O14914, United States Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsec. 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Evan McLaren Houseman, O17307.

Brig. Gen. Robert William Porter, Jr., O18048.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Roy Norman Walker, O29112.

Col. Philip Frederick Kromer, Jr., O18030.

Col. Alden Pugh Taber, O18134.

Col. Frederick Dwight Atkinson, O18169.

Col. John Clement Monahan, O38706.

Col. Frederick William Ellery, O18725.

Col. George Thigpen Duncan, O18878.

Col. William Mackentyre Thames, Jr., O29846.

Col. Robert Campbell Tripp, O18972.

Col. James Hilliard Polk, O19028.

Col. Sherburne Whipple, Jr., O19130.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of secs. 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and sec. 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended; to the rank indicated. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be major

Carter, Billy June, 20520A.

Park, Oakley Knox, 20823A.

Smith, Edward Patrick, Jr., 20825A.

Goggans, Walter Houseal, 20828A.

Miller, Richard Kewenige, 20830A.

Bear, Stanley Herman, 20826A.

Borders, James Lane, 21424A.

Tenney, Alonzo Cass, 21425A.

Troxell, John Robert, 21682A.

Spencer, W. B., 21683A.

Karmany, William Hummel, 21724A.

Stonehill, Robert Berrell, 21684A.

Barnum, Ferdinand, 22544A.

Whitehouse, Wesley Clay, Jr., 22545A.

Foley, Francis Edward, 19543A.

Payne, John William, 19544A.

Hessberg, Rufus Rosendale, Jr., 24647A.

Myers, Paul Walter, 21761A.

Shugart, Richard Tatum, 21843A.

Spiegel, Frederick Sigfried, 21842A.

Gilliland Jack Melvin, 21844A.

DENTAL CORPS

To be majors

Walker, Frederick Eugene, 19823A.

LaVere, Arthur Michael, 19824A.

Tomey, William Hayes, 19825A.

McNutt, John Howard, 19822A.

Armstrong, Russell Herion, 19911A.

Doran, Arthur Samuel, 19960A.

Cole, Thomas Robert, 19959A.

Michalik, Walter James, 20007A.

Feldmann, Earl Edwin, 20008A.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be majors

Kuhn, Ulysses Simpson Grant, 3d 19012A.

Fremming, Benjamin DeWitt, 19013A.

NURSE CORPS

To be majors

Keso, Frieda Emily, 21913W.

King, Helen Hadley, 21918W.

Ward, Patricia Inez, 21930W.

Wiggins, Mary Louise, 20975W.

Ardoin, Elena Mary, 21949W.

Reed, Eleanor R., 20982W.

Cosma, Helen Rose, 20983W.

Upshaw, Esther Long, 20924W.

Otto, Suzanne Marie, 21967W.

Waters, Mary Hulda, 21027W.

Gates, Mary Templeton, 21055W.

Patterson, Mary A., 20996W.

Reppak, Mary Jean, 20941W.

McGibboney, Sadie Lee, 22462W.

Duey, Jane M., 21059W.

Fussell, Ruth Elizabeth, 21108W.

Michalka, Pauline Theresa, 22011W.

Bakutis, Alice Rose, 22026W.

Quintini, Audrae A., 21123W.

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

To be captains

Hocker, James Snyder, 28165A.

Caulfield, James Edward, 28028A.

Rutherford, William Fain, 28166A.

Abrams, Carl Robert, 28167A.

Achee, Carl Edward, 28029A.

Nabers, James McSwain, 28168A.

Stanley, Russell Alfred, 28030A.

King, J. T., 28169A.

diDonato, Louis Vincent, 28031A.

Gray, Prichard Edwin, 28170A.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be captains

Earle, Jack Landis, 27991A.

Thorpe, James Hancock, 28134A.

Lindall, Dale Regnar, 27992A.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captain

Stephens, Belton Shaw, 27997A.

CHAPLAIN

To be captains

Monsen, Ralph Robert, 28155A.

Goetz, Charles Theodore, 28000A.

