SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1959

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

Rev. John Robertson McCartney, D.D., pastor of the Palm Springs, Calif., Presbyterian Church, offered the following prayer:

Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain who build it.

Let us pray:

God of our life, through all the circling years, we trust in Thee. In all the past, through all our hopes and fears, Thy hand we see. With each new day, when morning lifts the veil, we own Thy mercies, Lord, which never fail.

These are the gifts we ask of Thee, spirit serene;
Strength for the daily task, courage to face the road,
Good cheer to help me bear the traveler's load,
And for the hours of rest that come between
An inward joy in all things heard and seen.

These are the sins I fain would have Thee take away:
Malice and cold disdain,
Hot anger, sullen hate,
Scorn of the lowly, and envy of the great, and discontent,
Which casts a shadow gray
O'er all the beauty of the common day.

An especial blessing, we ask, O God, upon these, Thy servants, to whom the people have entrusted the guidance of the Ship of State. O how they need a lift from Thee, that they may nobly preserve the traditions of our past and praise the God who hath made and kept us a nation. Have in Thy loving care and keeping the President and Vice President of these United States, the Members of the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, the Senate, the House of Representatives, our armies the world around, and their loved ones. Especially, O Lord, this day do we pray for our diplomats, that they may be given wisdom in the deliberations which are deciding the destinies of our country and the world. Speed the day when the Prince of Peace shall come and when the war drums shall beat no longer, the battle flags be furled, and the kingdoms of this world shall become the Kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 2, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 88. An act to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct certain discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes;

H.R. 1434. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elba Haverstick Cash;

H.R. 1705. An act for the relief of Louis J. DeWinter and Simone H. DeWinter;

H.R. 3088. An act to amend sections 353 and 354 of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

H.R. 5836. An act for the relief of Dorothy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley; and

H.J. Res. 354. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

H.R. 88. An act to amend chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that certain boards established thereunder shall give consideration to satisfactory evidence relating to good character and exemplary conduct in civilian life after discharge or dismissal in determining whether or not to correct discharges and dismissals; to authorize the award of an exemplary rehabilitation certificate; and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5836. An act for the relief of Dorothy E. Green and Thelma L. Alley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 1434. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elba Haverstick Cash;

H.R. 1705. An act for the relief of Louis J. DeWinter and Simone H. DeWinter;

H.R. 3088. An act to amend sections 353 and 354 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

H.J. Res. 354. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PREVENTION OF WATERFOWL DEPREDATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 492), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with Federal and non-Federal agencies in the prevention of waterfowl depredations, and for other purposes" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1959

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

A letter from the Chairman and members, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the calendar year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

FINANCING OF CERTAIN HIGHWAYS FROM HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 209(f)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 in order to provide for the financing of forest highways and public lands highways from the highway trust fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Public Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, fiscal year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, fiscal years 1957 and 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PRICING OF SELECTED DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE CONTRACTS AND SUBCONTRACTS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the pricing of selected Department of the Air Force contracts and subcontracts, dated May 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON RECEIPT OF PROJECT PROPOSAL UNDER SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT OF 1956

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that the South San Joaquin Irrigation District of Manteca, Calif., had applied for a loan of $4,900,000 for project works estimated to cost $6,288,000; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 36

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to assure the continuance of surveys and planning and cooperation in the construction of projects of the State of Ohio that are vital and necessary to the control of floods and the conservation of soil and water by sufficient appropriations being granted for this purpose to the Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the Corps of Engineers, and other Federal agencies and departments

"Whereas water and soil are the most valuable natural resources of Ohio; and

"Whereas the citizens, industries, farms, and cities of Ohio have always been subject to floods, but more recently they have experienced severe hardships and great financial losses from floods; and

"Whereas the nature of rivers is such that storms occuring in headwater regions of a stream in one area frequently inflict damage to points in other areas, and the benefits of stream stabilization resulting in adequate and dependable water supplies in one area become beneficial to points in other areas; and

"Whereas it has become evident that we must use every means available and feasible to conserve and control all of the sources of water supply for agricultural, municipal, industrial, and recreational use; and

"Whereas watershed development has been increasingly emphasized as vital to all programs for the flood control and conservation of water and soil by the several agencies of Government, and the program is lagging because of the insufficiency of Federal funds for planning purposes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government through acts of Congress has delegated to two agencies, namely, the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture the primary responsibility for flood control and conservation of water and soil: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio*, That we respectfully urge, request, and petition the Congress of the United States to take such action necessary to assure (1) continuance of surveys, planning and cooperation in the construction of projects in the State of Ohio that are vital and necessary to the prevention of floods and to the conservation of water and soil and (2) that Federal funds for this purpose be appropriated in sufficient amounts to the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and also other Federal agencies and departments; and that we adopt this resolution and cause a copy thereof to be spread upon the Journal; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the Senate transmit authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of the Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States."

"JOSEPH W. BARTUNEK,
"*Clerk of the Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Finance:

"'ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 13

"'Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to aid the mining industry in Nevada and other sections of the United States either by imposing tariffs or by other reasonable and effective methods so that the United States may become more prosperous and be assured of a constant supply of minerals necessary for an effective defense program

"'Whereas the mining industry in Nevada and other sections of the United States has been seriously curtailed by the importation of minerals from foreign countries in which the costs of production are much lower than those which prevail in the United States under American standards; and

"'Whereas many areas of the United States are dependent in large measure upon the production of metals for the maintenance of their economics, and the drastic curtailment of such production has seriously affected the welfare of such areas through losses of revenue to local merchants, employees, business enterprises, and State and local governments; and

"'Whereas a healthy, stable domestic mining industry is a key to national security because without such industry the United States cannot be assured of a constant supply of minerals necessary for an effective defense program; now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to aid the mining industry of Nevada and other sections of the United States either by imposing tariffs or by other reasonable and effective methods so that the United States may become more prosperous and be assured of a constant supply of minerals necessary for an effective defense program; and be it further

"'*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be prepared and transmitted forthwith by the legislative counsel to the Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Member of Nevada's congressional delegation.'

"Adopted by the senate March 10, 1959.

"REX BELL,
"*President of the Senate.*
"LEALA H. WOHLFEIL,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Adopted by the assembly February 26, 1959.

"CHESTER S. CHRISTENSEN,
"*Speaker of the Assembly.*
"NATHAN HURST,
"*Chief Clerk of the Assembly.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 180

"Whereas the years 1961–65 will mark the centennial of the American Civil War, the supreme experience in our history as a nation; and

"Whereas the sacrifice of our people in that great ordeal was severe in Missouri and all sections of the land; and

"Whereas the far-reaching events of the Civil War established that the United States would remain permanently one nation; and

"Whereas the Civil War, the greatest internal crisis through which this Nation passed, forged the unity of this country and the sons of both the Union and the Confederacy have subsequently fought side by side for human freedom, justice, and the dignity of the individual among people everywhere; and

"Whereas Public Law 85–305, 85th Congress, House Joint Resolution 253, September 7, 1957, established the Civil War Centennial Commission because it is incumbent upon us as a nation to provide for the proper observance of the centennial years of this great and continuing force in our history; and

"Whereas the Honorable James T. Blair, Jr., Governor of Missouri, has established by proclamation the Civil War Centennial Commission of Missouri to develop a program to commemorate the significant role of Missouri in the Civil War; and

"Whereas the Carthage Chamber of Commerce, in cooperation with the Carthage City Council and the Jasper County Court, has created the Civil War Centennial Committee of Carthage in honor of the late Col. Ward L. Schrantz, noted Missouri writer and Civil War historian; and

"Whereas Colonel Schrantz suggested the erection of memorials at Carthage to honor the officers and men of both the Union and Confederacy; and

"Whereas these memorials will be dedicated on the 100-year anniversary of the Battle of Carthage; and

"Whereas the Battle of Carthage, July 5, 1861, was an important military event in the struggle for Missouri; and

"Whereas the memorial to the Union will be a statue of the late Maj. Gen. Franz Sigel, formerly of St. Louis, who was a distinguished leader in many Civil War battles including the Battle of Carthage; and

"Whereas the memorial to the Confederacy will be a statue of the late Claiborne Fox Jackson, distinguished public servant for Howard County, who was speaker of the Missouri House of Representatives, member of the Missouri Senate, Governor of Missouri, and champion of the Confederacy; and

"Whereas the Honorable John Flanigan, Jr., a distinguished Missouri attorney, is committee chairman, and the Honorable Robert N. Eddy, mayor of Carthage, is honorary chairman: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Missouri House of Representatives*—

"That the citizens of Carthage be commended for conceiving and supporting a magnificent program in splendid cooperation with the National Civil War Centennial Commission and Civil War Centennial Commission of Missouri;

"That members of the Carthage City Council and members of the Jasper County Court be commended for launching this program as proposed by the Carthage Chamber of Commerce;

"That all citizens of Missouri join in appreciating and understanding the Civil War efforts of Governor Jackson and General Sigel as symbolic of all the officers and men who fought and sacrificed in Missouri and other States between 1861 and 1965;

"That the Honorable Robert Eddy and the Honorable John Flanigan, Jr., be especially commended for their leadership on behalf of the program of commemoration at Carthage;

"That the late Col. Ward L. Schrantz be gratefully remembered for his contribution to the content of the program and his scholarship on the Missouri role in the Civil War;

"That all citizens direct interest to plans and programs of other Missouri communities for commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Civil War;

"That Missouri citizens make available books, manuscripts, miscellaneous printed matter, memorabilia, relics, and other Civil War materials to the Civil War Centennial Commission of Missouri for permanent preservation in libraries and museums within the State; and be it further

"*Resolved* That suitable copies of this resolution be furnished by the chief clerk of the Missouri House of Representatives to the following officers of the National Civil War Centennial Commission, 700 Jackson

Place NW., Washington, D.C.; the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, Honorary Chairman; the Honorable Richard Nixon, Honorary Vice Chairman; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Honorary Vice Chairman; Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant III, Chairman; Mr. Karl S. Betts, Executive Director; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution also be furnished: Dr. Bert Maybee, of Kansas City, Mo., chairman of the Civil War Centennial Commission of Missouri; the Honorable Carl Mose, of St. Louis, Mo.; the Honorable Byron Fly, of Joplin, Mo., presiding judge of the Jasper County Court; Mrs. Ward L. Schrantz, of Carthage; Col. Robert S. Dale, president of the Carthage Chamber of Commerce and assistant publisher of the Carthage Press; the Honorable John Flanigan, Jr., chairman of the Civil War Centennial Committee of Carthage; the Honorable Robert N. Eddy, honorary chairman of the committee."

A paper in the nature of a petition from B. F. Combs, of East Berkshire, Vt., favoring a complete takeover of the price controls, and so forth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Washington, D.C., chapter of the Unitarian Laymen's League, and by the National League of Unitarian Laymen, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide home rule for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., signed by Erwin D. Canham, president, embodying a resolution adopted by that organization endorsing the steps taken by the National Legislatures of the United States and Canada to institute periodic discussions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Telegrams, in the nature of petitions, from Manuel Cordero Valle, and sundry other citizens of Isabela, P.R., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 2023) to provide for amendments to the compact between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Mrs. Lyman Stewart, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to the conduct of unions and a sound Federal fiscal economy; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL OF MADELIA, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Village Council of the Village of Madelia, Minn., in opposition to the taxation of interest from municipal bonds, be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION 1959-24

Resolution requesting Members of Congress to oppose legislation making the interest from municipal bonds subject to Federal tax

At a regular meeting of the Village Council of the Village of Madelia, held on May 11, 1959, the following resolution was offered by R. Brandt, who moved its adoption:

"Whereas the Village Council of the Village of Madelia, Minn., has been informed that legislation is presently pending in the Congress of the United States, the adoption of which would make the income from municipal bonds subject to Federal income tax; and

"Whereas at the present time, municipal securities are finding a favorable market with investors; and

"Whereas there are presently pending many proposals for necessary improvements of municipal facilities, all of which will necessitate issuing of municipal bonds; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the Village Council of the Village of Medelia, Minn., that the proposed legislation would have an adverse effect on the market for municipal securities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Village Council of the Village of Madelia, Minn.*, That we hereby request our representatives in the Congress of the United States to oppose the proposed legislation; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the village clerk be authorized to forward a copy of this resolution to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Senator McCARTHY, and to ANCHER NELSEN, Member of Congress of the Second Congressional District of Minnesota."

C. L. BOHAN,
Mayor.

Attest:

WILLIS OWEN,
Village Clerk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 1976. A bill to make payments to Indians for destruction of fishing rights at Celilo Falls exempt from income tax (Rept. No. 342).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution authorizing attendance of delegations from the Senate and House of Representatives at the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (Rept. No. 343);

S. Res. 114. Resolution authorizing attendance of a delegation from the Senate at meeting of Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (Rept. No. 343); and

S. Res. 122. Resolution to print additional copies of Senate Document No. 22, of the 86th Congress, on labor-management policies.

JANET S. DUNN

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 127) to pay a gratuity to Janet S. Dunn, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Janet S. Dunn, daughter of William M. Dempsey, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to eight months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2095. A bill to establish a U.S. Passport Service within the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2096. A bill to provide that any person to be eligible for appointment as Governor of the Virgin Islands shall have resided in the Virgin Islands not less than 3 years prior to being appointed; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 2097. A bill to provide for the payment of losses sustained by persons investing in and holding farm loan bonds authorized and issued by joint-stock land banks which defaulted in payment of a portion of the principal and interest due on such bonds; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 2098. A bill to transfer the administration of the direct commodity distribution program, under which agricultural food products are made available to the needy in charitable institutions and family units, from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to establish a food stamp plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 2099. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2100. A bill for the relief of Milka Jurisich; and

S. 2101. A bill for the relief of Ourania Ben Blikas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2102. A bill for the relief of Irene Burda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2103. A bill to provide that surplus personal property of the United States may be donated to the States for the promotion of fish and wildlife management activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2104. A bill to bring employees of Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and to permit a Federal employee to obtain accredited service for period(s) of employment by Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation County Committees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF THE LATE SENATOR PATRICK A. McCARRAN

Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of Senator Patrick A. McCarran, presented by the State of Nevada, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered such

State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious in the field of law and government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Nevada.

TEMPORARY PLACEMENT IN ROTUNDA OF STATUE OF THE LATE SENATOR PATRICK A. McCARRAN

Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the State of Nevada is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Senator Patrick A. McCarran, of Nevada, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on such occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT THE PROCEEDINGS OF PRESENTATION AND ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF LATE SENATOR PATRICK A. McCARRAN

Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 43); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings at the presentation, dedication, and acceptance of the statue of Senator Patrick A. McCarran, to be presented by the State of Nevada in the rotunda of the Capitol, together with appropriate illustrations and other pertinent matter, shall be printed as a Senate document. The copy for such Senate document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed three thousand additional copies of such Senate document, which shall be bound in such style as the Joint Committee on Printing shall direct, and of which one hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate and one thousand six hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the Senate from the State of Nevada, and five hundred copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and eight hundred copies shall be for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Nevada.

RESOLUTION

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 127) to pay a gratuity to Janet S. Dunn, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full where it appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

PROPOSED U.S. PASSPORT SERVICE WITHIN DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Committee on Government Operations, of which I have the honor to be the ranking minority member, has for some time been studying the establishment of a U.S. Passport Service within the Department of State. We have published a couple of documentary studies on the subject, one entitled "Reorganization of the Passport Office," and another one entitled "Increased Cost of Issuing Passports."

Growing out of those studies and out of our work in the committee, I have drafted a bill to create a U.S. Passport Service within the Department of State, and I introduce it for appropriate reference.

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

The bill (S. 2095) to establish a U.S. Passport Service within the Department of State, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MUNDT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

RESIDENTIAL REQUIREMENT FOR GOVERNOR OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide that the Governor of the Virgin Islands must be a resident of that Territory for at least 3 years prior to his appointment by the President. By statute the civilian commissioners of the District of Columbia must be 3-year residents, and a similar provision of law applied to Hawaii during its Territorial period. The present Governor of the Virgin Islands, John David Merwin, is the first native-born Virgin Islander to hold that island's chief executive position; Morris F. de Castro was the only previous governor to be an islander—the others have been mainlanders.

The more than 30,000 Virgin Islanders have enjoyed full U.S. citizenship since 1927. Since that time, they have seen Puerto Rico moving into its present commonwealth status and were stirred when last year it was announced that the British Caribbean possessions of Trinidad, Jamaica, Barbados and the Leeward and Windward Islands would gain independent status in a West Indies Federation. While under the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of 1954, Virgin Islanders elect an 11-man legislature with limited powers, their governor, appointed from Washington, should also have roots in their land.

It is natural that the people of the Virgin Islands, as Americans, should wish a greater control of their own government. The bill which I am today introducing will be a step forward in this direction and an indication to the people of the Caribbean lands of the very real concern we have for the people of the Virgin Islands. Not only do the Virgin Islanders look to their neighbors who are achieving independence and increasing self government but many Latin Americans measure in our relations with Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands our devotion to the freedoms which we preach. We have been judged—and judged well—by our fair and equitable relations with Puerto Rico which have become the jewel in our crown of Latin American relations. If we wish the Virgin Islands should not be considered as an American "colony" then we must assume our responsibilities in helping the islanders move toward increasing self-government and self-responsibility.

The Virgin Islands, an unincorporated, organized territory of the United States situated in the Caribbean Sea, were purchased from Denmark in 1917. Congress extended U.S. citizenship to the Virgin Islanders in 1927 and in 1931 administration of the islands was transferred to the Department of the Interior where it now rests. The Governor of the Territory is appointed by the President for an indefinite term and the appointment is approved by the Senate; the Government Secretary is also appointed by the President but this appointment is not subject to Senate approval. The popularly elected legislation meets at least once annually but its enactments are subject to veto by the Governor. Where the Governor's vetoes are overriden, then the bill goes to the President of the United States who makes the final determination. The judiciary is also appointed by the President.

Mr. President, I think it is very important in the case of the Virgin Islands, as it is in the case of Puerto Rico, that we demonstrate our policy with respect to territories which adhere to the United States. We have been judged, and we will continue to be judged, by our relations with both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and indeed with the Philippines, in respect of our general policy with regard to all the other American Republics and all the territory of Latin America. I believe proposed legislation of this character, if enacted, would have a fine effect in that area, and I submit it in that spirit, and hope it will have early consideration by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEATING in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2096) to provide that any person to be eligible for appointment as Governor of the Virgin Islands shall have resided in the Virgin Islands not less than 3 years prior to being appointed, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FOOD ACT OF 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Thursday and Friday of this week, June 4 and 5, the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices, of which I am a member, will hold hearings on bills to expand the domestic consumption of food.

I am both a sponsor and a cosponsor of several of the bills before the subcommittee. I have joined my distinguished colleague from Vermont on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in sponsorship of a bill to assure an adequate diet, based on nutritional standards, to families and individuals who, through no fault of their own, cannot afford to buy an adequate diet. This is a good bill. From the standpoint of meeting the full nutritional needs of low-income families among us, it is the best bill before the subcommittee. It would also cost more to operate than some of the other bills before the subcommittee.

I might also add that even in years when budget balancing was not in vogue in this administration, the Secretary of Agriculture could see no need for it. I cannot predict with certainty that the Secretary will again oppose S. 585, but in the event that he does, I just want to be prepared to offer him something as an alternative to Senate bill 585.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which provides for a food stamp program, not as a substitute for the existing program of commodity distribution, but to work in conjunction with it.

Under the commodity distribution program, wheat flour, butter, nonfat dry milk, cornmeal, and dry beans are distributed to needy families. As nutritious as these commodities are, they do not provide a balanced diet. There is not available for example, such items as fluid milk and cheese; fresh beef, pork, poultry, and lamb; fresh vegetables and fruits; canned vegetables and fruits; peanuts and peanut butter, and cooking oil.

The food stamp bill I am introducing provides for $5 per person in the form of food stamps which, when matched with a like amount, can be used to buy food items designated by the administrator as needed to provide a better nutritional balance to the diets of those who are already receiving commodities and others who may be eligible under the provisions of the bill.

Provision has been made for the administrator of the commodity distribution program to assist States financially with administrative problems in the commodity distribution program, including storage and handling. Only a little over one-third of the 3,003 counties are participating in the commodity distribution program. For many, the cost of storage and handling has resulted in nonparticipation, thus denying needy families of CCC commodities.

In keeping with the rapidly developing sentiment to transfer the administration of the commodity distribution program from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the bill so provides. Administration of the school lunch and milk programs would be left in the Department of Agriculture under provisions of the bill.

I have included in the bill a provision to require the enrichment of wheat flour, rice, grits, and cornmeal available under the commodity distribution program and to provide for sanitary and convenient packaging of these foods. The chairman of the subcommittee has held hearings on his bill, which I fully support, and I feel it should be a part of any bill the subcommittee approves.

Mr. President, I will support this bill in the subcommittee, and I invite other Members of the Senate to consider the provisions of the bill and to join in support. As I stated at the outset of my remarks, it will not meet nutritional requirements of the low income and needy as well as will the bill of the Senator from Vermont. But it is a step in the right direction, since it does increase the number of food items available and since it does provide for meeting needs of all areas under the present commodity distribution program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2098) to transfer the administration of the direct commodity distribution program, under which agricultural food products are made available to the needy in charitable institutions and family units, from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to establish a food stamp plan, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Food Act of 1959".

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to (1) transfer the domestic program of direct commodity distribution to the needy from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, (2) provide for the extension and expansion of the direct commodity distribution program by authorizing assistance to State and local governments in administering and handling such programs, and (3) to provide for a food stamp plan for the purpose of securing an adequate and proper diet of foods high in nutritional value which are ordinarily consumed in inadequate quantities by the unemployed, the needy, and persons with low income, and others.

DEFINITION

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "food commodity" means any food product raised or produced in the United States on farms, including agricultural, horticultural, and dairy products, livestock, poultry and honey.

(b) The term "direct commodity distribution" means the program for the distribution of food commodities transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under section 4 of this Act.

(c) The term "food stamp" means a certificate, coupon, or other similar medium of exchange issued to eligible recipients.

(d) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

(e) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(f) The term "eligible food store" means an established grocery store, or merchant engaged in the distribution of food at the retail level, located in the community, meeting the requirement of eligibility as determined by the Secretary.

(g) The term "sanitary container" means any container of such material and construction as (1) will not permit the infiltration of foreign matter into the contents of such container under ordinary conditions of shipping and handling, and (2) will not, for a period of at least one year, disintegrate so as to contaminate the contents of the container, necessitating the washing of the contents prior to use.

TRANSFER OF DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS TO DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

SEC. 4. Not later than ninety days after the date of enactment of this Act, the administration of the direct commodity distribution programs under section 416(3) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is, except as hereafter provided, hereby transferred to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and all functions and activities carried out by the Secretary of Agriculture under such section shall be carried out by the Secretary within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such transfer shall not apply with respect to the donation of food commodities under such section for use in nonprofit school-lunch programs and in nonprofit summer camps for children.

TRANSFERS OF AGRICULTURAL FOOD PRODUCTS

SEC. 5. To facilitate the administration and continuation of such program, upon request by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available a maximum quantity of the agricultural food products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Secretary shall reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for costs incurred by the Corporation in making such commodities available to the Secretary under the provisions of this Act. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall upon request of the Secretary arrange for the processing, packaging, and delivery to designated points of any agricultural food product.

ENRICHMENT AND SANITARY PACKAGING OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

SEC. 6. In order to insure the nutritional value of cornmeal, grits, white rice, and white flour when such foods are made available for distribution under the direct commodity distribution program or for distribution to schools under the National School Lunch Act or any other Act, such foods shall be enriched so as to meet the standards for enriched cornmeal, enriched corn grits, enriched rice, or enriched flour, as the case may be, prescribed in regulations promulgated under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; and in order to protect the nutritional value and sanitary quality of such enriched foods during transportation and storage such foods shall be packed in sanitary containers. For convenience and ease in handling, the weight of any sanitary container when filled shall not exceed fifty pounds.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE TO STATES

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to give assistance to State and local governments in meeting the costs of food distribution, including local storage, under the direct commodity distribution program to the needy in charitable institutions and family units. Such assistance shall be made available in accordance with standards developed by the Secretary and used as the basis for securing the appropriation of funds for this purpose. To this end the Secretary shall conduct a study of the current expenditures of local governments on the direct commodity distribution program, the amount necessary to extend and expand the program as directed in this Act, including the addition of other cities and counties in the program, and report to the Congress on a formula for division of the funds requested, such formula to be based on the per capita revenues of the local government from whatever source, and the extent of need as represented by needy persons eligible under such program.