Haney, Paul Stephen, 28156A.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE NAVY

John C. Zimmerman (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensign in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Yorke G. Jacobson (civilian college graduate) to be lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be commander

Virgil E. Selbert

To be lieutenant commander

Jesse A. Browers

To be lieutenants

Robert A. Brown

Lewis N. Cahill

David E. Cowan

Robert W. Frazier

Rafael Garces-Rivera

James L. Glass, Jr.

Don C. Higgins

John H. Mazur

Paul D. Mozley

Bernabe G. Ostolaza

Edward C. Sacher

Robert A. Smith

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be commander

Joseph F. Taggard

To be lieutenant

Lloyd B. Chaisson

The following-named Reserve officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of

the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be captain

George R. Reynolds

To be commander

Lee P. Sharp

To be lieutenant commander

"J" Weir Mitchell

To be lieutenants

Ethan C. Allen

Robert A. Gaston

Marion M. Black, Jr.

Harry S. Riley

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Joseph S. Tramontana

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the line in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenants

Wayne H. Atkin

Howard A. Hill

Charles A. Aus

William B. Kalmus

James A. Babbitt, Jr.

Charles L. Mann, Jr.

Charles G. Batten

Ernest R. Nordtvedt

Carl Blaskowsky

John E. O'Drain

Daniel T. Bridge

Raymond E. Paul

William R. Bryant

Harmon E. J. Stanch

Bufford R. Brymer

Robert J. Stinner

Herbert J. Burrows

James J. Sullivan

William C. Green

Richard T. Thomas

Robert F. Gregg

Lawrence E. Traynor

Warren C. Hamm, Jr.

Bernard W. Welch

Charles T. Hampton

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Reece L. Andrews

Jack R. Gunter

Warren E. Aut

Arnold J. Hyman

Walter F. Baker

Ralph S. Larson

Charles B. Beuris

James W. McKinsten

John A. Byrne, Jr.

Gary A. McMahon

Alan S. Cabot

George W. Milam

John F. Dempsey

Don G. Primeau

David R. Giblett

John F. Sauers

FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenants

Calvin C. Dudley

Jason P. Law

George D. Murdoch

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Wayne H. Atkin

Kenneth E. Hammond

Charles A. Aus

Charles T. Hampton

David W. Ayers

Byron R. Higgins

James A. Babbitt, Jr.

Raymond F. Higgins

Charles G. Batten

Howard A. Hill

Reo A. Beaulieu

Lawrence G. Holt

Edward J. Belinski

Richard B. Howe

Carl Blaskowsky

Roswell L. Howell

Daniel T. Bridge

Marcel B. Humber

Burris Jenkins III

William R. Bryant

Forrest R. Johns

Thomas E. Jones

William B. Kalmus

William N. Kelt

Leonard Kleeman

Thomas J. LeBeau

Robert McN. Loftus

John C. Loucks

Fred T. Chalmers

John H. McKay

Edmond J. D'Arville

Gerald A. McKenna

Gordon J. Dey

James D. McLuckie

James C. MacKinnon, III

Charles L. Martin, Jr.

Jack L. Marriott

James K. Martin

George W. Mau, Jr.

Clifford D. Moran

Millard T. Gardner III

Dean R. Morford

George C. Gatje

Norman A. Nelson

Felix P. Gigliotti

James A. Newcomb

Robert H. Glaves

Robert B. Newton

Jimmy O. Gold

Richard L. Nichols

Frank O. Goodwin, Jr.

Ernest R. Nordtvedt

Robert F. Gregg

John T. O'Der

William C. Green

John E. O'Drain

Webster Griffith

Bernard J. O'Rourke

Warren C. Hamm, Jr.

Raymond E. Paul

Walter R. Petersen John F. Sweeney
Lawrence Phillips, Jr. Richard T. Thomas
Robert L. Rasmussen George I. Thompson
Phillip D. Richardson Lawrence E. Traynor
David L. Self Barrie K. Trebor-Mac-
James E. Service Connell
Howard W. Smith David A. VanHorssen
Herman A. Spanagel, Donald E. Vaden
Jr. John E. Wasson
Harmon E. J. Stanch Robert H. Weeks
Harold F. Stevens Bernard W. Welch
Donald E. Stine Robert L. Williamson
Robert J. Stinner Doane R. Willis, Jr.
Donald J. Stromme Jon C. Woodyard
James J. Sullivan Richard A. Zick

To be ensigns

Reece L. Andrews Arnold J. Hyman
Warren E. Aut Ralph S. Larson
Walter F. Baker James W. McKinsten
Charles B. Beuris Gary A. McMahon
John A. Byrne, Jr. George W. Milam
Alan S. Cabot Don G. Primeau
John F. Dempsey John F. Sauers
David R. Giblett Ned H. Shows
Jack R. Gunter Warren H. Winchester

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the line in the Navy (engineering duty), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenant

William T. Hale.

FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenant

Robert A. Dauber.

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

William T. Hale.

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the line in the Navy (aeronautical engineering duty), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Leroy B. Keely.

FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT

To be ensign

Leroy B. Keely.

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the line in the Navy (special duty, communications), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenant

John S. Jennings.

FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

John S. Jennings.

Alan C. Patureau, Reserve officer.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the line in the Navy (special duty, law), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Henry S. Palau

To be ensign

Lee R. Grogan

The following-named women officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Mary A. Collins Henrietta R. Lanier
Barbara G. Ellis Lida J. McDonough

FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Barbara J. Deerkop Nancy G. Hollenbeck
Marabelle Dowler

To be ensigns

Mary A. Collins Henrietta R. Lanier
Barbara G. Ellis Lida J. McDonough

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenants

Carter E. Carlton, Jr. Fred R. Portney
Thomas S. Dunn, Jr. Charles U. Shilling
Elgar P. Ellis, Jr. Martin F. Sokoloff
Vernon H. Fitchett Robert C. Thomas
James D. Gross Alexander G. Webb,
Ralph A. Heising Jr.
Max C. Karrer Morton D. Willcuts,
James W. Ledwith Jr.
Clinton J. McGrew, John R. Williams, Jr.
Jr. Bernard S. Yurick
Robert L. Mullin

FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Carter E. Carlton, Robert L. Mullin
Jr. Fred R. Portney
Thomas S. Dunn, Jr. Charles U. Shilling
Elgar P. Ellis, Jr. Martin F. Sokoloff
Vernon H. Fitchett Robert C. Thomas
James D. Gross Alexander G. Webb,
Ralph A. Heising Jr.
Max C. Karrer Morton D. Willcuts,
James W. Ledwith Jr.
Clinton J. McGrew, John R. Williams, Jr.
Jr. Bernard S. Yurick

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the Dental Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenants

Earl M. Carson James W. Hays
Russell A. Grandich Harry C. Pebley

FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Earl M. Carson James W. Hays
Russell A. Grandich Harry C. Pebley

The following-named officers for appointment to grade indicated in the Medical Service Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenant

Donald E. Still

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Warren R. Sanborn

FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenant

Richard B. Tallafarro, Jr.

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Donald E. Still

To be ensigns

Kenneth H. Dickerson
Warren R. Sanborn

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenants

William C. Fanely Jesse R. Hill, Jr.
To be lieutenants (junior grade)
Richard D. Christen- John W. Horrigan, Jr.
son Brian K. Lewis
Charles A. Hawkins William H. Riordan

FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT

*To be lieutenants**To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Joe A. Allinder, Jr. Nathan N. Burling-
William M. Bledsoe ham
Russell M. Brown Walter E. Conner

Lawrence J. Costello Fred A. Kling
William C. Fanely Marvin H. Lewis
William J. Hennessy Gardiner Marek
Jesse R. Hill, Jr. Frank J. Pokorny,
Donald K. Howe, Jr. Jr.
Charles C. Hubbard Ralph W. Price
William E. Kenealy, Thomas L. Schanz
Jr. George W. Stewart
John F. Kenny III

To be ensigns

Richard D. Christen- John W. Horrigan,
son Jr.
Charles A. Hawkins William H. Riordan
Brian K. Lewis

Mildred L. Odom, Reserve officer, for appointment in the Supply Corps in the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign and in the temporary grade of lieutenant (junior grade), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenant

Normand A. Richard

FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenant

Alan R. Gibbons

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Walter B. Feagins, Jr. Stanford E. Linzey, Jr.
John T. Goad Normand A. Richard
Homer E. Keen, Jr. Carl E. Ruud