STANDARDS

SEC. 8. The Secretary is authorized and instructed to establish minimum and maximum standards for participation in the program of direct commodity distribution to the needy in charitable institutions and family units. Maximum standards shall establish the upper limits in terms of income or other resources which an individual or family may have and remain eligible for participation in the program. Minimum

standards shall establish the lower limits in terms of income or other resources paid or furnished to the needy by State or local governments, and shall constitute a bar to participation in such program by any State or local government which pays or furnishes less than the minimums fixed by the Secretary: *Provided*, That the right of any State or local government currently participating in this program shall not be denied under any such standards until the appropriate legislative body of such unit of government shall have had reasonable opportunity to adjust standards to those established by the Secretary: *And provided further*, That no State or local government which denies food available under the direct commodity distribution program to needy persons who are ineligible for reasons of lack of legal residence only shall be permitted to participate in such program.

OTHER AID AS RELATED TO STANDARDS

SEC. 9. In establishing minimum standards in the direct commodity distribution program, the Secretary shall deal specifically with recipients of other types of aid under the Social Security and related Acts, as well as the assistance available from State and local governments and shall bear in mind that the receipt of other types of assistance, as such, shall not bar participation. Maximum standards for participation shall insofar as possible, relate only to income currently available to needy persons on a per capita basis.

FOOD STAMP PLAN TO SUPPLEMENT DIRECT COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION FOR NEEDY FAMILIES

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary is further authorized and directed to establish and administer a national food stamp plan to supplement the direct commodity distribution program for needy individuals in family units or in charitable institutions. The Secretary shall promulgate rules and regulations for carrying out such program.

(b) The Secretary shall from time to time designate the specific food commodities which may be purchased with food stamps issued pursuant to the provisions of this Act, and such stamps may be used only for the purchase of such designated food. Food commodities shall be designated by the Secretary which contain nutrient ingredients found by him to be commonly deficient in the diets of persons receiving agricultural food products under the direct commodity distribution program.

PERSONS ELIGIBLE FOR FOOD STAMPS

SEC. 11. (a) The following persons shall be eligible to receive food stamps for any month—

(1) Every individual who is a recipient of assistance or benefits for such month under the programs of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled provided for in titles I, IV, X, and XIV, respectively, of the Social Security Act.

(2) Every individual who is a recipient of unemployment compensation benefits for all or any part of such month from any State.

(3) Every individual who is the recipient of financial assistance, including agricultural food products under the direct commodity distribution program, for such month provided for the needy by any State or political subdivision thereof.

(4) Every individual who, but for lack of legal residence only, would be eligible for such month for financial or other assistance provided for the needy by the State or local subdivision in which such individual is located.

(5) Every individual in any nonprofit charitable institution, including hospitals, orphanages, homes for the aged and infirm, and other similar types of institutions not eligible under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), or (6) of this subsection.

(6) Every needy individual, including unemployed individuals not eligible for unemployment compensation benefits, with respect to whom the Secretary has received a certification for such month from the welfare or public assistance agency of a State or political subdivision thereof under an agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with the welfare or public assistance agency of any State or political subdivision thereof whereby such agency shall certify to the Secretary, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, the names of individuals of such State or political subdivision who are in need of public assistance but are not eligible for food stamps under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), or (5) of subsection (a), and the Secretary shall provide for the issuance of food stamps to be distributed to such individuals.

ISSUANCE AND VALUE OF FOOD STAMPS

SEC. 12. (a) The Secretary shall provide for the preparation of monthly food stamps for issuance to individuals eligible therefor under section 11. Such stamps shall be in such denominations as the Secretary shall determine and no individual shall receive food stamps with a face value exceeding $5 for any month. They shall be issued monthly and shall be valid only with respect to purchases made during the month for which they are issued.

(b) Food stamps issued under the provisions of this Act may be used only at eligible food stores and may be used only as part payment for food commodities purchased. Part payment shall not exceed one-half of the total cost of the food commodities purchased at the time such stamps are used, and in no event shall such stamps be used as part payment for any food commodities other than those food commodities designated by the Secretary pursuant to section 10.

(c) Food stamps shall be distributed by the Secretary, in the case of State agencies making payments to individuals under the programs referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 11(a), to the State agency making such payments, and, in the case of individuals eligible to receive food stamps under paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) of such section, to the State agency which certified the name of such individual to the Secretary. Subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary, the eligibility of any individual for food stamps shall be determined by the State agency making the payment by reason of which the individual is eligible for such stamps.

(d) Unless otherwise provided by the Secretary, food stamps for the use of individuals described in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 11(a) shall be issued to such individuals at the same time and together with any payments made by the State under programs described in such paragraphs. Food stamps for the use of individual's described in paragraphs (4) and (6) of section 11(a) shall be issued to individuals in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe.

(e) Food stamps shall not be transferred except as provided in this Act, and shall be valid only with respect to purchases made by or on behalf of the person to whom they are issued.

REDEMPTION OF FOOD STAMPS

SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary shall provide for redemption of food stamps through the cooperation of banking institutions throughout the Nation. For such purposes, he shall designate banking institutions which shall be authorized to accept such stamps from designated food stores. Institutions so designated shall pay at the time of presentation in cash or by credit to a demand deposit the full value of all food stamps presented to them.

(b) Banking institutions accepting food stamps may present to the Secretary, or such other agency as the Secretary may designate, evidence of the deposit with them of food stamps presented by eligible food stores, together with appropriate vouchers. Such evidence of deposit and vouchers shall be considered complete documentation for payment and payments may be made thereon.

(c) The Secretary may advance moneys to banking institutions, where such action appears necessary, to provide funds for the redemption of food stamps. Such advances shall be accounted for by such banking institutions at least monthly.

(d) The Secretary may contract to pay banking institutions designated to receive food stamps, a charge determined by the Secretary to be reasonable for the services rendered in acting as such depositories.

CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 14. (a) Whoever shall falsely make, alter, forge, or counterfeit or cause or procure to be falsely made, altered, forged, or counterfeited any food stamp or stamp similar thereto for the purpose of obtaining or receiving, or of enabling any other person to obtain or receive, directly or indirectly, from the United States or any of its officers or agents, any money or other thing of value, and whoever shall transfer or utter as true, or cause to be transferred or uttered as true, any such false, forged, altered, or counterfeited food stamp or stamp similar thereto, with intent to defraud the United States or any mercantile establishment, banking institution, or person, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

(b) Any person not being so authorized by this Act or the regulations issued pursuant thereto, who shall have food stamps in his possession or under his control, or any person who shall use, transfer, or acquire food stamps in any manner not authorized by this Act, or the regulations issued pursuant thereto, or who shall buy, sell, or exchange food stamps without being authorized to do so by this Act or regulations issued pursuant thereto shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

REPORTS

SEC. 15. The Secretary shall make an annual report to Congress describing the operations of the programs administered by him under this Act, and such report shall include but not be limited to information with respect to the following: The number of individuals entitled to receive assistance; the number which have received assistance; the extent to which the program has been effective in improving or maintaining health; the costs of the program to the Federal, State, and local governments; and recommendations for improvement of the program.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 16. The Secretary may, from time to time, issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary or proper in order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this Act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 17. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

EFFECT ON OTHER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

SEC. 18. Any benefits received under this Act shall not be deemed to be income or resources for the purposes of any provisions of the Social Security Act, nor shall such benefits be used to justify any decrease of cash or other benefits paid to any individual by any State or local subdivision thereof.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION LICENSES ON RIVERS INHABITED BY MIGRATORY FISH—AMENDMENTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, by request, I submit, for appropriate reference, amendments to the bill (S. 1420) to give the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over the issuance of hydroelectric project licenses issued by the Federal Power Commission. These amendments have been suggested as the result of action by agencies of the State of Oregon interested in development of fishery and water resources of our region. According to information I have received from Oregon Governor Mark O. Hatfield, these amendments have been endorsed unanimously by the Oregon Water Resources Board, the Oregon Fish Commission, and the Oregon Game Commission.

I submit these proposals, so that they may receive parallel consideration with my own bill, which is aimed at protecting migratory fish and game in areas where dam projects have been proposed. I am not certain that the amendments are necessary to assure protection of migratory fisheries; however, I intend to maintain an open-minded attitude, so that they can be thoroughly examined at any committee hearings.

When I originally introduced a fishery-protection bill at the last session of Congress, I made no effort to disguise the fact that I sought to protect migratory fish by giving the Secretary of the Interior some control over the issuance of power-dam licenses. My intention was to preserve migratory fisheries in areas where they might be imperiled by dam structures. I did not intend that dams should be built where the fishery resources would be irreparably damaged. It is still my belief that we must enact some legislation with strong safeguards to protect migratory salmon and steelhead of the Columbia River basin. Perhaps this objective can still be achieved under my bill with some amendments.

While I am glad to submit these amendments to Senate bill 1420, as a service to agencies of the State of Oregon, I do not believe the amendments provide sufficient protection against the issuance of licenses which would adversely affect the Columbia River fishery. It must be remembered that the Secretary of the Army has full authority to veto any project detrimental to navigation on our waterways; and I see nothing inconsistent in providing similar authority to the Secretary of the Interior, for the protection of fish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EQUALIZATION OF PAY OF RETIRED MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 541) to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services, introduced by me, for myself and other Senators, on January 20, 1959.

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

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 28, 1959, the names of Senators BARTLETT, BYRD of Virginia, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and MCGEE were added as additional cosponsors of the amendment to the bill (S. 1451) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, submitted by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Senators BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, CHAVEZ, DOUGLAS, MORSE, MOSS, NEUBERGER, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, TALMADGE, YOUNG of Ohio, KEFAUVER, and LANGER) on May 28, 1959.

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

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

By Mr. BUSH:

Commencement address delivered by Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson at the University of Houston on May 30, 1959.

By Mr. WILEY:

A statement of the purposes and objectives of the American Country Life Association of Chicago, Ill.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for 10:30 A.M., Wednesday, June 10, 1959, in room 2300, New Senate Office Building on the nominations of Herbert S. Boreman, of West Virginia, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Fourth Circuit, vice John J. Parker, deceased, and Charles L. Powell, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Washington.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nominations may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

FOOD ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1959—NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 1884

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to a hearing on a very important bill, S. 1884. Hearings will be held tomorrow, Friday, and next Monday by the Subcommittee on Agricultural Production Marketing and Stabilization of Prices of the Agriculture Committee.

S. 1884 was introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and is cosponsored by 14 other Members of the Senate. It is a bill to improve the surplus food distribution program by turning it into a real welfare food program.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] reported only last week that there are hungry children by the thousands right here in the Capital City, and millions of others hungry or malnourished up and down the land. I think it is this contrast between the alleged burdens of agricultural abundance and the obvious facts about malnutrition and hunger which bring bills like S. 1884 into the hopper year after year.

I hope we can pass a welfare food bill of some kind this year. I hope we can get past the bill-printing stage and the hearing stage and start a program, which will make our agricultural abundance an obvious blessing and not a problem.

But I suggest that all of us keep an eye on these hearings, and watch particularly for the appearance of that elder statesman of the free market, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson.

S. 1884 calls for transferring the domestic surplus food program to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare where the Secretary would be allowed to buy up additional products in adequate supply and thereby provide something more like a balanced diet for the needy. The cost of the surplus foods which would be supplied by CCC upon request would be charged to welfare, as would the cost of the additional foods purchased. This would mean that the farmers would not be charged with the cost of a welfare program. To that extent the rising costs of Mr. Benson's programs would be reduced—not much, but some. Here is a golden opportunity for Mr. Benson to come forth in favor of the farmer and still be consistent with some of his previous positions.

Mr. Benson has been opposed, firmly opposed, to a welfare food program in the Department of Agriculture. He is on record to this effect. He is also in favor of a welfare food program in the Department of Agriculture and is on record on this, too. This may make it hard to follow his testimony this week. Let me read a little of the record on this.

Mr. Benson's most recent position, so far as I know, was expressed in a couple of letters to President George Meany of the AFL-CIO last month. Mr. Meany, disturbed by the condition of the unemployed workers over the land, had asked Mr. Benson if the surplus food program could be improved, and if he could use any more authority and any more money for this purpose.

Mr. Benson's reply was signed by True D. Morse, but I do not doubt that Mr. Benson and Mr. Morse are in agreement on these fundamentals. Mr. Morse stated that they had all the authority they wanted and all the money they needed for all the food program they intended to carry on. He said that the Department of Agriculture was not in the welfare business and that it was not interested in running up the cost of the

farm program by giving away its surplus inventories.

This is no new position on Mr. Benson's part. Year after year he has been turning funds back to the Treasury—section 32 funds—which could have been spent to buy a better balanced diet for the needy. He has the authority. He has had section 32 money. But he simply did not like a welfare food program.

This attitude goes pretty far back, not all the way back, but pretty far. On May 12, 1955, long before Mr. Benson's flexible chickens began to come home to roost by the billions, there was a hearing before the Subcommittee on the Commodity Credit Corporation. The senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] was chairman and conducted the hearings. One of the first entries in the hearing was a letter from Mr. Benson's letter writer, Mr. True D. Morse.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of that letter printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 29, 1955.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in reply to your request for a report on S. 661, a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts.

The Department does not favor passage of S. 661.

S. 661 would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay the cost of processing food commodities into a form suitable for home or institutional use in connection with donations to domestic recipients of price-support commodities made under the authority of sections 407 and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949. By providing authority to pay processing costs, S. 661 would permit the donation of wheat and corn, in the form of flour and meal, respectively, to eligible domestic recipients.

The domestic distribution of wheat flour and cornmeal cannot be justified on the basis of the need for surplus-disposal operations. Such distribution would be more in the nature of a welfare or a relief program, which is not a direct responsibility of this Department.

Wheat and corn are storable commodities, and with stock rotation there presently is not a danger of substantial loss or waste of CCC-owned stocks. From the standpoint of inventory management, particularly since stocks of wheat and corn can be considered a reserve for strategic purposes, the Department's first responsibility is to secure all possible sales.

Moreover, as a possible surplus-disposal operation, the domestic distribution of wheat flour and cornmeal would have limited impact. The amounts so moved would be small in relation to the size of present holdings. The additional costs to CCC (including administrative costs) would outweigh any probable increase in domestic consumption of wheat and corn or any possible net reduction in the level of Government stocks.

Because of the widespread use of cereal products, we also believe that it would be difficult to avoid significant interference with normal marketings of wheat flour and cornmeal, particularly in the case of schools and institutions. Even among needy persons and families, because of their relatively high consumption of cereal products, we would anticipate that a donation program would result in only a small overall increase in the use of cereal products.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it will be apparent to anyone reading this letter that Mr. Benson and Mr. Morse wanted nothing to do with a welfare food program. They were opposed to Senate bill 661 because it authorized them to grind wheat and corn into flour and cornmeal for distribution to the needy. They were opposed because they did not think distributing flour and corn meal to the poor was a proper function of the Department. They did not think that it would use up the corn and wheat surpluses, and they were disturbed lest it interfere with the sales of those products by commercial firms.

The Congress did not agree with Messrs. Benson and company. We passed a bill authorizing them to grind wheat and corn and give it to the poor. Now more than half of the total poundage of food distributed to needy families is made up of flour and cornmeal. If it were not for this program the suffering which exists in this Nation would be very much greater.

Based on these examples, one would think that Mr. Benson would appear at the forthcoming hearings and take the position that if Senate bill 1884 passes, it must pass as written, that is, the domestic surplus food program should be transferred to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This would be consistent with his position that welfare food distribution is not a proper function of the Department of Agriculture. It would be consistent with his position that the farmers' program should not be jeopardized by having food for the needy charged against it. I hope Mr. Benson will take this position because I would like to see a real welfare food program launched and administered by the Welfare Department.

But I want to warn the Senate that this may not take place. Mr. Benson is a many faceted character. Sometimes he shines his light in the strangest directions.

Back in January 1944, before Mr. Benson became the farmer's savior, he appeared to be heard on the Aiken-La-Follette bill, the national food allotment plan, a bill to establish a national food stamp program to protect the low-income people of the Nation from suffering during the war.

According to the other witnesses on Senate bill 1331, this food stamp program was going to cost approximately $3 billion a year. The gross national product in the preceding year had been $192.5 billion. It was $436.7 last year (1958) considerably more than twice as much as it was in 1943. I mention this because today we would think about a $6 or $7 billion dollar program now about the same way we would have thought about this $3 billion program in 1944.

Mr. Benson appeared in his role as executive secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. He was very much in favor of that $3 billion welfare food program. He said his organization represented 4,600 farmer cooperatives and that they had a membership of 2.3 million members and that his council was all for the food stamp plan and had been for years.

He read a resolution by his council adopted in January 1940, which commended the Department of Agriculture for his food-stamp plan, called it an effective mechanism for moving agricultural surpluses into consumption among low-income groups, and urged extension of the plan to a national level as rapidly as possible.

He went on to say that in January 1944, the council adopted another resolution which read, in part:

> We favor the adoption of a sound food-stamp plan, administered at the State and local levels.

Presumably, Mr. Benson was not in disagreement with his council at the time and thought that a welfare food program was a very fine thing, even a stamp plan which today would cost $6 or $7 billion a year. I should like to think that he would stride into that hearing this week and say that S. 1884 should be passed, except that the amount made available should be increased to $6 or $7 billion a year. Or maybe he will come in and say that S. 1884 does not go nearly far enough and urge that the school lunch and school milk programs should be transferred from the Department of Agriculture because they are welfare programs and not a proper function of that Department, and he might even urge that the very limited S. 1884 be abandoned and the old Aiken national nutritional bill passed so that we could really do the job properly.

Maybe he will do that, because I am sure that, despite the nauseating job he now has of eating his own words on his fluctuating price program, he still has in his heart a little of the milk of human kindness for the poor.

But I am afraid we cannot count on him for this kind of a performance. In the hearings in 1944 he was all for a national food stamp plan because one of the provisions of the bill in which the food stamp plan was included called for killing consumer food subsidies which we were using to hold the price line. It became pretty evident during the hearing that what Mr. Benson was really out to do was to kill the consumer food subsidies with that bill, being confident that he and his confidants could then kill the food stamp program, or reduce it to nothing by cutting off appropriations.

In those same hearings there appeared Don Montgomery representing the national CIO. He favored a food stamp program and consumer subsidies, but was opposed to the bill Mr. Benson was supporting because he recognized what Mr. Benson was up to. He said:

> This bill is as coldblooded in its stated purposes as one who would say, "Let's help the poor families freezing in the garret of the tenement and the bums who have taken refuge in its cellar by setting fire to the place and burning it down.

Mr. Montgomery was convinced that the food stamp provisions were a "snare and a delusion, because, while purporting to protect needy families from the impact of rising food prices it will do no such thing, but on the contrary will subject them and all of us to the hazards of inflation which cannot be overcome by mere relief measures."

Whatever recommendations Mr. Benson has to make on S. 1884, I hope the chairman and the other members of the subcommittee will pursue his logic at some length so as to make sure that what he recommends is not another snare and delusion dressed up to look appealing.

SAVING AND BORROWING

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I call attention to an editorial entitled "Saving and Borrowing," which appears today in the Washington Post. I particularly call attention to the editorial's recognition of the problem of saving, and its indirect recognition of the serious problem of the dangers of inflation. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD, following these remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 3, 1959]

SAVING AND BORROWING

If the Soviet Union should overtake the United States industrially and economically in the coming decades it would probably be in spite of the cumbersomeness of central state planning and management. Such a development, however, might occur sooner than many expect because the Russians are showing an increasing capacity to save—that is, to form capital. To be sure, there is nothing voluntary about it. What is done with business and personal earnings is dictated by the state. But however, it is accomplished, a greatly superior rate of capital growth could bring the Soviet economy into line with ours quite rapidly.

Against this background, the news of rising interest rates in this country, coming so soon after the depth of the recent recession, is of more than ordinary interest. Superficially, it might be thought to illustrate nothing more than the excess of zeal with which this administration is striving for monetary stability (pursuing the goal in such a fashion, regrettably, that critical social deficits are growing faster than the budget deficit is being closed). There may be some truth in such a conclusion, since the banks raised their prime rate in obvious expectation of the Federal Reserve Board increase in the rediscount rate which has now occurred.

But there is a more important truth in other statistics with which the "Fed" is largely powerless to cope. These are the figures which show that the banking system has been steadily pushed into a tighter and tighter position all through the past decade; that the ratio of loans to loanable funds has risen steadily, right through the recession. Now nearly 90 percent of the country's available banking resources are at work in the form of loans, compared with about 50 percent a decade ago.

The rise in interest rates fundamentally reflects this narrowing gap between saving and borrowing. Although the "Fed" can force interest rates down somewhat—as it did last year—by facilitating the easier use of available savings, it cannot increase the rate of saving. What the "Fed" has done now, in other words, is merely to lift somewhat the artificial lid on rates which it clamped on during the recession, and the relative shortage of funds has naturally forced up borrowing costs.

The natural corrective upon which a free economy must rely is, of course, the prospect that higher interest rates will now induce more saving. Perhaps they will. Working against this, however, is the general ebullience over the immediate economic outlook, a state of mind not usually conducive to saving. Taxes, too, and the fear of inflation set up forces working in the contrary direction. The problem seems to be how to encourage higher levels of private and corporate saving while at the same time enhancing the Government's revenue position to help meet urgent public spending requirements without deficits.

TRIBUTES TO DR. JAMES R. KILLIAN, JR.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the resignation of Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., as the President's scientific adviser, is a great loss to our Nation and the entire free world. In his unobtrusive, quiet, but effective manner, Dr. Killian has applied his broad scientific background and administrative ability to the pressing scientific problems which beset our Government.

The result has been an increasing understanding and appreciation within the Government of the importance of science in our world today. Dr. Killian has also provided an important bridge between the scientific community and our Government. Finally, his influence has been an effective spur to America's vital efforts to press forward with the conquest of outer space.

I salute Dr. Killian for the invaluable services he has rendered to his country in this post and the many other positions he has filled over the years. I am sure the thanks and good wishes of all of us will go with him in the days ahead.

It is significant to note that many of the Nation's leading newspapers have paid tribute to Dr. Killian upon his resignation. I share their high opinion of this outstanding scientist, as well as their hope that his successor, Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, will continue the fine work he has begun. I ask unanimous consent to have two of these editorials printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times, May 29, 1959]

DR. KILLIAN'S SERVICE

All Americans can share the "very sincere regrets" that President Eisenhower voiced yesterday in accepting the resignation of Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., as his Special Assistant for Science and Technology. In his year and a half in that office Dr. Killian worked quietly but effectively to improve the organization of the Nation's research effort and to increase our resources, both human and material, for further progress in science and technology. He deserves the Nation's thanks.

We welcome the President's decision to continue the post of Special Assistant for Science and Technology and his choice of Prof. George B. Kistiakowsky of Harvard to fill it. The man occupying this position provides a direct liaison between the Nation's Chief Executive and the world of science which is so centrally important in this era. Professor Kistiakowsky is one of our most distinguished chemists, a man who has served our Nation well in a variety of earlier Government posts, including service with the Manhattan project. Professor Kistiakowsky, we may note, is one of the many foreign-born Americans who have contributed greatly to the strength and health of our society.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 30, 1959]

DR. KILLIAN'S SERVICE

Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., who has resigned as the President's science adviser, did much more in his 18 months at the White House than render invaluable personal services to this administration. He has, in our judgment, demonstrated beyond all doubt the need for full and continuing scientific representation in the top echelon of the Government.

The reports of his advisory committee favoring greater emphasis on science education and intensified basic research in the nuclear field have been outstanding contributions of a kind that previously had to be brought to bear on national policy by indirect or ad hoc means. Dr. Killian also had much to do with accelerating the space exploration program and putting it under civilian control. He restored a badly needed sense of balance on the nuclear test question.

More important than these particular decisions and recommendations, however, has been the salutary effect of his presence on administration decision-making generally. He has enabled the President to have a broader and less political judgment on scientific questions, too often befuddled with politics, service rivalries, and the grinding of parochial axes. Moreover, Dr. Killian has shown the scientific community how better to make its weight felt in the Government and has fostered much-needed confidence between Government and the scientists. His successor, Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, appears to possess the qualities needed to carry on this useful work, and we hope that the President will employ him to as great advantage as he has Dr. Killian.