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Warren H. Anderson Joseph A. D'Emidio
Edward F. Callahan, Richard H. Schellhardt
Jr. Bobby E. Stultz

The following-named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps in the Navy, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenants

Daisy Evans
Gretchen S. Hill
Pauline J. Kuenzi

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Joanne P. Smith

FOR PERMANENT APPOINTMENT

To be lieutenants

Dorothy I. McShea
Josephine M. Polignone

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Daisy Evans
Gretchen S. Hill
Pauline J. Kuenzi

To be ensign

Joanne P. Smith

Telofl Dmoch, for permanent appointment to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4, in the United States Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the United States Navy for temporary service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be chief warrant officer, W-2

Charles D. Albers Dave Nicholson
Roderick E. Bookout Gilbert H. Orr
William C. Faus John V. Patterson, Jr.
Camden E. Greene Hans J. Petersen
William D. Lankford Walter H. Routledge
Dean W. Larrick Leslie B. Ware
John R. Melton George K. Wolfes

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named Marine Corps Reserve officers for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be second lieutenants

John J. Caldas, Jr.	David H. Murch
Donald S. Carr	John A. Schuyler
William G. Ficere, Jr.	Lionel V. Silva
Robert A. Freeman	Gordon D. Strand
Donald J. Hatch	Everett L. Tunget
Richard B. Hohman	Norman H. Vreeland
Brian C. Kelly	Dwayne E. T. Wilson
James A. McCarty	

The following-named Marine Corps officer for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Marine Corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

To be chief warrant officer, W-3

Cedric A. Fevury

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 20, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-blessed God, through Thy grace and power our forefathers gained the freedom and the liberties which we now enjoy as a priceless heritage.

Grant that we and all succeeding generations may preserve and perpetuate those blessings in righteousness and in honor.

We humbly acknowledge that again and again, in our domestic affairs and foreign relations, we find it necessary to make decisions which seem to involve tremendous risks.

God forbid that we should ever hesitate or be afraid to take the adventurous ways of faith and follow Thy leading.

Inspire us daily to wait upon the Lord and be of good courage for where Thou dost guide Thou wilt provide.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our Salvation. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 5519. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain tracts of land in El Paso County, Tex., to the city of El Paso, Tex., in exchange for certain lands to be conveyed by the city of El Paso, Tex., to the United States Government;

H. R. 8047. An act granting authority to the Secretary of the Army to renew the license of the Ira D. MacLachlan Post, No. 3, the American Legion, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., to use a certain parcel of land in St. Marys Falls Canal project;

H. R. 9081. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey a 3-acre tract of land situated about 6 miles south of the city of San Antonio, in Bexar County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

H. R. 9801. An act to authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct,

maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa, Canal Zone.

H. J. Res. 549. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the State of New York to negotiate and enter into an agreement or compact with the Government of Canada for the establishment of the Niagara Frontier Port Authority with power to take over, maintain, and operate the present highway bridge over the Niagara River between the city of Buffalo, N. Y., and the city of Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada;

H. J. Res. 604. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York, New York, from April 14 to April 27, 1957, and in the Oklahoma Semi-Centennial Celebration to be held in various communities in the State of Oklahoma from January 1 to December 31, 1957; and

H. J. Res. 664. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11947. An act to amend and extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3903) entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5881) entitled "An act to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 849) entitled "An act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions for construction of facilities for research in crippling and killing diseases such as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, nervous disorders, mental illness, arthritis, and rheumatism, blindness, cerebral palsy, tuberculosis, multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, cystic fibrosis, and muscular dystrophy, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2182) entitled "An act for the relief of the city of Elkins, W. Va."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3073) entitled "An act to provide for an adequate and economically sound transportation system or systems to serve the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes."

THE SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. 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 H. R. 12138, the supplemental appropriation bill, 1957.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill and I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have until midnight tonight to file minority views upon the bill and that the report be printed with the majority report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CITY OF ELKINS, W. VA.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2182) for the relief of the city of Elkins, W. Va., 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 Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2759)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2182) entitled, "An Act for the relief of the city of Elkins, West Virginia," having met, after full