COMMON SENSE TALK ON THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in a recent editorial, the New York Times pinpointed some of the basic issues involved in congressional consideration of farm legislation. As the Times correctly emphasizes, we are not dealing with whether aid to agriculture should be continued. We all know that certain assistance will be given by the Federal Government to help our farmers.

However, there is a limit to the amount and type of aid which should be extended. It is my firm view that the sooner we let our farmers run their own businesses—with reasonable, but very limited help from Uncle Sam—the better.

I agree wholeheartedly with the New York Times editorial which specifies that the real issue on farm bills is whether we intend to continue the emergency World War II programs, which were originally designed to stimulate production. And I likewise agree that an important part of this question is how long—oh, how long—can we continue burdening America's taxpayers with the tremendous costs of these outmoded price support programs?

It is my hope that as this session progresses we will make further strides toward returning reason to our farm programs, in line with the recommendations of Secretary Benson and the administration. Only in that way will we be able to

get squarely on the road which will eventually lead to a solution of the farm problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the common sense comments of the New York Times on this subject.

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

[From the New York Times, May 26, 1959]

RECKLESS WHEAT POLICY

Farm bloc leaders in Congress are engaged in a race against time this week to obtain passage of a new wheat control law that would be even less defensible, if passed, than the law as it now stands. Next Monday is the deadline for such legislation, since Secretary Benson must then announce planting controls under whatever law may be in effect.

Price support and acreage allotments now stand at the minimum levels provided by the law—75 percent and 55 million acres, respectively. Since these are automatically determined by the wheat supply situation, and since the huge oversupply has not abated since a year ago, the Secretary of Agriculture has no legal authority, even if he so desired, to relax acreage controls or add further to the already overstimulated production by reducing the present level of price supports.

The decision of the Democrats to risk sending such a veto-inviting bill to the President in the face of the prospective rise in the Government-held surplus of that grain is almost unbelievably reckless. Its immediate explanation—if it can be called an explanation—is, as a Times correspondent suggests, that they have been made a little tipsy with the sense of power stemming from last week's victory over the administration on the housing issue.

The plan approved by the House Agricultural Committee would give farmers the choice of two alternatives. The first would reduce acreage by 25 percent (or to about 41 million acres) and boost price supports to 90 percent of parity. The other would eliminate all production controls and drop supports to 50 percent of parity. It is believed that, given a bill based on the second of these two proposals alone, the administration—which favors low price supports and a minimum of Government controls—might give it a blessing. The record of farmer referendums such as is provided for here, indicates, however, that the low price support alternative would almost certainly be rejected.

The basic question involved in the whole "farm problem" as it stands today has nothing to do with the question of whether we intend to continue aid to agriculture. The basic question is whether we intend to continue indefinitely a policy of price supports that were introduced as a world War II measure and were designed essentially as an incentive to increase production in that emergency.

Only less fundamental than this question is its principal corollary. This is: "Are we prepared to go on burdening the Government, the taxpayer, and the consumer with a huge program of subsidies that not only gives every evidence of continuing to grow, but roughly 80 percent of whose benefits may be expected to flow, as they have been flowing now for years, into the pockets of some 1,700,000 prosperous farm proprietors (about one-fourth the total of all farmers)?" Under mechanized production these farm proprietors can, in the case of wheat, for example, produce that grain for as little as 60 cents a bushel at a time when the Government is prepared to take their surpluses off their hands at $1.90 a bushel.

The legislator who expects to record himself in favor of either of the proposed Democratic wheat bills must be prepared, first, to answer "aye" to the underlying questions.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

PUBLICATION OF SENATE PAYROLLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story which appeared this morning in the Washington Post, concerning the ruling by Judge Holtzoff on the suit brought by Vance Trimble, of the Scripps-Howard publications, seeking publication of Senate payrolls.

Let me direct the attention of the Senate to the statement made by J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the Washington Post, on behalf of the board of directors of the American Society of Newspaper Editors:

The judge says "this subject is within the legislative power." That it certainly is. The House demonstrated this several times years ago when it opened to public inspection the payrolls of the Members. The Senate can do likewise. Both Chambers have the power to make public the information sought.

My Senate Resolution 99 is, I remind the Senate, pending in a subcommittee of the Senate Rules and Administration Committee.

I am not certain that Judge Holtzoff's ruling is the final judicial opinion on this matter. But I believe it puts the burden upon the Senate to make public on a current basis the information about its expenditures that the people—the taxpayers—are entitled to have.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point the text of my Senate Resolution 99.

There being no objection, the text of the resolution (S. Res. 99) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) the Secretary of the Senate is directed to include in his annual report to the Senate the amounts paid by him during the fiscal year covered by the report to each person employed in the office of each Senator, to each person employed in the office of the Vice President, and to each person employed by each committee of the Senate or subcommittee thereof, by reason of such employment.

(b) The Secretary of the Senate is directed to furnish, under such reasonable rules and regulations as he may prescribe, such information concerning current disbursements of public funds as may be requested of him by any person.

(c) Subsection (b) of this resolution shall take effect thirty days after the date of its adoption.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Trimble and Mr. Wiggins deserve the thanks of the American people for the battle they are waging on behalf of the people's right to know how their money is being spent. I hope this decision by Judge Holtzoff will prompt an early hearing by the Rules Subcommittee on my resolution.

I also ask unanimous consent that, along with my resolution, there be printed in the RECORD the story which appeared in the Washington Post of this morning.

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

SUIT BY NEWSPAPERMEN TO VIEW SENATE PAYROLLS IS THROWN OUT

District Court Judge Alexander Holtzoff threw out a newspaperman's suit to compel Senate disclosure of its payroll records yesterday, upholding all three of the major arguments advanced by the Government in its motion to dismiss the action.

The memorandum opinion presumably will be held applicable to a similar suit involving the House records brought by the small plaintiff, Vance Trimble, Scripps-Howard news editor. Judge Holtzoff's 10½-page opinion held that:

The matter at issue was the Senate's own legislative business and "it is no part of the judicial function to supervise or control" it under the constitutional doctrine of the separation of the governmental powers.

Trimble was without right, either constitutional or personal, to inspect the records in question. In this connection Holtzoff observed that "the constitutional privilege of freedom of the press does not include a right on the part of newspapermen to inspect documents not open to members of the public generally."

Refusal of Senate officials to disclose the data Trimble sought for publication did not interfere with the newspaperman's pursuit of his right to earn a livelihood. On this last point, Holtzoff commented that "the most that can be said is that they have declined to aid him to see documents which Congress has not seen fit to make accessible to the public."

Currently on file in both Houses of Congress are identical petitions of grievances seeking disclosure of the records involved, filed 2 weeks ago by J. R. Wiggins, vice president and executive editor of the Washington Post, on behalf of the board of directors of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Wiggins is president of the society.

In the wake of Holtzoff's opinion, Wiggins commented:

"With one sentence of Judge Holtzoff's opinion all parties surely are in agreement. The Judge says 'this subject is within the legislative power.' That it certainly is. The House demonstrated this several times years ago when it opened to public inspection the payrolls of the Members. The Senate can do likewise. Both chambers have the power to make public the information sought.

"It is to be hoped that they will, not because the information sought is needed by the press but because it is needed by the people in order to form a more perfect estimate of the services of those they elect to office."

CHANGE IN FOREIGN AID POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the New York Times for Tuesday, June 2, 1959, contained an article entitled "MANSFIELD Spurs Aid Policy Shift—Pleads in Senate for End of Grants as Way To Prevent Peril to Whole Program."

It is an excellent article, and it causes me, as I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the RECORD, to pay this commendation to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

I serve with the Senator from Montana on the Committee on Foreign Relations. I well know, Mr. President, what one must

expect when one makes suggestions for modifications of the mutual aid program. One must expect a great deal of criticism, because the impression has been created through the media of information in this country that anyone who makes a suggestion for any modification in the mutual security program is apparently following a policy which is not in the public interest.

I always admire the courage of statesmanship, Mr. President. I think the Senator from Montana has demonstrated that courage time and time again in the past several years when, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, he has suggested very constructive proposals for amendments to the mutual security program, which amendments, in my opinion, would really strengthen the security of our Nation and give us a better mutual security program.

Thus again this year the Senator from Montana, as a member of our committee, is taking the leadership in offering amendments to the program. If one will analyze a good many of the amendments some of us are proposing in the Committee on Foreign Relations one will discover that they are based upon the recommendations of the studies which were prepared for the Committee on Foreign Relations, almost 3 years ago now, by groups of experts from various universities and research institutes, for which studies the Senate appropriated some $240,000.

I have waited long and patiently for any answer to these recommendations which would justify the Senate in not following them. I shall support, until someone can show me any specific recommendation is unsound, the major recommendations of the experts.

I want the RECORD to show this morning that I intend to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Montana in support of the amendments he is offering in the Committee on Foreign Relations and in the Senate with regard to the mutual security program.

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

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

[From the New York Times, June 2, 1959]

MANSFIELD SPURS AID POLICY SHIFT—PLEADS IN SENATE FOR END OF GRANTS AS WAY TO PREVENT PERIL TO WHOLE PROGRAM

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON, June 1.—Senator MIKE MANSFIELD renewed his demands today for a fundamental revision of the foreign aid program.

The Montana Democrat, who is pressing for abolition of the bulk of outright grant aid, said that the administration's impassioned insistence that nothing must change would ultimately destroy the entire program.

Senator MANSFIELD would require the administration to produce by next year plans for abolishing special assistance and defense support by 1963. This year the administration is requesting about $1,100,000,000 for these two forms of grant aid, or more than a quarter of the total $3,900,000,000 program.

Defense support is an euphemism for grants to 12 countries with which the United States has military pacts. Special assistance provides grants to underdeveloped countries with which this country does not have military alliances. Both are essentially forms for subsidizing fragile or nonviable economies.

Senator MANSFIELD wants the Administration to produce new devices for doing this job. He argues that the grant technique makes for inefficiency, creates discontent with the entire program's future.

Leonard J. Saccio, Acting Director of the International Cooperation Administration, has opposed the changes as an attempt to legislate away the problems of this mid-20th century.

Mr. MANSFIELD told the Senate today:

"If you cannot legislate away the program of this mid-20th century, much less can you spend them away with never-ending grants of foreign aid."

FEARS DAY OF RECKONING

To continue the program in its present form, he said, "merely puts off until tomorrow the day of reckoning.

"I cannot accept it because, in the end, that course threatens to destroy what is essential to the Nation, what is desirable in this program, along with much that is nonessential and undesirable."

Senator MANSFIELD said that his speech was preliminary to the introduction of five amendments to the foreign aid bill. In addition to calling for a program to abolish special assistance and defense support grants they would:

Require disclosure of data on the total cost of the aid program to any recipient country.

Require that the ICA be dissolved and its functions be integrated in the Departments of State and Defense.

Strengthen control of the Secretary of State over all forms of aid, including military.

Put military aid directly in the Defense Department budget to make certain that each dollar spent for such aid is better spent abroad than at home.

The hard question raised by the MANSFIELD proposal to cut off grant aid is this:

If the Government is forbidden to make outright grants, what legitimate device can be used for keeping unviable economies such as Jordan and Libya from collapsing?

The administration argument is that such countries will find it impossible for years to come to survive economically without subsidy.

Senator MANSFIELD sought to answer this point today. Recipient countries, he said, need not be adversely affected by a cutoff of grants.

What such a change "will require," he said, "is a rethinking of the aid program, a reshuffling from top to bottom of the aid program in those countries. This rethinking, this reshuffling will be aimed at ending the state of one-sided, endless dependence in which they now find themselves."

Mr. MANSFIELD had no specific suggestions. He said, however, that his project would require that targets be set in the recipient countries for increasing productivity, closing foreign-exchange gaps, reducing excessive military forces, raising investments, and carrying out internal economic reform.

"I will bring about exploration of new ways, such as broad international participation in development, for helping to bring about economic progress," Mr. MANSFIELD said. "It should do much to place these recipient peoples, 4 years hence, in a position to move forward on their own momentum."

Most of the recipients, he said, are rich in resources. The administration, he went on, should help them to "organize and utilize these resources" for their own benefit.

If two or three countries cannot be helped to solve their problems, he said, Congress almost certainly would be willing to make exceptions to fit individual cases.

Senator MANSFIELD's proposal is consistent with many ideas being put forth this year by supporters of foreign aid to end the annual political fighting that they fear may eventually destroy the program.

NOMINATION OF LEWIS STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a telegram I received from Mr. and Mrs. Alland in regard to the Strauss nomination.

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

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *June 3, 1959.*

Senator WAYNE MORRIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We support your stand against Lewis Strauss, and as members of the Jewish faith we realize that anti-Semitism is not an issue here.

Sincerely yours,
ALEX and SONIA ALLAND.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION ON GENERAL INVESTIGATION OF RAILROADS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on February 2, 1959, I introduced for myself, for my colleague from New York, the distinguished present occupant of the chair [Mr. KEATING], and for the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], S. 858, a bill which would amend the Internal Revenue Code in order to permit railroads to take full advantage of tax relief granted by States or municipalities by amending the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the amount of such tax relief be exempt from Federal income taxes.

A report of the Interstate Commerce Commission, docket No. 31954, in the proceeding entitled "Railroad Passenger Train Deficit," was published on May 18, 1959, after an investigation which extended more than 2 years.

The report of the Interstate Commerce Commission strongly endorses the amendment of the Federal tax laws to encourage local and State tax relief "at least to the extent of disregarding State and local provided 'pretax net income' for Federal tax purposes." Indeed, that is one of the nine specific suggestions made by the Commission at the conclusion of its study.

The discussion by the Interstate Commerce Commission of this subject is so apt that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

I hope very much it will be carefully considered by the members of the committee, because I think it supports markedly the proposed legislation to which I have referred.

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

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION REPORT NO. 31954—RAILROAD PASSENGER TRAIN DEFICIT—DECIDED MAY 18, 1959

Facts developed upon general investigation to inform the Commission as to the

manner and method in which carriers by railroad subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act conduct their passenger business, particularly in respect to the nature and causes of the deficit therefrom and possible ways of eliminating that deficit. Recommendations made pursuant to section 12(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act and proceeding discontinued.

The NARUC (National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners) questions "the practicability of obtaining ad valorem property tax relief on the local level" but suggests that "there is precedent for relief on the national level in the adjustment of corporate income tax." One reason for reluctance of State authorities to lighten the railroad's taxload is the fact that the increased earnings would be subject to the Federal income tax. On this point the New York Public Service Commission states:

"Coincidentally, and prerequisite to effective State and local action along similar lines, provision must be made in the Federal Internal Revenue Code preserving for railroads the full benefit of any and all forms of State and local tax relief or aid so that 52 percent or more thereof will not be siphoned away and find its way into the Federal Treasury by operation of the present income tax law."

Federal taxes are of such nature that they tend to vary in the degree with fluctuations in railroad revenue, while State taxes show less relation to such fluctuations. For example, preliminary figures for 1958 show that class I railway operating revenues in that year were $9.56 billion compared with $10.51 billion in 1957, a reduction of 9 percent. Federal income and payroll taxes in the same period declined from $664 million to $558 million, a reduction of 16 percent. In the case of all other taxes, however, the reduction was from $405.8 million to $399.2 million, 1.6 percent.

The tax burden on passenger revenue is somewhat heavier than that on freight. In 1957, 12.8 percent of passenger service revenue was required for taxes assigned to that service, and the corresponding percentage for freight was 8.9 percent. For that reason any possibility of lower taxes affecting passenger service is important. We concur in the suggestion of the Senate committee "that State and local governments reexamine taxes now borne by the railroads for the purpose of determining and correcting inequitable tax situations that exist."

We recognize that the field of taxation is not our responsibility nor prerogative, yet to the extent that both Federal and State revenue measures tend to impede progress in public transportation and in the present rail passenger crisis even constitute a major factor against survival, we cannot disclaim responsibility for doing what we can to help find proper solutions. In this spirit this Commission has consistently urged repeal of the Federal excise tax on freight revenues and continues to urge repeal of the similar, but higher, tax on passenger revenues. Now it appears from our studies in this docket and by the New York studies followed by the Purcell Report that ad valorem income, franchise and other types of taxes should be reviewed and modified, particularly in States where the burdens are disproportionately heavy on railroads operating within their borders. Judging from developments to this point, however, even when States or municipalities agree relief is warranted, they see no justification for giving up local revenues only to have these savings reflected in the gross income of each railroad for Federal income tax purposes.

It has been pointed out forcefully, for example, that one railroad while losing some 33 million in 1958 in passenger operations, nevertheless, earned overall $4,050,000 net revenue for Federal tax purposes. If the several States and cities were agreeable to tax relief, in an effort to retain passenger service, including commuter trains, their willingness to enact appropriate measures, as well as their justification therefor in the public interest, necessarily would depend upon the railroads' retention of such benefits. This means the Federal tax laws and regulations must in some manner give reciprocal recognition of State relief. We understand legislation looking to that result has been introduced and will be considered by the appropriate committees.

The Congress, on the other hand, has the broad consideration of both freight and passenger service and the national system of transportation, apart from the essentially local concern over commuter services. It may properly feel that tax relief which it is called upon to provide, or that which it is asked to recognize as resulting from local and State relief measures, should be reflected to some extent in improved maintenance of railroad properties and in capital replacement, additions, and the like. With this in mind we suggest that differences in local and Federal viewpoints might be resolved by consideration of reasonable conditions requiring evidence of appropriate use of State tax relief funds as a prerequisite for Federal recognition.

Whether such conditions are warranted in the current crisis is not for us to say, but it seems evident from current State studies that local tax relief to railroads, an essential factor in continuance of local passenger and commuter train operation, will not be forthcoming where most needed and to the extent required until proper Federal recognition is assured. We strongly recommend, therefore, that the Congress consider appropriate measures to encourage local and State tax relief to railroads, at least to the extent of disregarding State and local provided pretax net income for Federal tax purposes.

THE ELECTIONS IN SICILY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from New York, the present occupant of the Chair [Mr. KEATING], in urging Americans of Sicilian extraction to communicate with their friends and relatives in Italy with respect to the pending election in Sicily.

My colleague has brought to our attention a very important event, with which we in New York have some familiarity. Mayor La Guardia, as my colleague noted, was a great leader in the fight in 1948 which resulted in a very material change, we all feel, of sentiment in Italy.

I do not consider this to be interference in the affairs of another country. This is people-to-people communication, an ideological and evangelical kind of communication, urging others to do as we do and also urging others to have the objective view which we have on the grimness of the struggle between communism and freedom.

I think we have a right to feel that if communism should win in Sicily it would just be a base of operations, a sort of Achilles heel for an attack upon the Italian boot.

I deeply believe, since we have a great population of Italian extraction in New York, this is a particular message to the people of New York. I hope very much others of our colleagues will join with us in similarly urging their constituents who may have friends and relatives in Sicily to take a good, hard look at the conditions there, not only in terms of what they may feel about the local situation but also in terms of the grim struggle in which the whole world is engaged and in which the people of the United States have such a burning interest.

I wish to congratulate my colleague, and also the Hearst newspapers for urging a great letter-writing and coupon campaign on this subject, for their enterprise and initiative. I emphasize, from my own experience in the foreign policy field, that this does not represent interference in any official or Government way with the affairs of another country. This represents what we call people-to-people communication. We have a right to participate in it. We have a right to feel that the people of Sicily or of Italy, if they want to say anything to the people of the United States of whom they are relatives and friends, are welcome to do so.

The free world not only guarantees freedom of elections, but also guarantees freedom of communication.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, friends of freedom in all lands are gratified when they observe a nation emerge from the shadow of totalitarianism and resume its rightful traditions of justice and liberty.

On June 2, 1946, the Republic of Italy was founded in a postwar climate of uncertainty and hardship.

Thirteen years later this Republic is one of the most productive of all European nations. It is a keystone of defense for the West. Its industries are producing goods on a scale not known before.

There are many other facts which could be quoted today to show how Italy has now won the admiration of the free world. I would like to recall, however, the crucial test of the 1948 Italian election.

Italy at that time had been the target of an intensive Communist campaign for control. Writers told us after the election that Communist groups had spent more than 4 years to prepare for a victory which would put Italy behind the Iron Curtain.

Great efforts were made to prevent this. Hundreds of thousands of letters were written by Italo-Americans to friends and relatives in Italy. April 18 and 19, 1948, were days of suspense as voters went to the polls.

An article in the November 1948, Reader's Digest summed up the returns:

The election results were truly staggering. More than 90 percent of those eligible had cast their votes. Anti-Communists had won control of both Houses of Parliament and a government without Communist ties was assured for the next 5 years. But most sober-minded persons realized that the victory was only an incident, even though a happy one. Italy had saved herself, as Churchill later pointed out, "for the time being" from Moscow dictatorship. The question on the lips

of many was, "How long can this victory be made to last?"

This week's anniversary of the Republic, and the many anniversaries yet to come, give a confident answer to that last question.

DOUBLE TALK AND EVASION BY LEWIS L. STRAUSS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on Monday I obtained unanimous consent to have a sermon by the Reverend Duncan Howlett, pastor of the All Souls Church in Washington, D.C., placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In this eloquent sermon, Dr. Howlett has laid bare one of the most important reasons why the Senate should not confirm Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce.

We have long recognized that the infinitely technical development of our language has made it possible for us to give the appearance of communicating without actually communicating at all. This—and not any wish of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to persecute Mr. Strauss—is the precise reason why the recent hearings consumed so much time. It proved impossible for even the most diligent members of the committee to obtain direct answers from Mr. Strauss.

Many of us are inadvertently ambiguous on occasions; but here is a man who has developed the practice of deliberate ambiguity to an art—a man so successful in the art of communication that he brought communication itself to a standstill. Our task in obtaining information from Mr. Strauss at the hearings was not always a simple matter of discerning simple untruths. In the words of Dr. Howlett, we had to "learn to deal with the falsehood that disguises itself in confusion; the lie which, rather than posing as the truth, vanishes together with the truth in a multitude of meaningless words."

A perfect example of this apparently responsive, but meaningless obfuscation was the reply to Senator ANDERSON'S double charge that Strauss' stand against the shipment of radioactive isotopes abroad was contrary to both sections 5a and 10a of the McMahon Act. After Senator ANDERSON carefully established his charge on this double basis, Mr. Strauss blandly replied that the charge was based only on section 5a, and implied that this was not pertinent because his defense was based on section 10a.

I submit, Mr. President, that here is a mathematically exact half-truth. It was true to say that Senator ANDERSON'S charge was based on section 5a. But it was just as true that it was based on section 10a. By implying that the charge was thus irrelevant, Strauss skillfully obscured the fact that he could not answer the charge and diverted the attention of the committee from his inability to do so.

Mr. President, we must not, in the words of Dr. Howlett, "allow double talk to become an instrument of national or international policy."

Talk for the purpose of stopping, rather than furthering communication has become a disease in public life. This is more dangerous than the technique of the big lie. It is more insidious because it is more subtle. Mr. Strauss did not create this disease, but he has succumbed to it. Our refusal to confirm Mr. Strauss would not be an act of personal malice—it would be an act for the public good.

Let the precedent against double talk and evasion be set here and now. Let us refuse to confirm Mr. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks excerpts from the testimony at the hearing before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on May 6, 1959, which illustrate the evasiveness and half truths of which I have been speaking.

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

EXCERPTS OF TESTIMONY TAKEN FROM INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE HEARINGS, MAY 6, 1959, ON THE NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, PAGES 1008–1015

Senator McGEE. What was the exception?

Mr. STRAUSS. The word is "foregoing." "And the actual test of the law goes on, but does not include source materials as defined in section 5b(1)." Period, end of the section.

Senator PASTORE. In other words, Mr. Strauss—let me see if I can clear this up—it was your understanding that Senator ANDERSON had asserted or had accused you of assuming your position under interpretation of the atomic energy law, section 5a, but you did not take your position under the interpretation of the law under section 5a which has to do with fissionable material; you took your position under section 10, which has to do with not communicating information to any other country in the world.

Mr. STRAUSS. Yes; and I so testified before the Joint Committee, and it is of record in the document to which the chairman a moment ago alluded, on page 42.

Senator PASTORE. If I am not right, you can correct me.

Senator McGEE. Mr. Chairman, we haven't gotten to the end of this point.

Mr. STRAUSS. I am aware of that, Senator. I know that this will be protracted.

Senator McGEE. We are trying to get down to the——

Senator PASTORE. Please read on, Mr. Strauss.

Mr. STRAUSS. "It is therefore apparent that fissionable material was intended to include plutonium, enriched uranium and other similar materials capable of causing a chain reaction and thus useful in the nuclear weapons."

This is the part I quoted:

"But it would require a very strained and incorrect interpretation of the act to state that the term 'fissionable material' included radioisotopes, which have no weapons potential and are used for peaceful purposes."

I will read on, but that was not the section of the act which I interpreted, and no strain was involved, I assure you.

Senator McGEE. The bottom of the page——

Senator PASTORE. Keep on reading.

Mr. STRAUSS. I will reach it. I will read every point of it, if you will permit me to:

"It is true that the Congress has subsequently amended this section of the act, in 1951, and again in 1958, to keep up with changing world conditions and need for cooperation with our military allies in the nuclear weapons field. However, at no time did the Congress prohibit export of radioisotopes for peaceful purposes."

I will end the quote for the moment. I differ with that:

"The 1954 act in fact contained a specific provision (sec. 7c) concerning 'byproduct materials,' or radioisotopes, and specifically authorized distribution of these materials for various purposes without any prohibition as to export or import."

I forgot that I was going back on the record, quoting Senator ANDERSON, beginning with the 1954 act:

"The prohibition as to export or import pertained specifically to 'fissionable materials' and not to 'byproduct materials,' or radioisotopes.

"Section 10a of the 1946 act"——

Senator McGEE. Are you reading from Senator ANDERSON?

Mr. STRAUSS. I am—(continuing) "pertained to control of information and did not prohibit exchange of materials. It would be a strained and incorrect interpretation of the act to state that transfer of an isotope involved 'an exchange of information' as there so clearly pointed out by Dr. Oppenheimer and others during the hearing."

Senator PASTORE. Mr. Strauss, don't you interpret that to mean that the position of Mr. ANDERSON was—and I will be corrected—that whether you interpret it under 5a or 10a, the point he was trying to make is that you could export a radioisotope; and your position is that you could if it was strictly for medical purposes, but you couldn't if they could be used for industrial purposes?

Mr. STRAUSS. That is correct, Senator.

Senator PASTORE. It is just as simple as all that. We have wasted 2 days over it.

Senator McGEE. Mr. Chairman, I was not quite finished here, in order to get this cleared up.

I am still quoting from Admiral Strauss' statement, on Page 15, when he says that "the Senator from New Mexico was not a member of the Joint Committee at the time and may not be as familiar with the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 as I then was." The pertinent section is not Section 5, he said, but section 10.

Mr. STRAUSS. That is correct.

Senator McGEE. Entitled "Control of information."

Mr. STRAUSS. That is right.

Senator McGEE. Yet you leave that out in terms of the Senator's case and his reference to it on which he built his charge. I am only asking that we clear up the record and make it read accurately, without the rather conspicuous omission here of the fact that his case rests on section 5a and section 10.

That is all that is at stake there. You read it very well.

Mr. STRAUSS. Thank you, Senator.

The Senator appeared to me to base his argument on section 5a(3). I base mine on section 10. I clearly stated in 1949 that that was the section upon which I relied.

Senator McGEE. Let the record show——

Mr. STRAUSS. To bring in another section was extraneous to my case.

Senator McGEE. You were attacking Senator ANDERSON'S case, and here it is in section 5a and 10a, and you have just read it.

Mr. STRAUSS. What is your point, Seantor?

Senator McGEE. That there was a significant omission in your statement here that you have handed to the press and to the members of the committee, in premising your attack on the Senator's case on the interpretation which you place on section 5 and quote from it, but you omit, and I trust inadvertently, his reference also in building his case, to section 10. That is all I asked that we clear up in the very beginning. It is as simple as that.

Mr. STRAUSS. I also omitted his reference to section 7c, Senator. The fact is that I was defending my position, not trying to establish Senator ANDERSON'S.

And Senator ANDERSON had advance knowledge of my position over the years. If he had wished to demolish my position, he would have directed his attention to section 10, instead of to section 5. And he made some fun of me by indicating that I thought this isotope was fissionable material. I never had any such idea.

Senator ANDERSON. May I——

Mr. STRAUSS. It is a reference to a bottle and a shovel.

Senator ANDERSON. Could I make a personal statement there?

The CHAIRMAN. If it is all right with the committee, it is all right with the Chairman.

Senator ANDERSON. Every word——

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute.

Is there any objection by the committee? All right.

Mr. STRAUSS. Could I go ahead?

Senator ANDERSON. Every word I wrote out originally was based on section 10a. Every word. It had nothing to do with section 5.

Dave Toll, the attorney for the committee, came over and said, "You mustn't overlook the other sections and in fairness you ought to put them in," and he wrote them in. And I took out the sections that related primarily to section 10, and let him file the whole thing. If you want to go check it, you can check it. To say that I have based my case on five is absurd and ridiculous, and nobody knows it better than the witness.

Senator MCGEE. Mr. Chairman, since I introduced it——

Mr. STRAUSS. The record speaks for itself.

Senator MCGEE. I would like to conclude.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator MCGEE. I remind the committee that in the charge here today leveled by the admiral we have read his statement on page 15 in which he impugns the knowledge available to Senator ANDERSON by suggesting he was not a member of the Joint Committee, and then educating him on what his lack of knowledge seemed to bring forth from him by saying the pertinent section is not section 5 but section 10. This is precisely what Senator ANDERSON reported in the committee hearing yesterday.

Mr. STRAUSS. Mr. Chairman, I am not impugning anyone. I am defending myself against an unwarranted attack. I have stated that the pertinent section is not section 5 but section 10, and the report of the Joint Committee makes it abundantly plainly clear: "Admiral Strauss relied upon section 10a of the act."

Senator COTTON. Mr. Chairman, we made no objection, and welcome the statement by Senator ANDERSON. But the record should show that in Senator ANDERSON'S testimony he spent most or part of page 684, a considerable part of 685, discussing section 5a, and then he mentions section 10a at the bottom of page 686 and dismisses it in just six lines.

Senator ANDERSON. That is not fair. Turn to page 688 and read it: "You will see that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy went carefully into Mr. Strauss' comments that section 10a of the act, which I will not try to quote in full, says," and so forth. I knew about his opinion; and I quoted it properly.

I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire will recognize that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

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.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that when action shall have been concluded on the agriculture appropriation bill today, it is the intention of the leadership to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 318, Senate bill 1541, to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, and for other purposes. The junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has talked to me about the bill several times. It is a very important bill. The senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is prepared to address himself to the bill this afternoon. So as soon as the Senate has completed action on the agriculture appropriation bill, it is planned to call up Senate bill 1541, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Yes; indeed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire all Senators to be on notice.

When action has been concluded on Senate bill 1541, it is planned to have the Senate consider Calendar No. 321, H.R. 7007, to authorize an appropriation of about a half billion dollars to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. That amount is, I think, identical with the figure in the President's budget. It is an important bill, one which should be sent to the President promptly for signature, so that the House may then begin its consideration of the appropriation to carry out the authorization. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. I do not believe there is any objection to it. The able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] will handle the bill on the floor. I wanted to make this announcement so that all Senators would be on notice.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it planned to take up any nominations today?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That will depend on the progress which is made on the bills. I would not like to have the Senate work until too late an hour. But if action should be concluded on the bills I have just mentioned, it might be possible to begin the consideration of nominations.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the nominations, then, be taken up tomorrow?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. They will be taken up when action has been concluded on the bills I have listed. I hope we may take them up during the latter part of the afternoon. I do not anticipate that there will be much discussion of the Alaska bill or the space bill. But whether the nominations will be taken up this afternoon will depend on how much time is consumed on the bills I have mentioned. As the Senator from New York knows, I am very desirous that the Senate shall begin the consideration of the nominations as soon as that is practicable.

INCREASED GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF EGGS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the New York Times today has published an editorial entitled "Grain Props, and Eggs." Also, the New York Times this morning has published an article entitled "United States Will Increase Purchase of Eggs To Help Farmers." I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorial may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, June 3, 1959]

GRAIN PROPS, AND EGGS

Secretary of Agriculture Benson has announced the Department's wheat program for the crop year beginning July 1. The amount of planting authorized has again been set at the minimum permitted by law, 55 million acres. On July 23 the customary referendum will be taken among wheat farmers. If they cast a two-thirds vote in favor of accepting marketing quotas (the compulsory part of the program) the support levels for complying farmers will be about $1.81 a bushel; in the remote case that marketing quotas should be turned down the support level would drop to about $1.05 a bushel.

President Eisenhower took the occasion to protest once more against the changes incorporated in pending legislation in Congress, which would increase price supports still further for farmers complying with acreage and marketing restrictions.

The administration has contended that incentive price supports are self-defeating. That is why the President declared that "continuation of this legislation for another year leads the wheat program one step closer to disaster."

The wheat program and other compulsory price support programs need to be better understood by other groups in the economy. At the present moment this is particularly true in the case of the financially troubled egg-producing farmers of the Nation. There is a huge disparity between the cost of producing wheat and corn on the big commercial farms of the country and the level at which price supports are fixed. Thus the average production of wheat an acre works out at 27 bushels. But the comparatively small number of farms that contribute about three-fourths of commercial supply each year average between 60 and 70 bushels.

While the Government will be standing by in 1960 prepared to absorb the Nation's surplus at $1.81 a bushel, millions of bushels of this surplus will be produced in the great Southwestern farm areas at as little as 60 cents a bushel.

This revolution in grain production should not be permitted to stop at that point. We know that whereas in the thirties 50 pounds of feed were required to produce 77 eggs, today the same amount will produce 145 eggs; tomorrow it is expected to be 160.

Why, then, doesn't the condition of the egg farmers reflect these enormous gains? The answer is that the producers of the basic food and feed grains have prevented them from being passed on to the producers of eggs, poultry, and meat by insisting on legislation designed to maintain price supports for their crops completely out of touch with reality.

[From the New York Times, June 3, 1959]

UNITED STATES WILL INCREASE PURCHASE OF EGGS TO HELP FARMERS—PROGRAM FOR FROZEN WHOLE PRODUCT TO START SHORTLY—DETAILS DUE LATER—WEEKLY BUYING SLATED—PRESSURE FROM NEW JERSEY AND PRODUCER GROUPS CITED—CASE LAUDS ACTION

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, June 2.—The Department of Agriculture announced today that it would buy frozen whole eggs to help the egg and poultry industry.

The Department said that it would begin the weekly purchases soon. The farmers have been seeking aid to help bolster sagging prices.

Details of the new frozen whole egg purchase program will be made known to the industry later this week, Department officials said. The frozen whole eggs will be stored for drying later this year and for distribution in the national school lunch program and in charitable and welfare programs.

Officials said that egg dryers were running at full capacity because of the heavy production, thus necessitating the frozen whole egg program rather than a step-up in dried egg purchases.

BUYING DRIED EGGS

The Department has been buying dried whole eggs to help stabilize prices to producers since April 16, the date on which it stopped the purchase of dried eggs for the national school lunch program. Total purchases to date under both programs has been 13,500,000 pounds or the equivalent of 1,400,000 cases of shell eggs. A case contains 30 dozen shell eggs.

The cost of these programs has exceeded $15 million. There was no immediate announcement on the probable cost of the frozen whole egg program.

Frozen whole eggs are used principally by bakers. The yolks and whites of eggs are separated from the shell and packed for freezing in 37½-pound containers. A container of this weight holds 30 dozen or 360 eggs. Ten pounds of dried eggs comes from the same number of eggs.

Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, agreed last Friday to reconsider further subsidies to the egg industry after a meeting with Philip Alampi, New Jersey Secretary of Agriculture and 10 representatives of New Jersey farmer and feed groups.

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, said today that he had been informed by the Department that other proposals by the New Jersey delegation were "still under active consideration." This was relayed to Senator CASE by Clarence I. Miller, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

The other proposals included the purchase of chickens for canning to be held for later use in the school lunch and welfare programs, release of feed grains going out of condition at a price 50 percent of what New Jersey producers pay for feed, purchase of shell eggs and a price-support program for poultry.

Mr. Benson has made clear that a price-support program would not be undertaken and that he frowned upon purchase of eggs in the shell because of storage problems and the interference with normal trade channels.

CASE HAILS PURCHASE

Senator CASE hailed the purchase of frozen whole eggs as "a sound and realistic step in the right direction to meet the immediate crisis."

But New Jersey's Democratic Senator, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., attacked Mr. Benson for failing to use the power and funds he has "to curtail the waves of bankruptcies now forcing farmers out of business in many States."

On the Senate floor, Mr. Benson came in for more criticism as the Senate rejected an administration-supported effort to cut $150 million from soil and water conservation payments in 1960.

The roll-call vote was 51 to 26 against an amendment by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, who has been trying to slash the program for years.

He proposed that the agriculture appropriations bill before the Senate authorize only $100 million for payments under the agricultural conservation program, known as ACP. The Senate vote upheld a provision calling for advance authorization of $250 million. This was the same amount authorized for this year and the same amount voted for 1960 by the House.

PAYMENTS TO FARMERS

ACP payments are made to farmers who install specified soil and water savings practices on their farms. Mr. Benson contends that these practices including use of lime, contour plowing, and terracing are routine modern farm methods for which no payments should be made. He has sought to cut the program almost every year since 1953.

This was the only major action taken by the Senate on the $3,975 million agriculture appropriations bill for the fiscal year beginning July 1. Frequent interruptions for other matters and statements by Members held up action on several amendments, including the contested limit of $50,000 on the amount of Federal price support that could be given to an individual farmer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am pleased, of course, that the Department of Agriculture, in this month of June, has at long last seen the necessity of making additional egg purchases. The price of eggs has been disastrously low since late March and continuing into April and May—2½ months. Millions and millions of dollars of savings have been liquidated, and hundreds of farmers have actually been broken on the rack because of the disastrous prices for eggs. But at long last the Secretary of Agriculture, who has had the authority all the time, who has had the money, by appropriation from Congress, all the time, and who has had the machinery for effectuating a policy of purchases all the time, has decided to move a little bit more in an effort to bolster prices.

By the way, these products are usable. They are usable at hospitals, usable in the school lunch programs, and usable in the overseas aid program. It is not as if the products would be wasted, and that all the Government would be doing would be to buy eggs and throw them into the ocean. That is not the case. The eggs will be dried and frozen, and, as such, will be edible and usable.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not familiar with the article to which the Senator has referred. Does the Senator say that the Government is supporting the price of eggs?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am saying that the administration now has decided, according to the article written by Mr. William M. Blair, to buy frozen whole eggs in order to help the egg and poultry industry. Mr. Blair, who is one of the respected writers on agricultural subjects and other topics for the New York Times, states:

The Department of Agriculture announced today that it would buy frozen whole eggs to help the egg and poultry industry.

The Department said that it would begin the weekly purchases soon. The farmers have been seeking aid to help bolster sagging prices.

Details of the new frozen whole egg purchase program will be made known to the industry later this week, Department officials said. The frozen whole eggs will be stored for drying later this year and for distribution in the national school lunch program and in charitable and welfare programs.

Officials said that egg dryers were running at full capacity because of the heavy production, thus necessitating the frozen whole egg program rather than a step-up in dried egg purchases.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I assume that that program would apply to the production of eggs all over the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope so. I hope it will not be limited merely to certain seaboard areas, because many other egg-producing areas in the country are in distress.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can assure the Senator from Minnesota that most of the egg producers in Georgia are in a precarious situation, and I hope that something will be done to enable them to remain in business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is very lucky if the egg producers in Georgia are still able to remain in business.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some are not; but most of the stalwart ones are still surviving.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The good, stalwart people of Georgia need to remain stalwart in these perilous days.

Mr. RUSSELL. Indeed, they must.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was intrigued by the agricultural editorial published in that great newspaper, the New York Times, a publication for which I have always had great respect. The two concluding paragraphs are quite interesting to read:

This revolution in grain production should not be permitted to stop at that point—

That is a reference to earlier comments in the editorial—

We know that whereas in the thirties 50 pounds of feed were required to produce 77 eggs, today the same amount will produce 145 eggs; tomorrow it is expected to be 160.

Why, then, doesn't the condition of the egg farmers reflect these enormous gains? The answer is that the producers of the basic food and feed grains have prevented them from being passed on to the producers of eggs, poultry, and meat by insisting on legislation designed to maintain price supports for their crops completely out of touch with reality.

Oh, Mr. President, every once in a while something is written which makes a man feel that he may know a little something. I do not profess to be an expert in these matters; but right now I feel like a graduate student in agricultural economics, compared with the writer of that paragraph in the New York Times editorial. In other words, if this is the thinking of the experts on the editorial

staff of the New York Times, then I qualify as a graduate student in agricultural economics, Phi Beta Kappa.

What do the members of the New York Times editorial staff think farmers have been paying for feed? The only reason, I suppose, why more egg and poultry producers have not gone broke—and plenty of them have—is that the price of feed grains, likewise, is at a very low level. I wonder how much those editorial writers think the price supports are on feed grains? They are 60 percent of parity. What is the price, may I ask, of feed grains in the market? It is less than 60 percent of parity. What do they think chickens are fed? They are not being fed uranium—I hope. The feed grains which poultry use are at this time selling at about the lowest price feed grains have been sold for at any time in the past 15 years.

Of course, there is processed feed. But the farmer is not the processor of the feed. The farmer produces the raw material. Indeed, the processed feed does get a little expensive. But the processors of feed happen to be some of the friends of the New York Times. The oats produced by Mr. Farmer—and oats are a good raw food for chickens—sell in the marketplace for around 60 cents a bushel. That is not much of a price. The price support on basic feed grains is very, very low—not 90 percent of parity, not 75 percent of parity, but 60 or 65 percent of parity, when they are supported at all.

Mr. President, the problem is that even with all the modern scientific advancement, when eggs are selling for 17, 19, or 21 cents a dozen—grade A, large eggs—the egg producer cannot make any money. He has to receive a little something for what he produces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the 3-minute limitation in the morning hour, the time available to the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for another 3 minutes, so as to edify the New York Times editorial staff on some matters such as feed-grain prices.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the New York Times editorial staff would be better off if they knew a little about some of the medicinals and some of the other things which are required for a modern chicken ranch or chicken farm.

Today, all kinds of drugs are used to make sure that the poultry are not infected—for instance, mycin drugs, which, by the way, are used for both livestock and poultry—and all sorts of vaccines. I do not know how many of the editorial writers of the New York Times have vaccinated chickens. But I have vaccinated many chickens; and I have sold some of the vaccine, too.

Today, the problem of the poultry producer is not the cost of raw feed which the farmer produces, because the poultry producer can produce some of the raw feed on his own land. The problem the chicken farmer has is the high cost of money, under this administration's interest policies, in case he wants to build a chicken house or wants to improve his chicken ranch or farm; the high cost of materials; the high cost of processed feeds; and the higher cost of a host of other commodities which go into making a modern chicken farm or poultry farm.

Mr. President, I am not complaining particularly about the prices a farmer has to pay for the feed he uses for his poultry. After all, a feed processor is entitled to make a profit. I believe in the profit system, too, but not alone for some people's friends. I believe that if a profit is good for some people, it is good for everyone—just as I believe in private property: If it is good for Cousin Joe and Uncle Ned, it is also good for Cousin Sam; it is good for everybody.

I believe that the feed processor is entitled to a fair price for the feed, and the pharmaceutical manufacturers are entitled to fair prices for their drugs, and the serum manufacturers are entitled to fair prices for their products, and the worker is entitled to a fair wage, and the banker is entitled to fair interest.

But, having said that, I wish to say that I think Mr. Farmer, too, is also entitled to a fair price for his products, which, in this case, are the eggs and the chickens.

But as of this morning, in the State of Minnesota, hens are selling for 11 cents or 12 cents a pound, and they have been selling for as little as 9 cents a pound; and grade A, top, superior quality eggs have sold in Minnesota—which is one of the top poultry producing States of the Union—for as little as 17 cents a dozen. On the other hand, the same eggs have been sold in the metropolitan centers for 59 cents a dozen, 65 cents a dozen, or, at delicatessens, 75 or 80 cents a dozen.

Mr. President, I repeat, here on the floor of the Senate, that there needs to be a full-scale investigation into the egg brokerage business, because there is a big, big difference between what happens at the henhouse and what happens at the supermarket. Believe me, Mr. President, as I said earlier, the only one who processes an egg is a hen. That is not a matter of processing or wrapping or advertising. An egg is an egg; and eggs are classified on the basis of whether they are small size, pullet, middle, random, large, or super large—king size. Mr. President, if you get a king-size egg, you have to pay a pretty good price for it. But I wish to say that some of our queen-size hens that make these king-size eggs are not getting king-size payments for their work beyond the call of duty. [Laughter.]

All I am asking for is that the Department of Agriculture, as it proceeds with this belated, tardy program of egg purchases, do something for the egg producers, for the farmers, and do it before it is too late.

So I give a word of thanks to the Secretary of Agriculture for having been convinced by some of my colleagues from New Jersey and elsewhere. Some of us from the Middle West are not so persuasive. I started working on the Secretary away back in April. However, I hope that my persistence was a part of the general effort which moved the Secretary to some belated action.

If the Secretary or anyone else wishes any figures in regard to grain prices, we can provide them.

Let me add that it makes little difference how much lower the price of grain goes; that will not help the predicament of the poultry farmer, because his prices have already fallen to a disastrously low level. What is needed is a better poultry and egg market.

UNIFORM STANDARDS OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT PAYMENTS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an excerpt from the morning ticker which deals with a statement, attributed to the President of the United States, in regard to unemployment. This news item begins as follows:

> Jobless benefits: Eisenhower said he signed a bill recently to increase pension and unemployment benefits of railroad workers because after very careful study he concluded that it was a well balanced measure.

But the next paragraph of the ticker item reads as follows:

> But as for extending more liberal unemployment benefits to all other workers, the President made it clear he still feels that is a job which the States should handle primarily. He recalled that he has urged repeatedly that the States adopt uniform standards with longer duration of benefit payments.

Mr. President, I think all of us agree that uniform standards should be adopted; I think the President was absolutely correct.

But I do not know how uniform standards can be adopted without having it done at the Federal level.

I am surprised at the statement, attributed to the President, that so far as unemployment insurance or unemployment benefits are concerned, they should be left to the States. It seems to me that is about the only area as to which that kind of thinking is being engaged in.

We are about to launch a program of increasing the interest on Government bonds; and apparently the ways are pretty well greased to shoot that program into operation in a hurry. I think this shows a great concern for the moneylenders and a great concern for the Wall Street crowd. When we consider unemployment programs and economic programs to make work, then consideration for the people should be shown. It seems to me that we should attack this problem at the national level.

Unemployment insurance has always been a joint program as between the Federal Government and the States. I could not disagree more with the President's statement in which he said that it should be left to the States. I think we should show a little more concern in this Congress particularly for the problems of the people. We show so much concern about the problems of the great financial institutions of the country.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the agreement entered yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7175) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion to reconsider is withdrawn, and the question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to reconsider the vote agreeing to the so-called O'Mahoney amendment on page 15, line 25.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion and call up the amendment which I have at the desk, which I offer on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Colorado for himself and the junior Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 15, in line 25, after the comma following the figure, to insert the following: "of which $15,000 shall be available for range and feedlot market reporting in Colorado and adjacent areas and."

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, information has come to me that those in charge of the market reporting service in the Department of Agriculture regard the proposed reporting service as a very important activity. It is in category 1. The witnesses for the Department did not apprise us of that fact when they were before the committee. They were asked about this specific project, and did not then tell us it was classified in category 1.

Other items involving category 1 marketing reports were disallowed by the committee. For that reason, I have suggested to the two Senators from Colorado that they content themselves with a bare-bones operation for the next year, which would be involved in this $15,000 item. However, there would be nothing which would prevent the Department from allowing more than $15,000 for this service.

I think I should say for the record that I have been told by responsible officers of the Department that they could carry on this work with $17,000. If they desired, of course, they could allot other funds for this purpose.

In view of the extraordinary conditions affected by this amendment, I shall take the "dangerous" step of accepting it and taking it to conference and seeing what we can work out.

I hope those who have offered proposals as to other items which the committee has been unable to accept will understand that this project is in a somewhat different category, because it has been in operation for 2 years on an experimental basis and financed from research funds. Unless I accept the amendment, those involved will be deprived of a service they have already enjoyed. As to other activities for which we have declined to make provision, those interested in them have not tasted of the enjoyment of having a marketing service, and perhaps they will not be too bitter about being requested to wait for another year.

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

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I agree with the statement of the Senator from Georgia that this item is in a different category. There were some errors made in not making a proper presentation when the testimony was given before the committee. I thank the senior Senator from Georgia for his fair consideration of this proposal.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, from the colloquy had yesterday, as to the nature of the amendment, I feel the record is complete, so I shall not burden the RECORD further. I believe, however, I should say, in all seriousness, the service referred to is considered to be a very, very necessary part not only of the livestock industry in Colorado and the adjacent area, but also the agricultural community as a whole.

To the Senator from Georgia let me say that I appreciate his taking the steps which he has taken in accepting this amendment, which I hope we shall be able to hold in conference, because I know that what he said yesterday, even though perhaps it was not pleasing to me, was based upon the high principles which always govern him in these matters, and for which he has been noted throughout his entire career. So I express my appreciation to him.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield back any time that may remain in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] for himself and the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I call up the amendment which I have at the desk, identified as "6-2-59-B." I ask the clerk to read it with the modification that the last figure be $375 million, which was intended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 19, line 6, strike out the figure "$450,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$375,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this amendment deals with the expenditures under the soil bank program. The bill as reported by the committee provides for $450 million.

That represents an increase of $125 million over the House figure and $75 million over the budget estimate. It proposes to spend $75 million more for this program next year than is even recommended by the budget.

Personally, I think the whole soil bank program, from its inception, has been a failure and that it would be much better to strike the provision for it from the law. I do not think it has accomplished the purpose for which millions of dollars are being expended. We should not be paying $300 million or $400 million to take acreage out of production particularly in view of the fact that the Senate has on numerous occasions appropriated millions of dollars to other agencies to bring new acreage into production.

If we stop this contradiction we could save billions and have a better farm program.

Only yesterday the Senate agreed to an additional $250 million to increase the fertility of the acreage already in production. Certainly, if we do not stop this kind of procedure these contradictory programs are going to bankrupt us.

It appears evident that we are making a mistake on this program. It has been criticized by practically all Members of the Senate. I do not think anyone today would defend the program as being a workable one. Certainly we should not put $75 million more in this program, which is an admitted failure, than even the Department wants.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret very much that I must decline the kind invitation extended by the distinguished Senator from Delaware. I cannot accept the amendment. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in calling it to my attention and inviting me to accept it. I wish I could agree with the Senator. It is always pleasant to agree with one's colleagues. However, I cannot accept the amendment.

We are dealing with only one stage of the legislative process when we consider these matters on the floor of the Senate. This item still must go to conference. The other body reduced the program authorization for next year $50 million below the budget estimates. Judging from my experience in the past I rather suspect the Senate will be compelled to yield a part of the recommended $450 million in the conference.

The committee has taken action on the matter by a vote in the subcommittee and in the full committee. Under the circumstances, as much as I appreciate the courtesy and ability of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, I do not feel I

could on my responsibility accept this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may I ask how much time there is remaining to each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has consumed 2 minutes, and the chairman of the subcommittee has consumed 1 minute. The Senator from Delaware has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the debate on the amendment will be very brief. This is a very simple amendment and merely boils down to a question of how enthusiastic we are for the soil bank program. In particular, do we wish to compel the administration to spend $75 million more than is even recommended?

I think we are practically ready to vote. If it is all right with the chairman of the subcommittee, I am going to suggest that we have a quorum call with the time not charged to either side, in order to get Members to the Chamber. I should like to have a yea and nay vote.

I think we can vote very promptly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the call of the roll not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. 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. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the yeas and nays may be ordered on the Senator's amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Georgia yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment before the remainder of the time is yielded back.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that this item relates to the last year of the conservation reserve program. This is an authorization for that program, with respect to which the budget estimate was $375 million. That has been increased to $450 million by the Senate committee. That is $125 million above the House figure, as I understand. I think it would be rather singular if we were to undertake to approve the Senate committee figure, under the circumstances, when it is so much in excess of the House figure, and $75 million above the budget estimate.

It has been pointed out that some farmers could not get in under the program heretofore, because of the contention that the funds for the 1959 program were inadequate. But this is the last year. The program will go out of business. I am sure that the Budget Bureau and the House have gone into this subject very thoroughly. I believe we should sustain the budget figure. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Delaware will prevail.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to take a few minutes of my time.

I would like to point out that if this program were to be extended over a period of years, as the President requested in his message to the Congress of January 29, 1959, it would cost a great deal more than $450 million. From all I have been able to ascertain it is very obvious that there is no possibility whatever that this program will be extended as has been requested by the President in his message.

The committee was attempting to carry out the philosophy of the President's message by raising this authorization to $450 million. I am somewhat astonished that the senior Senator from Illinois did not take cognizance of that fact.

The bill has not yet become a law. It must run all the hazards of conference. It is highly unlikely that we shall be able to preserve the figure of $450 million in conference. If we were to reduce the figure to $375 million, we would not be able to preserve that figure.

When dollars and cents are involved, a conference becomes a matter of give and take. We must give as much as we are able to take. It is not like a conference on the language of a provision of a bill—which can be rewritten. But when dollars and cents are involved, we cannot expect either body of Congress to yield completely to the other.

In my opinion the committee was completely justified in its action. I hope the Senate will support the action of the committee.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that action by the other House would have reduced the program to a program to be carried out within 5 years, and would have excluded the 10-year program?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true.

Mr. HOLLAND. The action of our committee was to restore the 10-year program, which was, in effect, restoring reforestation among the objectives to be covered by the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The 5-year limitation, which we eliminated in committee, is not involved in the pending amendments. But the reforestation program is involved in the pending amendment which would cut the authorization by $75 million.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is a fact that the action of the committee in continuing the reforestation program by changing the 5-year limitation to a 10-year limitation means that if we are to have true reforestation contracts, we must have the money to support such contracts.

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no question about that. If the House figure were to prevail, there would be an allocation of only 2,300,000 new acres for the conservation reserve program next year, I point out that we cannot justify the expenditure of this large administrative fund on such a small acreage.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that this is one of the effective methods still left open to us by which, in taking tilled land out of production, we are making a definite approach to wiping out continued farm surpluses?

Mr. RUSSELL. With the Department pursuing its policy in so many areas of removing planting restrictions, this is the only program that I know of that we can hope to use to take acreage out of production of those commodities which are proving to be such a glut on the market.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly approve the Senator's answer. My view, in supporting writing into the bill the full authorized amount of $450 million, is that this is the most effective blow we shall have an opportunity to strike for the discontinuance of increasing surpluses in farm production during this session of Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is the only opportunity we shall have.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Was the action of the committee unanimous?

Mr. RUSSELL. As I recall, it was not unanimous, but it was practically so. The vote was more than 2 to 1. There was a show of hands. Those who expressed any doubt did not even request a rollcall. I think there were two or three objections in the committee. However, I hope the Senator will bear in mind that this is a large committee, with a membership of 27.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I listened to the colloquy between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Georgia. I fully agree with the expressions made by the Senator from Georgia in response to the questions of the Senator from Florida.

The entire authorization is needed. It is more needed this year than it was last year. As the Senator has pointed out, when we eliminate acreage controls and rely on only one mechanism to reduce production, namely, lower supports, there must be something to absorb some of the marginal land, which has been repeatedly put into production, thereby increasing the surpluses which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns.

This program, besides affording control over production, represents a sincere and consistent effort at real service. The more farm people we can bring into the conservation reserve program over an extended period of years, the better our conservation program will be.

This is not a year-to-year program. In many instances these contracts run for 10 years or longer.

As the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, what we are doing is merely fulfilling the authorization which Congress once made, in the light of the program laid down by the experts in the Department.

I support the action of the committee. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Delaware—offered, of course, in good faith—will be defeated, in equally good faith, by a resounding majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to take a little time to point out again that we are dealing with the soil bank program. What the bill proposes to do is to spend $75 million more than the amount which has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Remember this is a program which has been very much criticized by many Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. Only yesterday I heard one of the orators on the other side of the aisle refer to the program as the Eisenhower golf club program. He said it was of benefit primarily to the golf clubs, the rich men's clubs. Today we have a chance to vote to cut back the program. I wonder how he will vote today. Let the RECORD show that as we vote on the soil bank program, we are voting on not only its merits but also on the question of approving it to an extent beyond even that visualized by the administration. The committee bill would provide $75 million more than even the administration believes should be spent on the program.

Let us make this issue very clear, Mr. President. Personally, I believe that the soil bank program should be rolled back even more than the amendment proposes. In my opinion, it has been a failure. I do not believe we can justify spending $450 million of the taxpayers' money for this program, which takes land out of production, especially when we are going to spend through another agency hundreds of millions of dollars for bringing new land into production. If we reject the pending amendment, we will not only be approving the soil bank program but also be approving it to an extent far beyond that which is recommended by the administration. Seventy-five million dollars are involved in the amendment. All the amendment proposes to do is to bring the program back to the minimum of the budgetary estimates. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a report as furnished by the Comptroller General of the United States in which he points out certain specific examples of abuses under the soil bank program. This is further evidence in support of the contention that by all means this program should be cut back.

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

LAND DIVISIONS—HIDALGO COUNTY, TEX.

Case No. 1: In 1957, a 6,500-acre tract of land was divided into 12 parcels and sold. Acreage on 11 of these parcels was subsequently placed in the conservation reserve program for a period of 10 years. The annual payments on the conservation reserve contracts amount to $44,600, or a total for the 10-year contract period of about $446,000.

In addition, acreage reserve program contracts amounted to $64,800, and estimated practice payments amounted to $35,200 on these properties through 1958. Other information pertaining to the transactions follows:

1. No downpayments were required of the purchasers.

2. There is evidence that the purchasers were required to obtain maximum payments under the soil bank programs and assign the payments against the purchase price.

3. In October 1958, 5 of the 11 parcels were refinanced and the annual installments payable by the purchasers were reduced to $5,000, the maximum amount a producer may receive under the conservation reserve program. The reduction of annual installments coincided with the discontinuance of the acreage reserve program.

4. Two of the purchasers were shown as doctors.

Case No. 2: Division of this tract of land totaling about 16,000 acres began in 1956. Sales were generally made on the same terms as those outlined in case No. 1. In 1958, 23 separate pieces of this tract had been entered into the conservation reserve program under 10-year contracts. The annual payments on these contracts amount to $105,000, or a total for the 10-year period of the contracts of about $1,050,000.

In addition, acreage reserve program contracts amounted to $131,000, and estimated practice payments amounted to $40,800 on these properties through 1958.

PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF CURRENT REVIEW OF 1959 CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

1. In Curry County, N. Mex., 2,600 acres of a 3,600-acre farm were divided into five parcels and sold in 1957. The sale was contingent upon the purchasers' execution of 10-year conservation reserve contracts. Annual conservation reserve program payments on these five parcels total $21,000.

2. We found 12 instances in Curry County, N. Mex., where land leased from the State had been placed in the conservation reserve program. In one of these instances, about 550 acres leased for 25 cents an acre was placed in the conservation reserve program at an annual rental rate of $9 per acre. Detailed information as to acreage and rental rates is being developed on the remaining cases.

3. In Bottineau County, N. Dak., the land value estimates established by the county committee and used in establishing the payment rates appear high based on our review. The county committee established a value of $65 per acre for land of average productivity, whereas the average per acre sales price of 52 farmland sales since 1956 was $48, including buildings and wasteland.

In one case, a 600-acre farm, including buildings, was purchased in 1956 for $19,000. If the purchase price of $19,000 was considered applicable only to the 530 acres classed as cropland, the value per acre would be only $36 compared to the value of $65 assigned by the county committee.

4. Our review to date in two counties in North Dakota has not disclosed evidence of land divisions to avoid the $5,000 payment limitation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield back the remainder of my time. I assume all time has been yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. 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. RUSSELL. 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 the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. 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. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official business as a Member of the U.S. Committee of the Atlantic Congress.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCELLAN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senate from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. If present and voting the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—37

Allott	Dirksen	Pastore
Anderson	Douglas	Prouty
Bartlett	Dworshak	Robertson
Beall	Frear	Saltonstall
Bennett	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Scott
Bush	Hruska	Smathers
Butler	Javits	Smith
Byrd, Va.	Keating	Thurmond
Capehart	Kuchel	Williams, Del.
Case, N.J.	Lausche	Young, Ohio
Cotton	Martin	
Curtis	Muskie	

NAYS—48

Aiken	Hart	Monroney
Bible	Hayden	Morse
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Mundt
Cannon	Holland	Murray
Carlson	Humphrey	Neuberger
Carroll	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Church	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Clark	Johnston, S.C.	Russell
Cooper	Jordan	Sparkman
Eastland	Kerr	Stennis
Ellender	Langer	Symington
Engle	Magnuson	Talmadge
Ervin	Mansfield	Wiley
Fulbright	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Gore	McGee	Yarborough
Gruening	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—13

Case, S. Dak.	Hennings	Morton
Chavez	Kefauver	Moss
Dodd	Kennedy	Randolph
Green	Long	
Hartke	McClellan	

So the amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to offer a clarifying amendment. On page 4 there is an item of $1 million for the Agricultural Research Service, to provide for additional labor to be employed under contracts and cooperative agreements to strengthen the work at research installations in the field.

Under the language of the proviso, there would be a restriction on the type of services to which this appropriation would be applicable. Therefore, I ask that after the word "Service," in line 15, the words "in Departmental research programs" be added. This is a clarifying amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. Copies of the amendment have been prepared, and I ask that they be distributed to other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, in line 10, it is proposed to strike out the period at the end thereof, and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following:

Provided, That in carrying out price support programs required by law no funds or stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be utilized for the purpose of carrying out price support operations for any crop planted after January 1, 1960, for which expected production for such year exceeds domestic consumption plus exports by more than 3 per centum and for which the Secretary has failed to provide acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices pursuant to section 401(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if this amendment is adopted and carried into effect by the Secretary, in my judgment, it will save approximately $1 billion in the fiscal year running from July 1, 1960 to June 30, 1961. I believe the adoption of the amendment is also necessary in order to save the farm program from the hands of Secretary Benson.

The amendment provides:

That in carrying out price support programs required by law—

And most agricultural commodities do have a price-support program required by law—

no funds or stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be utilized for the purpose of carrying out price support operations for any crop planted after January 1, 1960, for which expected production for such year exceeds domestic consumption plus exports—

Including those under Public Law 480—

by more than 3 per centum and for which the Secretary has failed to provide acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices pursuant to section 401(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

Mr. President, all of us know that the surpluses of agricultural commodities have increased under Secretary Benson from $2,450 million worth when he came into office in 1953 to $9 billion worth at the present time, and all predictions are that this amount will increase next year to $11 billion, $12 billion, or $13 billion worth, or possibly even more than that, depending upon the weather.

I think the basic reason why that has happened has been Mr. Benson's erroneous price theory.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to complete my statement; and then I shall yield.

MR. BENSON'S MISTAKEN PRICE THEORY

Mr. Benson's price theory, which has been adopted by the President, is that firstly, lower prices for agricultural products will bring such an increased demand for those products as to provide the farmers with a higher total income. He also believes secondly, that lower prices for farm products will decrease the production of those products, and thus there will be an effective and proper equilibrium between supply and demand.

Let me say that I believe this theory of his is mistaken on both counts, because a reduction of agricultural-commodity prices does not appreciably stimulate demand, for two reasons: first, it is not passed on to any real degree to the consumers; second, even if it were passed on to the consumers, since the demand for food is inelastic, there will not be a great increase in the quantities demanded. Next, I think experience has taught us that a reduction in the price per unit of agricultural commodities will in most cases cause farmers to produce more, rather than less, because in order to meet their fixed costs of taxes, interest, depreciation, time payments, and so forth, they will work harder to produce more bushels and more pounds, in an effort to offset the decrease in the prices per bushel and per pound.

PRICE SUPPORTS WITHOUT PRODUCTION LIMITS IS IRRESPONSIBLE

Furthermore, Secretary Benson has, in the case of grain and other feed crops, fixed a price-support program without any attempt to reduce the quantities which will be produced. In fact, he has fixed, for corn, for the current year, a price of between $1.12 and $1.13 a bushel; and he will pay that amount to all farmers regardless of the quantities of grain they produce. In other words, the sky will be the limit; he has thrown everything open. The result is already being seen: The acreage planted to corn this year is very much greater than the acreage planted to corn last year. Yesterday, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] said that the acreage planted to corn this year will be close to 90 million acres, instead of 72 million acres last year. Reports which I have received from seed firms in Illinois are that the sale of seed is very much greater this year than it was last year; and that if the weather is at all favorable, there will be, not 3.3 billion bushels of corn, but many hundreds of millions of bushels more; and the Government will have to take the corn at $1.12 a bushel. So the surpluses will increase enormously.

What the Secretary has done in the case of corn, he has also done in the case of certain other agricultural commodities, such as feed grains, including grain sorghums, oats, rye, barley, and also for soybeans, honey, tung nuts, cottonseed, flaxseed, and dried edible beans. The effect of these actions by the Secretary is to provide an open-end program under which he agrees to buy, and the country to pay for, everything in these products the farmers grow. I think that will cause the expenditure of unnecessary hundreds of millions of dollars. In my judgment, unless this program is reversed next year, the cost will be $1 billion greater than they have been in past years.

My amendment is designed to strike at this discertionary power of the Secretary, be providing that when he establishes price supports under the law he must also impose some restrictions upon production as required in section 401(c) of the Agriculture Act of 1949.

I know that a technical objection has been raised; it has been said by some, "Well, in that event, the Secretary will not put price supports into effect, and he will not put acreage restrictions into effect; and then the whole program will go down the drain."

Certainly that is not my intention, Mr. President. Although I do not pretend to be an expert on all the facets of this complex subject, we have had the laws examined very carefully, overnight; and if the amendment is read carefully, it will be seen that in the case of support programs required by law, the Secretary will have to provide acreage allotments, if funds are to be paid from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

AMENDMENT WOULD NOT ALLOW SECRETARY TO JUNK PROGRAM

Some may say the Secretary could use the amendment to junk the programs, and, by failing to provide acreage allotments, he would not have to pay price supports. I do not believe this to be the case. For most of the open ended crops, the Secretary must set price supports. They are required by law. Since he must set supports and pay the sums from CCC funds, he will have to provide acreage allotments, if my amendment is adopted.

I have prepared a table, by crops, of present support levels in the law. I shall merely refer to corn, which is the leading commodity. The present support level is 66 percent, or $1.12.

The law provides that in the case of corn the price must be set at 65 percent of parity or 75 percent of the market price of the past 3 years, whichever is higher.

Barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums are tied to the corn price, so what holds for corn applies to these other crops. Cottonseed, soybeans, flaxseed, and inedible beans are tied together. Honey

has a mandatory price provided of 60 percent of parity, and for 1959 the price has been established at 60 percent for extracted honey.

The law provides that the price of tung oil shall not be less than 60 percent, but must be 65 percent if the supplies of tung oil are not excessive.

In short, on close examination of the various acts, it will be seen that not even Ezra Taft Benson can escape from the provisions of the amendment, and cannot use the terms of my amendment as a means of nullifying this program.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to call attention to the language in the fourth line from the bottom of the Senator's amendment, which relates to excess or surplus commodities. It reads, "plus exports by more than 3 per centum." It seems to me the Senator's amendment would be better if the language were "plus exports plus a supply for 3 months," or a certain period of time, because, I say, most respectfully, the provision of 3 percent would leave the consumer pretty much at the mercy of a very tight market at all times.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I point out that the language relates to expected production, and not to existing stocks. The stocks of all these commodities are very ample, as the Senator well knows.

In the case of corn, the supply in CCC loans and storage amounts to 1,571 million bushels.

In the case of barley, the supply is 159 million bushels.

In the case of grain sorghums, the supply is 302 million hundredweight.

In the case of oats, the supply is 104 million bushels.

In the case of soybeans, the supply is 134 million bushels.

I think the existing CCC supplies are ample, so we can apply this test to the current production.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The only other factor I desire to bring to the attention of the Senator is what we call the normal set-asides or reserves which are specified in existing law. For example, a certain percentage of the annual production—I think it is 15 percent for wheat—is called a reserve or set-aside, as a sort of cushion for national emergency uses. I would hope the language likewise could be in terms of what the supply qualifications are based on. In other words, what is a surplus and what is a set-aside? A set-aside cannot be called a clear surplus, if it is a legitimate percentage of set-aside or surplus for national emergency purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If there were no surplus, the Secretary would not be required to put into effect acreage allotments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My point relates to the definition of "surplus." The word "surplus" I think should be defined as that amount which is over and beyond the necessary requirements for domestic consumption and the estimate of normal exports, plus the set-asides or reserves which are required for national security or national emergency purposes.

What I am worried about is that sometimes when we define "surpluses" we think it includes everything which is in the warehouses, private or public, over normal exports and domestic consumption, when, in fact, there is provided in the law, which has been in existence since 1938, and which has been amended a couple of times, a provision for set-asides and reserves for national security and national emergency purposes and national disasters. It is 15 percent or 20 percent of certain crops. The percentages vary depending on the basis of the estimated needs in case of national disaster.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, does the Senator from Minnesota assert that the supplies of corn and other feed grains—barley, grain sorghums, oats, and rye—are not excessive?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the stocks of corn are excessive, obviously. I say the stocks of wheat, for example, are excessive. I do not believe the stocks of oats or barley or soybeans would be considered to be excessive, because those are variable crops, and they are crops, by the way, as to which the production pattern goes up and down. Are there 120 million bushels of soybeans in supply?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are 134 million bushels of soybeans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is more than we have had in the past.

I understand the acreage planted to soybeans this year is going down, primarily because of the corn program. Acreage is being shifted from the production of soybeans to corn because of the guaranteed price on corn. All I am saying is that, when reference is made to surpluses of soybeans, there must be considered the domestic soybean consumption—which the amendment covers—normal exports—which the amendment covers—plus what is needed for a set-aside. Perhaps the set-aside would be only 15 or 20 million bushels; but, whatever it is, it should be evaluated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in order to make my meaning clear—and my meaning is intended to be, roughly, what the Senator from Minnesota has stated—I ask to modify my amendment by including the word "normal" between the words "plus" and "exports," and to include after the word "exports," the phrase, "plus set-asides required by law for national emergency purposes."

Mr. HUMPHREY. That would considerably strengthen the amendment.

AIM IS TO SAVE FARM PROGRAM AT LESS COST

Mr. DOUGLAS. I so modify my amendment. I think it would meet the objection of the Senator from Minnesota. I think he has made a very valuable suggestion. These are highly complicated subjects. What I am trying to do is to turn the spigot off in future years. I want to save the farm program, particularly for the low income farm and the farm family. I think ultimately we shall probably have to shift to a system of supporting incomes, with a limitation on the amount of income which is supported, rather than a system of support prices, in order to maintain the family farm. It may not always be the most efficient farm unit, although there are now numerous studies to show that it may well be as efficient as the huge corporate farms, but it is the most efficient social unit in which children may grow up.

I think the program can be carried into effect at a much lesser cost than the present farm program, which seems to be running about $3 billion a year in CCC losses, and which next year may run at the rate of from $4 billion to $5 billion. I think we can provide a decent farm program at a cost of not more than $2 billion a year, and that we can effect savings and at the same time rescue the farm program from the hands of Secretary Benson, who I am convinced is trying to wreck the program by guaranteeing price supports without any restrictions on production. Finding himself swamped with corn, he will say to Congress and to the country next year: "The program has broken down, and we must eliminate it completely." Unless we take protective steps now, he is likely to face us next winter with precisely such a suggestion.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's purposes are exactly right. From my point of view the Senator is surely to be commended, because what the present situation will lead to is exactly what the Senator from Illinois is pointing to not only as a possibility but as a reality.

If the present situation is extended to wheat, as it was to corn—which was the proposal of the administration—it will lead to unbelievable production and accumulation of surpluses. What the Senator seeks to do by his amendment—and what the Senator is discussing—is to provide some way to shut off unlimited production.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator would not shut off price supports, provided there are measures of marketing practices, allocations, or restrictions upon production.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the majority leader if he will yield me 5 minutes or 10 minutes from the time on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I know that at the conclusion of a long debate on a highly complicated measure Members of the Senate may seem puzzled by the submission of this amendment, and, in the absence of specific knowledge, they may be tempted to vote against it on the ground that it may get us into difficulties, although I do not foresee any. We have tried to meet the difficulties in the several days this amendment has been under preparation and discussion. I assure Members of the Senate that we have searched the laws very carefully,

and we believe the adoption of the amendment will mean it will not be possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to escape from the provisions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the tabular study which has been prepared on the basic laws governing these various commodities.

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

Crop	Unit of quantity	Present support levels		The law
		Percent	Price	
Barley	Bushel	60	$0.77	Feed grain. Tied to corn on a feed value equivalent.
Corn	do	66	1.12	65 percent of parity or 75 percent of the market price of the last 3 years, whichever is higher.
Flaxseed	do	60	2.38	Set at 0 to 90 percent.
Grain sorghums	Hundredweight	60	1.52	Feed grain. Tied to corn.
Oats	Bushel	60	.50	Do.
Rye	do	60	.90	Do.
Soybeans	do	64	1.85	Tied to cottonseed. If set for one must be set for the other. Legislative history began with Stegall amendment to OPA on cottonseed. Gave price support for long list of commodities. Extended for 2 years following hostility and since by the Agriculture Act of 1948, 1949, etc. Basis is legislative history and the tying to cottonseed.
Cottonseed	Ton	57	38.00	Cottonseed and soybeans must be related.
Honey	Pound	60	.082	Mandatory. Minimum of 60 percent of parity and has been established for 1959 for extracted honey at 60 percent—8.2 cents per pound.
Tung nuts	Ton	[1] 65		Law reads not less than 60 percent but must be 65 percent if supplies of tung oil are not excessive. As the latter was imported from China and there is now a small supply, essentially the 65 percent minimum prevails. Designated a nonbasic in Agriculture Act of 1949.
Beans, dry edible	Hundredweight	60	5.35	Same as cottonseed and soybeans.

[1] Minimum.

EXPENDITURES WILL INCREASE NEXT YEAR

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that if we do not adopt some amendment such as the one I am proposing we will find ourselves committed to the expenditure of a much larger sum of money next year than the $3 billion for this year; and for the year after next, unless something is done, the expenditures will be still greater.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in fixing price supports without any restriction upon production, violated the most basic rule of farm economics. I have practically never heard anyone advocate price supports without provision for some controls over production. I have heard a few persons advocate such a course, but they have been regarded as extreme leftists, so to speak. Now we have the Secretary of Agriculture adopting a program which only the wildest radicals would put into effect, namely, price supports without any limitation upon the number of bushels which the U.S. Treasury is asked to buy, or must be forcibly fed, so to speak, in unlimited quantity. The only difference is that the Secretary of Agriculture would fix a low price, whereas some of those who have advocated unlimited production have advocated high price supports. However, the Secretary of Agriculture has really followed the most discredited policy possible in fixing farm prices.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is citing the ironical situation of an administration which, on the one hand, talks about wanting to control surpluses and preventing surpluses, and which, on the other hand, actually follows policies and lays down policies which promote the accumulation of surpluses.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that one of the reasons why the holdings of the Commodity Credit Corporation are as large as they are today is the unbelievable practices of the Commodity Credit Corporation itself in handling its stores or its stocks. It used to be true, for example, with regard to the soybean business, that a private processer or exporter would have his own inventory. Today such an individual simply lets the Government hold the product all the time, which means he does not have to have an inventory. He does not have to have warehouses. The Government has them. The beans go into the warehouse under loan, and if exporter X wishes to make a deal overseas, whether it is a Public Law 480 deal or a cash sale, all he does is go to the Commodity Credit Corporation to get his stocks.

It used to be true that many private grain traders would have their own warehouses, their own elevators, and so on, in which they took care of their own stocks. Today all of them let the Government do it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Minnesota to say that Mr. Benson has put into effect a form of socialism in warehousing?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has said on the floor before that never in the history of this country has agricultural warehousing been closer to socialism than it is today. The Government today is the main warehouser, the main storage depot of commodities not only for public use, but also for private use. It is commonly known in the grain trade that really one is simply not much of a businessman if one is foolish enough to warehouse his own commodities. All one does is let the Government do it for him, and then take the commodities out of the Government bins whenever they are needed. In the meantime, the Commodity Credit Corporation has to pay all the administrative costs which are involved.

This is a part of the problem we face today. This is what the Senator seeks to correct by his amendment.

Furthermore, I wish to point out that the administration low price-support program, with no controls, is designed to get rid of the small farmer and to maintain the large farmer, because it is perfectly true that with price supports at 60 percent of parity, in the case of some commodities, if a farmer has a 20,000-acre farm, a 5,000-acre farm, or a 10,000-acre farm, particularly if the farm is an adjunct to a corporation, so that it has the benefit of tax laws and can charge off certain losses, such a farmer can produce by using modern machinery, many millions of bushels at a low price and perhaps make a small profit upon the total operation. However, Mr. and Mr. Hans Schmidt—who are farming in Brown County, Minn., on 120 acres of land; who are paying taxes at the township level, at the county level, and at the State level; who are paying Federal and State income taxes and excise taxes; who have to buy machinery for the farm; who have to provide for their family; who contribute to the church, contribute to many fraternal societies, and contribute to charitable organizations—have a little tougher time getting by on 60 percent of parity.

What we see is a determined policy on the part of the Government to eliminate what is called the marginal farmer. Who are the marginal farmers? That is a question to be determined by the omnipotent power in the Department of Agriculture. It is to be determined by what the Department says is marginal. I suppose they use the yardstick of the automobile industry. The only ones which are not marginal are those left, and there are some of those about which they are a bit dubious.

SECRETARY BENSON'S "BARN DOOR" FINANCING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in concluding my argument I wish to say that the administration has made many bitter charges against Congress and against the Democratic Party, alleging we have engaged in back-door financing in that we have guaranteed supports which later called for the expenditure of greater funds than were initially to be appropriated. This has been chiefly true with regard to the farm program, but I want to remind Congress and the country that the farm program now on the books is the product of the Eisenhower administration. They dictated it at the point of the gun. I am glad to say I voted against it. The action of the Secretary of Agriculture in fixing price supports without any control over the quantities produced is not merely back-door financing, it is barn-door financing. I submit that a barn door is bigger than a back door.

The action of the Secretary of Agriculture, in my judgment, will cost us at least $1 billion next year; and while I

hesitate to make this charge, the Secretary of Agriculture must have known that this would happen. In my judgment he did it in order so to swamp the public with expenditures that in disgust the people not understanding the issues, would vote to eliminate the entire program.

As one who wishes to support a decent farm program, as well as to save money for the taxpayers of the country, I believe that this move to try to restrict plantings beginning the first of January 1960, with respect to those commodities for which price supports are required by law, is the best way of turning off the spigot.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us what effect his amendment would have on those crops on which acreages have been fixed? Last year, as the Senator will remember, Congress enacted laws affecting corn and other feed grains, as well as cotton and rice. In the case of cotton, the minimum acreage was fixed at 16 million acres plus 350,000 acres to take care of small farms. In the case of rice the minimum acreage was fixed at 1,652,000 acres.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My amendment would not affect cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts; but it would affect——

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it affect wheat?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; it would not affect wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. What about the practice of overplanting? There is some overplanting in wheat.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a separate question. But it would affect corn, the feed grains, and some other minor products upon which the Secretary has fixed a separate price, without any control over quantities or acreage—notably flaxseed, honey, and tung nuts.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point an analysis of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, prepared by the Senate Agriculture Committee.

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

EXPLANATION OF DOUGLAS AMENDMENT (6-1-59-H) TO H.R. 7175, AS FINALLY MODIFIED

This amendment prohibits use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds in carrying out price-support programs required by law for any crop planted after January 1, 1960, if—

(1) expected production exceeds domestic consumption, normal exports, and set asides required by law for national emergency purposes by more than 3 percent, and

(2) the Secretary has failed to provide acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices pursuant to section 401(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

The Secretary is authorized by section 401(a) of the 1949 act to provide price support through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him. The amendment would prevent use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds in certain circumstances, thereby requiring the Secretary to resort to other means available to him. Possibly section 32 funds, appropriated funds or other means might be found to carry out the required program, but this might be difficult or impossible since price support is usually made available through use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds. The Secretary would be required to use any funds available, and Congress might feel it necessary to provide appropriated funds, since the amendment is applicable only to programs required by law.

Since the amendment applies only to programs required by law, it is restricted to those commodities upon which Congress has made price support mandatory. The Secretary would be free to support prices of all other commodities, where authority is discretionary, without regard to the amendment. If the amendment were to prevent the carrying out of a price-support program required by law, it may be that the amendment would not interfere with a discretionary support program for the same commodity, but this would certainly be dubious.

The amendment is restricted to crops planted after January 1, 1960. It would therefore not apply to any commodities which are not planted such as milk, butterfat, wool, mohair, and honey; and might not apply to commodities for which production is not on a crop basis. It is difficult to determine how it would apply to the 1960 wheat crop, part of which is planted in 1959 and part of which is planted in 1960, or to tree crops, such as tung nuts and crude pine gum, where part of the trees may have been planted in years past.

The amendment would enable the Secretary, by failing to provide acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices pursuant to section 401(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to disregard the will of Congress and prevent price support required by Congress.

The effect of the amendment upon the basic agricultural commodities, other than corn, for which acreage allotments and marketing quotas are provided by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, is obscure. Section 401(c) specifically includes marketing quotas authorized by law. These would appear to meet the marketing practices requirements of the amendment, and it is unlikely that section 401(c) could be construed to provide for acreage allotments or quotas more stringent than those required by law. Certainly the amendment would be satisfied by the Secretary's prescription of allotments or quotas required by law insofar as acreage allotments and marketing practices are required. However, it may be that the amendment may be satisfied only if the Secretary prescribes acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices. Production goals are generally somewhat contrary in nature to allotments and quotas, looking to the achievement of a certain minimum production, rather than to curtailment of production.

The trigger point at which the amendment would become effective varies from that provided by law for quotas or allotments. Where the statutory formulas for quotas may take production, carryover, and imports into consideration, the amendment takes only expected production into consideration. Where the statutory formulas may take domestic consumption, exports, and an allowance for carryover into consideration, the amendment takes domestic consumption, exports, and set-asides required by law for national emergency purposes into consideration. We do not know of any set-asides required by law for national emergency purposes.

The amendment would probably have some effect with respect to corn, barley, grain sorghums, oats, and rye, but its principal purpose would be to appear to give the Secretary discretion to avoid carrying out programs required by Congress. Thus the Secretary now has authority to impose restrictions under section 401(c) and the amendment gives him no additional authority. The amendment does not require the Secretary to impose any restrictions. It simply prohibits price support if he does not impose restrictions. The Secretary may avoid price support by failing to impose restrictions. On the other hand, if he desires that the price support program be carried out as directed by Congress, he may impose the simplest of restrictions under section 401(c), such as allotments equal to the planted acreage (as he has done at times for sugar), production goals equal to some percentage of the normal production of the planted acreage, and marketing practices of the most minimum nature and which would be carried out in any event.

Mr. ELLENDER. With respect to the commodities the Senator has just mentioned, there is no doubt that the present law would be changed should his amendment be adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I do not think so. The Secretary would be required to comply with the present law. The present law requires price supports for those commodities; and we would require control over fresh planting, or additions to current stocks.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is the Senator stating, in effect, that the Secretary is not following the law?

Mr. DOUGLAS. He is taking every advantage of the law to break the farm program; and this amendment is designed to prevent him from doing so.

Under section 401, as the eminent chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry knows, the Secretary has discretion in these matters of production controls. This amendment is intended to remove such discretion by a limitation on the funds spent.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No doubt the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is offered with the best of intentions; but, in effect, it would repeal much of our basic law. For example, there is no provision at the present time for production controls on dairy commodities. If we should find a surplus of dairy commodities——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say to my friend that my amendment reads "crops planted" and would thus exclude dairy products.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The Senator said he would yield to me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In effect, the amendment would repeal most of our basic legislation affecting price supports. It would create a most chaotic economic situation. It would break prices of many of our major farm products. I believe it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It requires affirmative action by the Secretary of Agriculture in a field in which there is no basic law for production controls. Therefore I make the point of order that this amendment proposes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). The Chair is ready to rule on the point

of order raised by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I be heard on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Parliamentarian and the Chair will examine the nature of my amendment, they will see that it reads:

Provided, That in carrying out the price support programs required by law—

That is, programs already in effect under the law—

no funds or stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be utilized for the purpose of carrying out price support operations for any crop planted after January 1, 1960, for which expected production for such year exceeds domestic consumption plus normal exports, plus set-asides required by law for national emergency purposes, by more than 3 percent, and for which the Secretary has failed to provide acreage allotments, production goals, and marketing practices pursuant to section 401(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

What the amendment would do would be to remove the discretionary powers of the Secretary of Agriculture and require him to fix production restrictions if price supports are guaranteed. Price supports are guaranteed for the commodities covered by this amendment; but it would remove the discretion to which I have referred, not by a change in the law, but by a limitation upon the funds spent.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois makes a pretty good case for the point of order I am making. He admits that his amendment would repeal certain legislation; and for that reason it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My question to the Senator is asked for the purpose of obtaining his opinion as to the merits of the basic proposal of the Senator from Illinois, that there should be a limitation upon the quantity of the price-supported farm products.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The general thinking of the Senator from Illinois, I believe, is that if we are to have a reasonably high price-support program, we must have production control. I subscribe to that part of his argument.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any bill pending in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry which would limit farm products, in the face of the huge surpluses which we are piling up?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The wheat bill which was passed the other day would decrease the production of wheat by from 200 million to 300 million bushels. The two-price or domestic parity plan for wheat would eliminate most of the Government cost. It would get the Government completely out of the business of acquiring and storing wheat.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How about corn?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I do not know of any particular application to corn.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In order to achieve the objective the Senator from Illinois has in mind, it would be necessary to follow the method suggested by him, that is, by the enactment of legislation to make mandatory the fixing of limitations on the quantity of products whenever price supports are paid. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Perhaps the chairman of the committee [Mr. ELLENDER] may want to reply.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me state to my good friend that last year Congress passed an act—and opportunity was afforded the Senator from Ohio and other Senators to amend the bill—which dealt with the production of corn and other feed grains. What we did was to comply with what the Secretary of Agriculture desired—that is, lower price supports with respect to corn and other feed grains.

The support price this year has been reduced to 66 percent of parity. It could go down to 65 percent of parity. It was felt that reducing the support price to as low as 65 percent of parity would deter the future planting of corn and other feed grains.

It is true that under the present law corngrowers can plant any amount they desire. There is no restriction. The same situation prevails with respect to other feed grains. There is no limitation whatever on the acreage; but the theory which has been advocated by the Department was that if lower price supports were provided production would be deterred.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My question has not been answered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it has. I said there was no restriction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My question was whether there is any other method of achieving what the Senator from Illinois desires to do by way of placing in an appropriation bill this condition with respect to the right of spending money, or fixing a limitation upon the products on which price supports are paid. Is there any other method?

Mr. ELLENDER. It would be necessary to amend the law, and to do it in the proper manner.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It would require a complete change in the law, which I would favor.

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

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. A few days ago I read in the New York Times a very spirited attack by the President of the United States on Congress because of the farm legislation which has been passed by Congress. As I understand the principle involved—and I believe the Senator from Louisiana has explained it—the theory of the administration is that a reduction in price supports will thereby curtail production. That is basically it; is it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. As a matter of fact, I say to my good friend from Colorado that the Senate went on record in support of that theory last year by passing a bill which was more or less sponsored by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CARROLL. That has reference to corn. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. With respect to corn, the price support has been fixed at the average price received for that crop over the past 3 years, but not under 65 percent of parity.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator from North Dakota will yield further I should like to say that I wish to follow the argument of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. As I understand his argument, the concept of reducing the price-support program without imposing controls is nonsense. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. The next question is this: As I understand the Chair is ready to rule on the point of order. However, I believe the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois is based on that premise, and it would take from the Secretary certain discretionary powers now contained in law, and in a sense would overcome what we might have done last year in connection with the price-support program in dealing with corn.

In other words, we would say to the Secretary of Agriculture, "You shall not exercise your discretionary power under the law." Therefore, to answer the question of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, we are placing a limitation on an appropriation bill. Is this the argument on the question of the point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I should like to add a word or two. If the Douglas amendment should prevail, the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to put production controls on corn, and there would be a price support of only about $1.12 to $1.15 a bushel. It would create an intolerable situation. The corn farmer could not stand it. He could not stand the imposition of production controls along with that low price. If we are going to have a production control program, the corn farmer is entitled to a better price-support level.

Mr. CARROLL. If I may follow that reasoning a little further; in other words, by virtue of what we have done previously with the corn program, it would be a limitation on the production of the corn farmer without giving him the benefit of the price-support program. Is that the point?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. He would have the present price support program, with is a minimum of 65 percent of parity, or about $1.12 a bushel. However, on top of that, he would have strict production controls.

Mr. CARROLL. How much control would there be?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The amendment has not been printed, but I should think it would require the strictest kind of control.

Mr. CARROLL. Under existing law, is there any control?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. There is no basic law for production controls on corn.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator from Illinois care to comment on this subject?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. What I have tried to do is impose a limitation on the purposes for which the funds are spent. If that is out of order, then the whole language on page 28 beginning on line 10 and running to line 5 on page 29 is also out of order. There are no less than four restrictions listed there with respect to the use of the funds, which the committee itself included. It includes a limitation on price supports in excess of $50,000, a definition of what is meant by a person, and so forth.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, what is the order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). It is the point of order which has been raised by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. RUSSELL. As chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, I should like to know what the pending question is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the point of order raised by the Senator from North Dakota.

The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to have the regular order, with all deference to everyone concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is subject to a point of order, and the point of order will be sustained for two reasons: The provision dealing with the excess of expected production over domestic consumption plus normal exports creates a contingency as set forth in paragraph 4 of rule XVI and, therefore, in the opinion of the Chair, is in contravention of the rule. In addition, it imposes additional duties upon the Secretary of Agriculture.

For these reasons, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall not take the time to appeal from the ruling of the Chair, although I wish to say that if the amendment is subject to a point of order, so also is the amendment of the committee restricting to $50,000 the amount of crops which can be purchased from any one person. That also is legislation and subject to a point of order. I shall not indulge in any reprisals. I shall not raise a point of order on that provision.

I do, however, most respectfully request the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to give serious consideration to the amendment in committee—I understand it is now under consideration by the committee—and to reaffirm my belief that it is perfectly ridiculous to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to fix prices on commodities on the output of which he imposes no restrictions of any kind. In my judgment, the Secretary of Agriculture is leading us not only down the road to disaster but almost to bankruptcy.

The responsibility lies directly on the shoulders of the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States. I am sick and tired of having it said that Congress is involving us in this open-end, back-door appropriation. The barn-door expenditures of Mr. Benson are infinitely greater than any other appropriations by Congress.

I also have an amendment to save $11 million. However, since my attempt to save a billion dollars has been defeated, I am sure there is no chance of our saving $11 million. Therefore I merely ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

On page 20, line 6, strike out the figure "$39,135,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$28,135,000".

On page 25, line 14, strike out the figure "$1,431,665" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$1,269,665".

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

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on the amendment in this bill which deals with the $50,000 limitation of supports.

It should be pointed out for the RECORD that so far as I am concerned this amendment is satisfactory and that I am supporting the committee position. The Senate had approved an amendment which I offered last week, calling for a limitation of $35,000. I would have preferred the same limitation of $35,000; however, being realistic, I felt that if we could hold the limitation at the $50,000 figure and make a bona fide limitation, it would be much better than to engage in a legislative fight on this appropriation bill and perhaps lose all.

I was not overlooking the fact that under the parliamentary situation we are in at this time I would need a two-thirds vote to put the $35,000 limitation in this bill.

This amendment, as the Senate approved it and as the committee approved it—and I wish to commend the committee for approving it—effectively provides that there shall be a limitation on the total of all loans of $50,000 with respect to all agricultural commodities produced in any one calendar year that are available to anyone person. This is a bona fide limitation, as was the limitation prescribed in the $35,000 amendment upon which we voted earlier. The term "person" is adequately defined to prevent its being abused.

The amendment provides that if a person wishes he may market his produce through a cooperative and obtain the same credit. The language, however, is drawn in such a manner that if a man uses a cooperative and obtains, say, a $30,000 loan through the cooperative, he then becomes eligible for a loan of only $20,000 when he goes outside the cooperative. The limitation is a total of $50,000, no matter how the loan is made nor whether it is to an individual, through a corporation which he owns or through a cooperative. The language is adequately drawn so as to apply the limitation to a total loan of $50,000 for any one year on all commodities produced.

The amendment is also phrased in such language that, as it applies to a cooperative, while it reserves the right of individual members to obtain the maximum loan, either through the cooperative or outside, it does not give the cooperative the right to count its membership and say, "We have 10 members; therefore we can borrow $500,000," and then allocate the money so that perhaps one member would receive $100,000 and another only $1,000. This is not an averaging arrangement. It is a definite ceiling.

The language of the bill limits the loan to $50,000 under all circumstances, and it instructs the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe proper regulations to carry out the law. I believe the language is adequate to take care of the situation, and while I would have offered the amendment to reduce it to $35,000 had the parliamentary situation been right, I am supporting the committee amendment.

I point out that previously the House accepted the $50,000 figure. While the House language was not adequate, nevertheless from the legislative debate the intent of the House was clear. I not only have high hopes that this provision will remain in the bill in conference and become law but also state that if it is not kept in I shall oppose the conference report when it returns.

As I pointed out to Senators who were supporting me in connection with the $35,000 amendment, the present amendment is attached to a bill which is going to the White House whereas the amendment which the Senate approved earlier was attached to a bill which may have an uncertain fate ahead of it. I have tried to be realistic. Therefore I feel that, all things considered, we had better take what limitation we can get, and here we have a victory in our grasp.

I think this step is a major victory for the taxpayers and will stop the free ride which these large corporate-type farms have been enjoying.

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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. RUSSELL. 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 time remaining on the bill has not been yielded back.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield back all time which may be at the disposal of the committee or the majority leader, with the understanding that the time remaining to the opposition will be yielded back also.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, with that understanding, I yield back the time remaining on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. All time has expired. The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of a death in the family.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent on official business as a member of the U.S. Committee of the Atlantic Congress.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—74

Aiken	Hart	Murray
Allott	Hayden	Muskie
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bartlett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Beall	Holland	Pastore
Bennett	Hruska	Prouty
Bible	Humphrey	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Robertson
Cannon	Javits	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Church	Jordan	Scott
Clark	Kerr	Smathers
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith
Curtis	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lausche	Stennis
Dworshak	Magnuson	Symington
Eastland	Mansfield	Talmadge
Ellender	Martin	Thurmond
Engle	McCarthy	Wiley
Ervin	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Frear	McNamara	Yarborough
Fulbright	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Morse	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Mundt	

NAYS—10

Bridges	Case, N.J.	Keating
Bush	Cotton	Williams, Del.
Butler	Dirksen	
Capehart	Goldwater	

NOT VOTING—14

Byrd, Va.	Hartke	McClellan
Case, S. Dak	Hennings	Morton
Chavez	Kefauver	Moss
Dodd	Kennedy	Randolph
Green	Long	

So the bill (H.R. 7175) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, 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. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. DWORSHAK the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PURPOSE OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE IS TO WRECK THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I voted for the agricultural appropriation bill with a very heavy heart. I believe it is now apparent, from the ruling of the Chair and the procedures of the Senate and the House of Representatives, that it is impossible to control the Secretary of Agriculture, and that the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to carry out what I believe to be is his intended purpose of wrecking the agricultural price-support program, although in the process he bankrupts the U.S. Treasury.

PRODUCTION LIMITATIONS COULD BE FIXED

The Secretary of Agriculture has fixed price supports upon corn and other feed products without placing any restriction whatsoever upon the number of acres to be planted or the quantities to be produced. He could have protected the taxpayers and the farmers. A good Secretary of Agriculture would have done so. But not Ezra Taft Benson.

There will be an enormous corn crop this fall, which the Secretary of Agriculture, by his own act, will support at $1.12 a bushel; and by his failing to have imposed any restrictions whatsoever, we shall be committed to buy and to support every bushel that is turned in.

We may have a 4 billion bushel corn crop. Certainly we shall have a much larger corn crop than we have had in previous years, unless there is disastrous weather. The large crop will be directly the result of the actions of the Secretary of Agriculture.

In my opinion, the Secretary is both wrecking the farm support program and helping to bankrupt the Treasury. Let it not be said by him or by the administration that Congress is responsible for this. It is the acts of the Secretary that are responsible.

The amendment which I offered, and which was ruled out of order on a point of order, attempted to control the abuse in the next year by restricting price supports, in the cases where it was required by law, only to those commodities where restrictions on output had also been imposed by the Secretary. I think my amendment would have saved at least $1 billion, and would have made the farm support program more acceptable to the American people. But it was ruled out of order as being legislation on an appropriation bill.

CONGRESS HAS LOST CONTROL OVER AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS

I only hope the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will bring out of committee soon a farm bill, and that it will contain restrictions such as I have suggested. I think, as a result of actions by the Secretary, we have largely lost control over the farm program. The Secretary can throw the gates open, as he has shown every evidence of throwing the gates open, to unlimited production, fixing price supports, and bringing about a huge expenditure, so he can then misrepresent the facts to the American people, and then say it is the farm program that is at fault, and ask to eliminate all farm programs.

I had thought of voting against the appropriation bill to show my disgust at a situation in which the Congress finds itself delivered into the hands of Ezra Taft Benson and the Eisenhower administration; but I also remembered that there are many good features in the farm bill—not so much on the commodity stabilization side of the bill, but in appropriations for school lunches, for the REA, and for other purposes which are very close to my heart, and which I think are close to the hearts of most Americans.

I must say that if the fate of the appropriation bill had been in my hands, I should not have wished to kill it. So it went through my mind that enough Senators would be in favor of the bill so that it would pass, and that one Senator could express his disappointment by voting against it.

Then I remembered the moral rule that the German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, laid down—one's "so act that the purpose of thy action should become universal law;" or, in nontechnical language, "Never do that which you do not want to see universalized." While this is not an invariable rule of conduct, it is fairly good rule.

I concluded that to vote "nay," knowing the vast majority of the Senate would vote "yea," might make me look good in the eyes of the voters, but it would be morally unacceptable. So, therefore, with a very heavy heart, and with what I hope was a weak voice, I voted "yea."

I think the whole farm program needs to be revised. I am for a farm program, but I want to see it geared particularly to protect the small-sized family farm. I do not believe the present program has over a year more to run. As we revise the program, I hope we shall center our efforts toward protecting the family-sized farm.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois for his legislative effort, which has been ruled out of order. He has not only emphasized to the committees that have control of this type of legislation but he has emphasized again and again and again on the floor of the Senate and

elsewhere the need for real farm legislation. He has emphasized again to Secretary Benson that he ought to be exercising some leadership in this field. We know that in our total economy, agriculture is the softest spot. Last year we exchanged viewpoints on this matter on the floor of the Senate. I for one have been urging a unit control—a bushel control—on wheat and corn.

I think the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois is 100 percent right. We must curb production, and not merely reduce price supports. We have got to curb production in this field. We shall never have any success in the farm program until production is reduced.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I have talked to many Senators who are on the committee, and, without exception, they have agreed on the desirability of unit control for tobacco, cotton, wheat, and corn; but, as Mark Twain said one time about the weather, everybody talks about it, but nobody does anything about it. The distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] has a bill advocating this very approach.

We have got to do something, because there is no question in my mind of the logic of the remarks of the senior Senator from Illinois. To use an old expression, he hit the nail on the head when he said there is a deliberate effort to undermine the farm program and to try to create the impression that the Democrats are responsible for the uneconomic condition which exists in agriculture.

I commend the Senator from Illinois for his fine effort to try to save $1 billion in the farm program.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I also should like to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois for his perspicacity in this field. As the Senator knows, the Secretary of Agriculture has pursued two basic premises which have been proved to be entirely wrong. The first is that lower price supports would have a tendency to reduce production. The second is to give price supports, without, as the Senator so ably pointed out, enforcing controls.

On February 16 last, the distinguished chairman of the committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin, and I all received a promise from the Secretary of Agriculture that he would give the committee an omnibus bill—giving his recommendations for dealing with the farm problem. Nevertheless, he has not yet produced the bill which he promised many months ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had read of that matter in the press and in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am very glad to have the Senator from Missouri make the statement again on the floor of the Senate. I think it is another indication that the Secretary does not wish even to advance any policy. He wants to be able to advise the President to veto any bill the majority of the House and the Senate may pass, and then force us to accept the existing law, which, unfortunately, does give discretion to him to put into effect price supports without imposing production controls.

Using that power on corn and feed grains, the Secretary refused to impose production controls, and we are going to have corn running out of our ears and money running out of the Treasury.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What the Secretary is really trying to do, is he not, is to blame the Congress for the failure of his program and for his own administrative inefficiency?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is absolutely correct. The Secretary is ready to defeat price supports even if it costs the American taxpayers $5 billion or $10 billion.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I again commend the able Senator for his analysis of this situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Illinois is making a fair case against the Secretary of Agriculture. I ask the Senator whether he can imagine anything the Secretary of Agriculture might have done, within the authority he has had, to undermine the farm program which he has not done?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know of anything. I would give the Secretary a 100 percent grade on every measure designed to injure the American farmer.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to point out to the Senator that through the years the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, has pointed to the egg industry as an example of how the agricultural economy would correct itself if we permitted the free market forces to operate. The Secretary is more prophetic than he anticipated. Today we know that eggs are selling at about 40 percent of parity. This process has gone on for 3 or 4 months.

Mr. President, last week egg prices reached the lowest national average since 1941. The position of the egg producers in Minnesota, which is an export market where prices of eggs are several cents a dozen lower than the national average, has been desperate for several months.

The fact is that in an uncontrolled market the price does not drop in the same proportion as the supply goes up. Price reductions do not reflect, in simple rates, the increase in supply. The egg supply this year is only a little more than 4 percent over last year's average, but this has resulted in a 29 percent drop in the price of eggs.

As Senators know, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives has held hearings on the egg and poultry market, and on May 13 in a letter forcefully requested the Secretary of Agriculture to "review all existing authority and availability of funds with the purpose of immediately and fully implementing, in every practical manner, such programs of purchase, diversion and export of eggs and poultry products as will lead toward improvement in the present critical situation within the domestic poultry industry."

Last week the answer came in the form of a letter from Mr. Clarence L. Miller, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, stating that the Department would not use the authority and funds provided through the section 32 program and Public Law 480 to purchase laying hens, shell eggs or broilers for use in the relief programs in the United States, or for export, or for the school lunch program.

Mr. President, instead of following the policy laid down by the Congress, Mr. Benson called a well-publicized meeting of 27 national and regional representatives of poultry farmers, farms organizations and food retailers, and after this gathering the Secretary produced his solution. His words were:

> An accelerated program of promotion, advertising, and merchandising, calling into play all the imaginative and creative forces which have characterized many successful food promotions in the past.

Mr. President, I submit that this is a wholly inadequate response, and one which makes light of the considered judgment of Congress. The crisis in the egg and poultry market is not a result of the failure of Madison Avenue advertising. Its basic cause lies in the Secretary's faith in a free and uncontrolled market for farm products within a nation where all other major segments of the economy are subject to some degree of rational control over supply and demand. Immediately, the crisis is a response to the cheap feed policy of the Department and generally reduced farm income, which have led farmers to take a chance to break even by expanding livestock and poultry production. There is every reason to believe that the poultry emergency will soon be followed by a similar crisis in pork.

Senators will recall that, at the beginning of his administration in 1953, Mr. Benson assured the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that he believed in a price-support program, at least to the extent that it was needed to "prevent disaster to the farm-producing plant."

It seems to me that the major step which the Congress must now take is to define the word "disaster." Egg prices in Minnesota have been at 42 percent of parity and lower for 3 months. I have called and written the Department of Agriculture frequently, asking the Department to use the funds and authority it has, and the responses have been similar to those received by the House Committee on Agriculture last week. I think we can fairly conclude that 42 percent of parity is not low enough to constitute disaster in the Secretary's lexicon. What does—35 percent or 25 percent?

The emergency in the case of poultry and eggs is simply the present manifestation of general crisis threatening agriculture. During the past several years farm prices and farm income have declined steadily, although the cost of food

to the consumer has risen. The farmer's share of the consumer's dollar has dropped from nearly one-half to about 39 percent. We are all aware of the surpluses which have accumulated in wheat, cotton, and certain other farm products.

There is a pressing need for a reevaluation of the entire farm program, as the Senator from Illinois has said, starting with the principle that the family farm is not only an economic base but is also a social and spiritual force, and that its continuation is a primary objective of the farm program.

There is a real danger that the farm program will be undermined by some who, in fact, would like to see the whole program abolished, but who take a position which makes them appear as defenders of the family farm.

I may say that today I received what I believe to be the first publication in which the Department of Agriculture lends its name to the sales promotion program, which I mentioned. The publication is entitled "The Gold Rush of 1959—Eggs—Nutritious Nuggets for Your Menu."

The "gold rush" has no reference whatsoever to the income of the farmer who produces the eggs. So far as I can discover, it relates to the fact that the yolk of the egg is still yellow and has some nutritional value.

I shall not read this report, but I notice, as I look at about the second from the last paragraph, that the Secretary of Agriculture, the Department of Agriculture, at last gives some advice to the people of this country on how to cook eggs. This is an important contribution, particularly since it relates to how to boil eggs. I suppose there may be a few people in this country who do not know how to boil eggs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does Mr. Benson say that one should place eggs in boiling hot water to boil them?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is said that the first and fundamental rule, whether cooking eggs in water, in a frying pan, or an oven, is to use low or moderate, even heat, and that, like all protein foods, eggs cooked at too high a temperature become tough and leathery.

I am sure the American people who read this report will proceed in a great rush to the supermarkets and to the stores to buy eggs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota is a master of sardonic understatement. I think the Senator has made an excellent point.

PRESIDENT MUST ALSO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. President, I have one final point before I yield the floor and go downstairs to have lunch, to eat some eggs and help to reduce the egg surplus. I do not think we should blame Mr. Benson alone on this matter. The policy of Mr. Benson is also the policy of Mr. Eisenhower and the Republican administration. I think we have centered responsibility too much on the Department of Agriculture and not sufficiently on 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, because every step Mr. Benson has taken has also been a step approved by the President.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly agree with the Senator from Illinois. Sometimes the impression is created that when Mr. Eisenhower took office as President, in January of 1953, he went out on the White House lawn and found all the various Secretaries waiting for him, and somehow he got them to take their respective offices. This was not the case, as the Senator has pointed out. Those Secretaries had to be picked; they had to be recommended; they had to be confirmed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The President not only appointed Mr. Benson, but he has held him in office against the protests of a large proportion of American farmers. He has approved all the legislation suggested by Secretary Benson. He has vetoed legislation passed by the Congress which Secretary Benson asked to have vetoed. He has placed his stamp of approval upon every act of the Secretary of Agriculture.

While I like the President personally, while I think he is a very decent man—if I had sufficient skill at golf and if I were invited I would be glad to play golf with him; or if I had sufficient skill at bridge and were invited to come to the White House I would be glad to play bridge with him—while I think he is a very fine person individually, so far as agriculture is concerned I think he is simply a ditto mark for Ezra Taft Benson.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the appropriation bill which has just been passed calls for the expenditure next year of $220 million over and above the amount which the administration requested in its budget estimate.

I shall give a tabulation of the amounts.

The Senate by a vote authorized the expenditure of $75 million more under the soil bank program than was requested by the administration.

I will say at this point that it is rather interesting and somewhat amusing to note that so many of those who have denounced the soil bank program and even some who have referred to the program as the "golf links program" voted today not only for the program but also for $75 million more than the administration wanted.

It could be that this was a practice Presidential campaign speech. Rather than being against the program, I suppose the criticism is that it has not been elaborate enough. Anyway, the Senate had a yea and nay vote and provided $75 million above the budget request for the soil bank program.

The next item, the ACP program, which is shown on page 12 of the bill, is another program involving additional expenditures. The Senate by another yea-and-nay vote provided $150 million over and above the amount requested by the administration. This, again, will be a direct expenditure which must be accounted for by the taxpayers.

Again, in reference to page 27 of the bill, the chairman of the subcommittee admitted there was a false claim with regard to a $100 million saving in the bill as reported by the committee. The chairman of the subcommittee, who was in charge of the bill, admitted in a colloquy with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that it was not a bona fide reduction so far as expenditures were concerned. This is in reality another $100 million increase.

That brings the total increase in the bill to $325 million. Now, as the committee reported with regard to the rest of the bill, taking into consideration the increases and decreases, there was provided a $105 million reduction in the other items. That leaves an increase of $220 million which this bill, just passed by the Congress, will call for in expenditures in the next year over and above the administration request.

In addition, the bill also provides for $33 million of loan authorizations for the Farmers Home Administration again over and above the amount requested by the administration.

There has been much boasting about the fact that the appropriation bills call for cuts from the Eisenhower budget. I think the RECORD should show that the yea-and-nay vote on this bill called for $253 million over and above the budgetary request.

I call this to the attention of the majority party because I know that they want to keep the tabulation correct, and if there is any question as to this tabulation, I will yield to any Senator at this time who wishes to take exception to it because these are the figures the taxpay will be called upon to pay. Since there is no answer I assume they agree. The taxpayer will not pay on any such figures as are shown on the first page of the report. These are "trick" figures to show a savings of $105 million and are arrived at only by eliminating from the computation all of those items which have substantial increases. The taxpayers will pay for the bill as a whole and have a right to be told the real truth.

I say that the report when it states on the front page a reduction of $105 million, refers only to a portion of the bill and does not refer to all of the bill. There is in reality $253 million increase, and the report should show it. This has been confirmed by the colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee who yesterday admitted the accuracy of these figures. There is no question about them. And I say again, I shall be glad to yield to any Senator who desires to question the figures. I repeat, the bill as passed represents a $220 million cash expenditure increase and a $33 million loan authorization increase.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Again I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for the way he has dug into the figures and has been so influential in endeavoring to keep the bill within budgetary bounds. We have been furnished by him with the accurate figures, which are not questioned, so far as I know. Let me say to the Senator that I voted against the bill, as he did, as a

protest against "busting" the budget in connection with items with respect to which it seemed to me that the budgetary provisions were ample. Every time we try to keep within budgetary bounds we are told, "We must loosen up here, and cut out somewhere else." But the "somewhere else" never appears.

In connection with the amendments which the Senator from Delaware offered, we had our opportunity to keep the bill within reasonable bounds, but a majority of the Senate voted not to do so.

If the bill comes back from conference in some reasonable form, I shall be happy to vote for it. I hope that the figures the Senate has placed in the bill will not be sustained in conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from New York. I likewise hope that the amount of appropriations can be brought down in conference. With the $12 billion budget deficit confronting us this year, I think it is essential that we in the Congress reduce these appropriations. We cannot do it by increasing them above the amounts which are recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

I am not saying that there is anything sacred about the Budget figures. Many of the figures are even too high; but certainly, as a bare minimum, we can live within a $77 billion budget. If we are not going to live within it, let us as Members of Congress accept our responsibility and not boast about how much we are cutting here and there. Let us not report appropriation bills with reports to the effect that we are saving $105 million when there is not a Senator who will stand up and say that those figures, as they were reported to the Senate, have any degree of accuracy. They were merely bookkeeping items, juggled around to look good to the taxpayers.

They do not reflect any degree of accuracy as far as reporting the full cost of the bill. That statement cannot be challenged by any Member of the Senate. If any Senator wishes to challenge it, I will yield to him for that purpose.

No Senator wishes to challenge my statement.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, 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. 5805) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 254) to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Canada.

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. 758. An act for the relief of Viktors Neimanis;

S. 1197. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended;

S. 1217. An act to add certain public domain lands in Nevada to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation;

S. 1228. An act to amend Public Law 85-590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1242. An act to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision.

REIMBURSEMENT OF STATES BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ON HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am pleased to advise the Senate the House Committee on Public Works has voted today to report favorably H.R. 6303, a bill to provide fair and equitable reimbursement by the Federal Government to States which constructed certain sections of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

H.R. 6303, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the House committee, Representative CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, of New York, is a companion measure to S. 1714, which I have introduced for myself and other Senators, including the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], the two Senators from West Virginia [Messrs. BYRD and RANDOLPH], and my able colleague from Connecticut Mr. [DODD].

Mr. President, the enactment of legislation to reimburse the States for highways taken for the Interstate System is necessary in the interests of justice. The action taken today by the House committee is a significant step forward toward that goal.

I hope that the Senate Committee on Public Works, on which I had the privilege of serving in former Congresses, will soon begin to consider the reimbursement problem, and that this Congress will act to solve it.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement I made before the House committee on May 19 may be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF U.S. SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH, OF CONNECTICUT, URGING SUPPORT OF BILLS TO PROVIDE FOR EQUITABLE REIMBURSEMENT BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO THE STATES FOR HIGHWAYS TAKEN INTO THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS, DELIVERED BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, MAY 19, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for your invitation to testify before this committee, once again, on bills providing for fair and equitable reimbursement by the Federal Government to States which constructed certain sections of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

For several years I have urged Congress to do justice to the States which have contributed mileage to the Interstate Highway System, but which have not been reimbursed. I sincerely hope that action will be taken this year.

As a matter of equity, Congress should now establish the principle that the States are entitled to reimbursement for highways which were completed or were put under construction by contract on the Interstate System between August 7, 1947, and June 30, 1957, and take definite steps to provide such reimbursement within a reasonable time.

The bills relating to this subject which I have introduced in the present Congress are S. 570 and S. 1714. S. 570 is a refinement of bills I have introduced in former Congresses. S. 1714 is a companion measure to H.R. 6303, introduced by the distinguished chairman of this committee, Representative CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, of New York, I am pleased to join Chairman BUCKLEY in a mutual effort to seek support for this needed legislation. I am delighted to inform you that the bill has attracted considerable interest and support in the Senate. Among its cosponsors are the senior Senator from Oklahoma, Senator KERR; the senior Senator from Ohio, Senator LAUSCHE; the junior Senator from New York, Senator KEATING; the two Senators from West Virginia, Senators BYRD and RANDOLPH; and my able colleague from Connecticut, Senator DODD.

S. 570 and S. 1714 have the same goal of equitable reimbursement in view, but would provide different methods of reaching it.

S. 570 would:

1. Declare it to be the policy of the Federal Government to reimburse the States, on an equitable basis, for acceptable highways, free or toll, which have been incorporated into the Interstate System.

2. Authorize the Secretary of Commerce to provide reimbursement, upon request of a State, if he determines highways so incorporated meet Interstate System standards. The amount of reimbursement would be limited to the cost of the highway, less depreciation, and less the total amount of Federal funds used in its construction. Additionally, in the case of toll highways, the reimbursement would be further reduced by deductions for the cost of all auxiliary facilities needed for its toll operation.

3. Require the States to use funds so reimbursed for construction of projects on highways which connect with the Interstate System and enhance its utility and, after completion of such projects, on any Federal-aid system. No State matching funds would be required.

In order to prevent excessive additions to the normal flow of funds from the highway trust fund in any single year, S. 570 provides that a State shall have until July 1, 1974, to obligate reimbursed funds to its credit, with a provision that no more than 10 percent of the total credit may be obligated in any fiscal year.

Your chairman's bill, H.R. 6303, and my companion bill, S. 1714, declare a policy that each State in which a toll or free highway, or portion thereof, has been included in the Interstate System is entitled to reimbursement and that funds so reimbursed shall be used for construction of highways on the Federal-aid primary system.

The bills authorize appropriations out of general funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated and not out of the highway trust fund—and this, of course, is a major departure from the financing proposed in my earlier bill, S. 570, and provided for in the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 which was intended to finance completion of the Interstate System.

The appropriations would be authorized over a 15-year period commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and would total the net reimbursable amount of $4,295,600,000. The amounts involved for any one fiscal year range between $225 million and $360 million—clearly within a feasible area.

The argument most often advanced against the Federal Government paying its just debts to the States for their contributions to the Interstate System is based solely on expediency. Where, it is asked, is the money coming from?

Gentlemen, let us grasp the nettle firmly. It is time for this Congress to recognize that the Federal Government can pay its bills only by taxing the people. Either we tax openly and honestly, or we impose the hidden, dishonest, cruel tax of inflation through deficit financing.

The proposed reimbursements to the States will, it should be noted, have no effect upon the budget for the next fiscal year. If the bills are enacted, ample time will be provided for inclusion of the amounts to be reimbursed in the budget for the succeeding fiscal year, commencing June 30, 1961. If off-setting savings cannot be found elsewhere in the budget—a solution which is to be hoped for—then the money must come from taxation.

I would prefer that the bill be paid by those who enjoy the benefits of these modern, safe highways. As you all know, we already face an impending shortage of funds in the highway trust fund which, under present law, will make it impossible this year to apportion funds for the interstate system.

President Eisenhower has recommended a temporary increase of 1½ cents a gallon in the Federal tax on motor fuels, effective July 1st, to keep the highway trust fund on a pay-as-you-go basis and to maintain the planned construction schedule.

I regret that the leadership of this Congress apparently is unwilling to act upon the President's recommendation. Should, however, the Committee on Ways and Means of this body and the Senate Finance Committee belatedly give active consideration to a temporary increase in the motor fuels taxes, I hope they would also consider additional sources of revenues from highway users which could be used to finance the reimbursement program.

The other alternative, as proposed by Chairman BUCKLEY's bill and the companion bill, is to finance reimbursements from general funds in the Treasury. Unless off-setting savings can be found elsewhere in the budget for fiscal 1961, the Congress in the next session will be faced with the necessity of financing the program by taxation—either by raising taxes openly and honestly, or by the inflation tax of deficit financing. Of these unpleasant alternatives, I prefer the former.

In any event, gentlemen, this committee and this Congress have the duty to pay debts owed by the Federal Government to the States. There is an obligation on the part of the Federal Government to reimburse the States for the mileage the Federal Government has taken into the Interstate System without compensation. The Federal Government encouraged the States to believe that they would be given credit for these highways; otherwise many of them would not have been built. It would be a gross miscarriage of justice if heavy penalties are imposed upon the very States who had the courage and vision to undertake the construction of urgently needed highways prior to the enactment of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. Failure to enact a reimbursement bill would inflict such unjust penalties.

THE NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on the floor of this Senate on Thursday, May 28, the distinguished Senator from Oregon called Secretary Strauss "an enemy of the people." He described his record as "horrendous."

Is a man who in his youth helped to feed the starving people of France, Belgium, and central Europe an enemy of the people?

Is a man who has spent many thousands of dollars of his own earning to find a better means of controlling cancer an enemy of the people?

Is a man who served his country during war with such distinction that his services were twice recognized and commended by the President of the United States an enemy of the people?

Is the man who insisted upon the establishment of a system to tell when our potential enemies achieved atomic weapons capability an enemy of the people?

Is the man who first and alone urged and stoutly maintained, against powerful opposition—almost unanimous opposition—that we should not be less well armed than the Soviet—that we must develop the hydrogen weapon—is that man an enemy of the people?

Is the man who played a leading role in helping formulate the President's program of atoms for peace an enemy of the people?

Is the man whose idea established the International Atomic Energy Agency, who sponsored the Scientific Conferences on the Peaceful Atom, who gave the impetus of support to the program to control the fusion reaction for power development, who never hesitated to stand by an unpopular cause when it was his duty in the national interest, is that man an enemy of the people?

It seems to me we should look to our own accomplishments and our own record. What are the criteria for judging a man to be an enemy of the people?

I say to you, Mr. President, that history will be confounded by the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Oregon. Let us not make the mistake of being so misled by him that we do an unparalleled injustice to Mr. Strauss.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS AND TAX COURT APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ROBERTSON. 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. 5805) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

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

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 3, 1959, pp. 9696–9697, 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. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the report be agreed to.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a table on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. The table reflects, by each appropriation item, the amount voted by the House of Representatives, the amount voted by the Senate, and the amount agreed to by the conference committee.

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

Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, 1960 (H.R. 5805)

	Budget estimate	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference action
TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
TITLE I				
Office of the Secretary: Salaries and expenses	$3,300,000	$3,300,000	$3,300,000	$3,300,000
Bureau of Accounts:				
Salaries and expenses	3,464,000	3,464,000	3,464,000	3,464,000
Division of Disbursement: Salaries and expenses	22,280,000	21,500,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
Total, Bureau of Accounts	25,744,000	24,964,000	25,464,000	25,464,000
Bureau of the Public Debt, Administering the Public Debt	47,500,000	47,000,000	47,000,000	47,000,000
Office of the Treasurer, United States: Salaries and expenses	17,750,000	17,500,000	17,500,000	17,500,000
Bureau of Customs: Salaries and expenses	53,865,000	53,865,000	53,865,000	53,865,000

Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, 1960 (H.R. 5805)—Continued

	Budget estimate	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conference action
TREASURY DEPARTMENT—Continued				
TITLE I—continued				
Internal Revenue Service: Salaries and expenses	$365,500,000	$363,000,000	$365,500,000	$364,250,000
Bureau of Narcotics: Salaries and expenses	4,080,000	4,080,000	4,080,000	4,080,000
U.S. Secret Service:				
Salaries and expenses	4,100,000	4,000,000	4,032,000	4,016,000
Salaries and expenses, White House Police	1,055,000	1,055,000	1,055,000	1,055,000
Salaries and expenses, guard force	338,000	338,000	338,000	338,000
Total, U.S. Secret Service	5,493,000	5,393,000	5,425,000	5,409,000
Bureau of the Mint: Salaries and expenses	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,300,000
U.S. Coast Guard:				
Operating expenses	[1] 190,780,000	[2] 189,000,000	189,000,000	189,000,000
Acquisition, construction, and improvement	[1] 24,500,000	[2] 22,000,000	[3] 24,500,000	[4] 23,250,000
Retired pay	29,900,000	29,500,000	29,500,000	29,500,000
Reserve training	15,000,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000
Total, Coast Guard	260,180,000	256,000,000	258,500,000	257,250,000
Total	787,712,000	779,402,000	784,934,000	782,418,000
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT				
TITLE II				
Administration, regional operation, and research	72,600,000	71,500,000	72,398,600	71,750,000
Operations	3,010,000,000	2,988,000,000	2,998,000,000	2,993,000,000
Transportation	527,320,000	524,000,000	524,000,000	524,000,000
Facilities	200,660,000	188,660,000	194,660,000	190,660,000
Postal modernization	[5] 88,500,000	[2] 75,000,000	[3] 88,500,000	[4] 80,000,000
Public services	(172,000,000)	----------	(37,400,000)	(37,400,000)
Total	3,899,080,000	3,847,160,000	3,877,558,600	3,859,410,000
TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES				
TITLE III				
Salaries and expenses	1,535,000	1,535,000	1,535,000	1,535,000
Grand total, Treasury, Post Office, and Tax Court	4,688,327,000	4,628,097,000	4,664,027,600	4,643,363,000

[1] Language limiting annual accrued expenditures.
[2] House deleted language.
[3] Senate restored language.
[4] Deleted language.
[5] Language providing "no year" funds.

Administrative expenses of Government corporations (limitation on amount of corporate funds to be expended)

Corporation	Estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Conference
Liquidation of RFC	($95,000)	($90,000)	($90,000)	($90,000)

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN LAWS AFFECTING THE STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 318, Senate bill 1541. My purpose is to have the bill made the pending business.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1541) to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1541) to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after "Sec. 2.", to insert "(a)"; on page 2, after line 4, to insert:

(b) Section 6(e) of said Act is amended by striking out the word "legislative" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "calendar".

On page 8, after line 8, to insert:

(d) Title 18 United States Code, section 1385, is amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

On page 11, line 17, after the word "section", to strike out "40" and insert "44"; on page 15, line 17, after the letter "(a)", to strike out "Title 28, United States Code, section 48, is amended by striking out the word 'Seattle,' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'Seattle, Anchorage.'", and, in lieu thereof to insert "The Judicial Conference of the United States, with the assistance of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall conduct a study, including a field survey, of the Federal judicial business arising in the State of Alaska with a view toward authorizing the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit to hold such terms of court in Anchorage or such other Alaskan cities as may be necessary for the prompt and efficient administration of justice."; on page 16, line 18, after the word "court", to insert "and approved by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts"; at the top of page 25, to insert:

DEFENSE BASE ACT

SEC. 40. (a) Paragraph (2) and (3) of section 1(a) of the Defense Base Act, as amended (55 Stat. 622; 42 U.S.C. 1651 and the following), are amended by striking out "Alaska;" in the parenthetical phrase in each paragraph.

(b) Paragraph (6) of section 1(a) of that Act is amended by striking out "or in Alaska or the Canal Zone".

(c) Section 1(b) of that Act is amended by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3), inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and adding the following paragraph: "(4) the term 'continental United States' means the States and the District of Columbia."

After line 12, to insert:

TIMBER REMOVAL

SEC. 41. The Act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1093), as amended (16 U.S.C. 607), is further amended by deleting the words "Territory of Alaska" and the words "or Territory" where they there appear and by inserting the word "Alaska," after the words "In the State of".

After line 18, to insert:

WAR HAZARDS COMPENSATION ACT

SEC. 42. (a) Paragraphs (2), (3), and (5) of section 101(a) of the War Hazards Compensation Act, as amended (56 Stat. 1028; 42 U.S.C. 1701 and the following), are amended by striking out "or in Alaska or the Canal Zone".

(b) Section 104 of that Act is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not apply with respect to benefits on account of any injury or death occurring within any State."

(c) Section 201 of that Act is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) the term 'continental United States' means the States and the District of Columbia."

On page 26, after line 9, to insert:

BUY AMERICAN ACT

SEC. 43. Section 1(b) of Title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10c(b)), is amended by striking out the word "Alaska,".

At the beginning of line 15, to change the section number from "40" to "44"; on page 27, line 1, after the word "of", where it appears the first time, to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$3,000,000"; on page 28, in line 4, after "Sec.", to strike out "41" and insert "45. (a)"; in line 6, after the word "terminated", to insert "or curtailed"; after line 13, to insert:

(b) Structures and improvements of block 32 of the city of Juneau granted to the State of Alaska by section 6(c) of the Act providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union (72 Stat. 339, 340) shall include all furnishings and equipment in the structure known as the Governor's mansion, or used in the operation or maintenance thereof.

At the beginning of line 21, to change the section number from "42" to "46"; in line 22, after the name "Alaska", to insert "prior to January 1, 1965,"; on page 29, at the beginning of line 3, to

strike out "to appoint a temporary commission of three persons to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and settle such disputes." and insert "(1) to appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate a temporary commission of three persons, to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and settle such disputes, and (2) to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to establish such temporary commission or as may be necessary to terminate such temporary commission at the conclusion of its duties."; in line 14, after the word "necessary.", to strike out "Any settlement made by such commission under the authority of this section shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary." and, in lieu thereof, to insert "No commission shall be appointed under authority of this subsection after June 30, 1965."; on page 30, at the beginning of line 8, to insert "The commission may establish such procedures, rules, and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its duties under this section."; at the beginning of line 13, to insert "Any commissioner may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. A vacancy in the commission shall not impair the right of the remaining commisisoners to exercise all the powers of the commission."; in line 24, after the letter "(d)", to strike out "The President is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."; on page 31, at the beginning of line 5, to change the section number from "43" to "47"; on page 33, after line 17, to insert:

(g) The amendments in sections 40 and 42 shall take effect when enacted: *Provided, however,* That with respect to injuries or deaths occurring on or after January 3, 1959, and prior to the effective date of these amendments, claims filed by employees engaged in the State of Alaska in any of the employments covered by the Defense Base Act (and their dependents) may be adjudicated under the Workmen's Compensation Act of Alaska instead of the Defense Base Act.

On page 34, at the beginning of line 2, to change the section number from "44" to "48"; after line 6, to insert:

OTHER SUBJECTS

SEC. 49. The amendment by this Act of certain statutes by deleting therefrom specific references to Alaska or such phrases as "Territory of Alaska" shall not be construed to affect the applicability or inapplicability in or to Alaska of other statutes not so amended.

And, at the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "45" to "50"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Alaska Omnibus Act".

FEDERAL JURISDICTION

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4 of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339), providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, is amended by striking out the words "all such lands or other property, belonging to the United States or which may belong to said natives", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "all such lands or other property (including fishing rights), the right or title to which may be held by said natives or is held by the United States in trust for said natives".

(b) Section 6(e) of said Act is amended by striking out the word "legislative" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "calendar".

TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAWS

SEC. 3. Any Territorial law, as that term is defined in section 8(d) of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339, 344), providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union—

(a) which provides for the regulation of commerce within Alaska by an agency of the United States, and

(b) the application of which to the State of Alaska is continued solely by reason of such section 8(d), shall cease to apply to the State of Alaska on June 30, 1961, or on the effective date of any law enacted by the Legislature of the State of Alaska which modifies or changes such Territorial law, whichever occurs first.

SUGAR ACT

SEC. 4. Section 101 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended (7 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 1101), is further amended by adding thereto a new subsection, to be designated subsection "(o)" and to read as follows:

"(o) The term 'continental United States' means the 49 States and the District of Columbia."

SOIL BANK ACT

SEC. 5. Section 113 of the Soil Bank Act (7 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 1837), is amended to read as follows: "This subtitle B shall apply to the continental United States, except Alaska, and, if the Secretary determines it to be in the national interest, to the State of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and as used in this subtitle B, the term 'State' includes Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

ARMED FORCES

SEC. 6. (a) Title 10, United States Code, section 101(2), is amended by striking out the words "Alaska, Hawaii," and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Hawaii".

(b) Title 10, United States Code, sections 802(11) and 802(12), are each amended by striking out the words "that part of Alaska east of longitude 172 degrees west,".

(c) Title 10, United States Code, section 2662(c), is amended by striking out the word "Alaska,".

NATIONAL BANK ACT

SEC. 7. Section 5192 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 144), is further amended by striking out the words "in Alaska or".

FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

SEC. 8. (a) Section 1 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 221), is further amended by deleting the period at the end of such action and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "; the term 'the continental United States' means the States of the United States and the District of Columbia."

(b) Section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 466), is further amended by striking the words "in Alaska or".

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

SEC. 9. (a) Paragraph (3) of section 2 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1422 (3)), is further amended by striking out the words "Territories of Alaska and Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Territory of Hawaii."

(b) Section 7 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1466), is further amended by striking out the words "continental United States, to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "continental United States (including Alaska), to the Territory of Hawaii."

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 10. The National Housing Act is amended by—

(a) striking out the word "Alaska," in sections 9, 201(d), 207(a)(7), 601(d), 713(q), and 801(g) (12 U.S.C., secs. 1706d, 1707(d), 1713(a)(7), 1736(d), 1747 1(q); supp. V, sec. 1748(g));

(b) striking out the words "the Territory of Alaska," in section 207(c)(2) (12 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 1713(c)(2)), and inserting the word "Alaska" in lieu thereof;

(c) by striking out the words "the Territory of Alaska or in Guam" in section 214 (12 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 1715d; 48 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 484d), and inserting the words "Alaska, Guam," in lieu thereof; and

(d) striking out the word "Territory" in the two places where it appears in section 806 (12 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 1748e), and inserting the word "State" in lieu thereof.

COAST GUARD

SEC. 11. Title 14, United States Code, section 634(b), is amended by striking out the words "and for the territory of" in both places where they appear therein.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SEC. 12. (a) Paragraph (6) of section 2 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77b (6)), is further amended by striking out the word "Alaska,".

(b) Paragraph (16) of section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(16)), is further amended by striking out the word "Alaska,".

(c) Paragraph (18) of section 202(a) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended (15 U.S.C. 80b-2(a)(18)), is further amended by striking out the word "Alaska,".

(d) Paragraph (37) of section 2(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (15 U.S.C. 80a-2(a)(37)), is further amended by striking out the word "Alaska,".

(e) Paragraph (1) of section 6(a) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended (15 U.S.C. 80a-6(a)(1)), is further amended by striking out the word "Alaska,".

SOIL CONSERVATION

SEC. 13. (a) Section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 590h(b)), is further amended by inserting, immediately following the words "continental United States", the words ", except in Alaska".

(b) Section 17(a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590q(a)), is further amended by striking out the words "the United States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "the States, the Territory of Hawaii", and by striking out the word "Alaska" the second time it appears therein.

BALD EAGLES

SEC. 14. Section 1 of the Act of June 8, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 668), is amended by striking out the words "except the Territory of Alaska,".

WILDLIFE RESTORATION

SEC. 15. Section 8(a) of the Act of September 2, 1937, as amended (16 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 669g-1), is further amended by striking out the words "the Alaska Game Commission,", "said Territory of Alaska,", "not exceeding $75,000 for Alaska, and", and "the Territory of Alaska,".

FISH RESTORATION

SEC. 16. Section 12 of the Act of August 9, 1950, as amended (16 U.S.C., supp. V, sec.

777k), is further amended by striking out the words "the Alaska Game Commission,", "said Territory of Alaska,", "not exceeding $75,000 for Alaska, and", and "the Territory of Alaska,".

CRIMINAL CODE

SEC. 17. (a) Title 18, United States Code, section 5024, is amended by striking out the words "other than Alaska" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including Alaska".

(b) Section 6 of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 845, 847), is amended by striking out the words "other than Alaska" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including Alaska".

(c) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be effective on July 7, 1961, or on the date of the Executive order referred to in section 18 of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339, 350), providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, whichever occurs first.

(d) Title 18 United States Code, section 1385, is amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

EDUCATION

SEC. 18. (a)(1) Subsection (a) of section 103 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 1580, 1582), relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out "Alaska," each time it appears.

(2) Paragraph (3)(B) of section 302(a) of such Act (72 Stat. 1580, 1588), relating to definition of continental United States for purposes of allotments for science, mathematics and modern foreign language instruction equipment, is amended by striking out "does not include Alaska" and inserting in lieu thereof "includes Alaska".

(3) Section 1008 of such Act (72 Stat. 1580, 1605), relating to allotments to territories, is amended by striking out "Alaska,".

(b)(1) Section 4 of the Act of February 23, 1917 (20 U.S.C. 14), relating to allotments for teacher-training, is amended by striking out "$90,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$98,500". The proviso in the last paragraph of section 5 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 16) and so much of section 12 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 22) as follows the last semicolon shall not be applicable to Alaska prior to the third fiscal year which begins after the enactment of this Act.

(2) Paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U.S.C. 151), relating to definition of States and Territories, is amended by striking out "the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Territory of Hawaii".

(3) Subsection (e) of section 210 (20 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 15jj(e)), and subsection (a) of section 307 of such Act (72 Stat. 1580, 1600), relating to definition of State, are each amended by striking out "Alaska,".

(c) Paragraph (13) of section 15 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (72 Stat. 548, 558), relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out "Alaska,".

(d)(1) The material in the parentheses in the first sentence of subsection (d) of section 3 of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, relating to determination of local contribution rate, is amended to read: "(other than a local educational agency in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, or in a State in which a substantial proportion of the land is in unorganized territory for which a State agency is the local educational agency)".

(2) The fourth sentence of such subsection is amended by inserting "(including Alaska)" after "continental United States" the first time it appears in such sentence. The fifth sentence of such subsection is amended by inserting "including Alaska)" after "continental United States" the second time it appears in such sentence.

(3) The last sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "Alaska," and by inserting after "the Virgin Islands," the following: "or in any State in which a substantial proportion of the land is in unorganized territory for which a State agency is the local educational agency,".

(4) Paragraph (8) of section 9 of such Act (20 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 244 (8)), relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out "Alaska,".

IMPORTATION OF MILK AND CREAM

SEC. 19. Subsection (b) of section 9 of the Act of February 15, 1927 (21 U.S.C. 149(b)), is amended by inserting the words ", including Alaska" immediately following the words "continental United States".

OPIUM POPPY CONTROL

SEC. 20. Section 12 of the Opium Poppy Control Act of 1942 (21 U.S.C. 188k) is amended by deleting therefrom the words "the Territory of Alaska,".

HIGHWAYS

SEC. 21. (a) The Secretary of Commerce shall transfer to the State of Alaska by appropriate conveyance without compensation, but upon such terms and conditions as he may deem desirable, all lands or interests in lands, including buildings and fixtures, all personal property, including machinery, office equipment, and supplies, and all records pertaining to roads in Alaska, which are owned, held, administered by, or used by the Secretary in connection with the activities of the Bureau of Public Roads in Alaska, (i) except such lands or interests in lands, including buildings and fixtures, personal property, including machinery, office equipment, and supplies, and records as the Secretary may determine are needed for the operations, activities, and functions of the Bureau of Public Roads in Alaska after such transfer, including services or functions performed pursuant to section 44 of this Act; and (ii) except such lands or interests in lands as he or the head of any other Federal agency may determine are needed for continued retention in Federal ownership for purposes other than or in addition to road purposes.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, any contract entered into by the Federal Government in connection with the activities of the Bureau of Public Roads in Alaska which has not been completed on the date of the transfer provided under subsection (a) hereof may be completed according to the terms thereof.

(c) (1) The State of Alaska shall be responsible for the maintenance of roads, including bridges, tunnels, and ferries, transferred to it under subsection (a) of this section, as long as any such road is needed for highway purposes.

(2) Federal-aid funds apportioned to Alaska under title 23, United States Code, for fiscal year 1960 and prior fiscal years, and unobligated on the date of enactment of this Act, may be used for maintenance of highways on the Federal-aid systems in Alaska.

(d) Effective July 1, 1959, the following provisions of law are repealed:

(1) Title 23, United States Code, section 103(f);

(2) Title 23, United States Code, section 116(d);

(3) Title 23, United States Code, section 119;

(4) Title 23, United States Code, section 120(h), except that the portion of the first sentence thereof relating to the percentage of funds to be contributed by Alaska shall continue to apply to funds apportioned to Alaska for fiscal year 1960 and prior fiscal years;

(5) Sections 107(b) and (d) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 374, 377, 378);

(6) Section 2 of the Act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U.S.C. 322 and the following); and

(7) The Act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 446), as amended (48 U.S.C. 321(a) and the following).

(e) Effective on July 1, 1959, the following provisions of law are amended:

(1) The definition of the term "State" in title 23, United States Code, section 101(a), is amended to read as follows:

"The term 'State' means any one of the forty-nine States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico.";

(2) Title 23, United States Code, section 104(b), is amended by deleting the phrase ", except that only one-third of the area of Alaska shall be included" where it appears in paragraphs (1) and (2) of said section 104(b);

(3) Title 23, United States Code, section 116(a), is amended by deleting the phrase "except as provided in subsection (d) of this section," and by capitalizing the word "it" immediately following such phrase; and

(4) Title 23, United States Code, section 120(a), is amended by deleting the phrase "subsections (d) and (h)" and by inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "subsection (d)".

INTERNAL REVENUE

SEC. 22. (a) Section 2202 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to missionaries in foreign service), and sections 3121 (e)(1), 3306(j), 4221(d)(4), and 4233(b) of such Code (each relating to a special definition of "State") are amended by striking out "Alaska,".

(b) Section 4262(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (definition of "continental United States") is amended to read as follows:

"(1) CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES.—The term 'continental United States' means the District of Columbia and the States other than Alaska."

(c) Section 4502(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of "United States") is amended by striking out "the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska" and by inserting in lieu thereof "the Territory of Hawaii".

(d) Section 4774 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to territorial extent of law) is amended by striking out "the Territory of Alaska,".

(e) Section 7621(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to boundaries of internal revenue districts) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) BOUNDARIES.—For the purpose mentioned in subsection (a), the President may subdivide any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or may unite into one district two or more States or a Territory and one or more States."

(f) Section 7653(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "its Territories or possessions" and inserting in lieu thereof "its possessions or the Territory of Hawaii".

(g) Section 7701(a)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of "United States") is amended by striking out "the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Territory of Hawaii".

(h) Section 7701(a)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of State) is amended by striking out "Territories" and inserting in lieu thereof "Territory of Hawaii".

(i) The amendments contained in subsections (a) through (h) of this section shall be effective as of January 3, 1959.

COURTS

SEC. 23. (a) The Judicial Conference of the United States, with the asisstance of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall conduct a study, including a field survey, of the Federal judicial business arising in the State of Alaska with a view toward authorizing the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit to hold such

terms of court in Anchorage or such other Alaskan cities as may be necessary for the prompt and efficient administration of justice.

(b) Title 28, United States Code, section 81A, is amended by inserting the word "Ketchikan," immediately following the word "Juneau,".

(c) Such authority as has been exercised by the Attorney General heretofore, with regard to the Federal court system in Alaska, pursuant to section 30 of the Act of June 6, 1900 (48 U.S.C. 25), shall continue to be exercised by him after the court created by section 12(b) of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339, 348), providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, is established.

(d) All balances of public moneys received by the clerks of each division of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska pursuant to section 10 of the Act of June 6, 1900, as amended (48 U.S.C. 107), which are on hand after all payments ordered by that court and approved by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall have been made, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as required by law, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the amounts so covered, which are hereby appropriated, to the State of Alaska.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

SEC. 24. (a) Subsection (g) of section 11 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (29 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 41(g)), relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out "Alaska,".

(b)(1) Subsection (i) and paragraph (1) of subsection (h) of such section, relating to definition of allotment percentages and Federal shares for purposes of allotment and matching for vocational rehabilitation services, are each amended by striking out "(excluding Alaska)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(including Alaska)".

(2) Paragraph (1) of such subsection (h) is further amended by striking out "Alaska,".

(3) Such subsection (i) is further amended by striking out "Hawaii and Alaska" in clause (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "Hawaii".

GOLD RESERVE ACT

SEC. 25. Section 15 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended (31 U.S.C. 444), is further amended by striking out the words ", the District of Columbia, and the Territory of Alaska" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and the District of Columbia".

SILVER PURCHASE ACT

SEC. 26. Section 10 of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C. 448b), is amended by striking out the words ", the District of Columbia, and the Territory of Alaska" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and the District of Columbia".

NATIONAL GUARD

SEC. 27. Title 32, United States Code, section 101(1), is amended by striking out the words "Alaska, Hawaii," and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Hawaii".

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

SEC. 28. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 5(h) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 466d(h)(1)), relating to Federal share for purposes of matching for program operation, is amended by striking out "(excluding Alaska)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(including Alaska)" and by striking out, in clause (B), "and Alaska".

(b) Subsection (d) of section 11 of such Act (33 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 466j(d)), is amended by striking out "Alaska,".

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 29. (a) Title 38, United States Code, section 903(b), is amended by striking out the words ", or to the place of burial within Alaska if the deceased was a resident of Alaska who had been brought to the United States as a beneficiary of the Veterans' Administration for hospital or domiciliary care"; by inserting the word "continental" immediately before the words "United States" the second time they appear in such section; and by inserting, immediately following the words "continental United States" in both places where they appear in such section, the parenthetical phrase "(including Alaska)".

(b) Title 38, United States Code, section 2007(c), is amended by striking out the word "Alaska,".

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

SEC. 30. (a) Subsection (f) of section 3 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 472(f)), is amended by striking out the words ", Hawaii, Alaska," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "(including Alaska), Hawaii,".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 702 of such Act (40 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 522(a)), is amended by striking out the words "Territories of Alaska and Hawaii" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Territory of Hawaii".

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

SEC. 31. (a) Subsection (f) of section 2 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 (f)), relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out "Hawaii, Alaska," and inserting in lieu thereof "Hawaii," and by striking out ", the District of Columbia, or Alaska" and inserting in lieu thereof "or the District of Columbia".

(b)(1) Effective July 1, 1959, section 371 of the Public Health Service Act, as added by the Alaska Mental Health Enabling Act (42 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 273), is repealed.

(2) Subsection (a) of section 372 of such Act (42 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 274(a)), is amended by striking out "the Territory of".

(3) Subsections (b), (c), and (e) of such section are each amended by striking out "the Territory" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Alaska".

(4) Such subsection (e) is further amended by striking out "the Territory's" and inserting in lieu thereof "Alaska's".

(c)(1) Subsection (a) of section 631 of such Act (42 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 291i(a)), relating to definition of allotment percentage for purposes of allotments for construction, is amended by striking out "(excluding Alaska)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(including Alaska)" and by striking out "for Alaska and Hawaii shall be 50 per centum each" in clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "for Hawaii shall be 50 per centum".

(2) Subsection (d) of such section, relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out "Alaska,".

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

SEC. 32. (a) Paragraph (8) of section 1101(a) of the Social Security Act (72 Stat. 1013, 1050), relating to definition of Federal percentage for purposes of matching for public assistance grants, is amended by striking out "Alaska and" in clause (ii) of subparagraph (A) and by striking out "(excluding Alaska)" in subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "(including Alaska)".

(b)(1) Subsection (a) of section 524 of the Social Security Act (72 Stat. 1013, 1054), relating to definition of allotment percentage for purposes of allotments for child welfare services, is amended by striking out "50 per centum in the case of Alaska and" in clause (B).

(2) Subsection (b) of such section, relating to definition of Federal share for purposes of matching for child welfare services, is amended by striking out "50 per centum in the case of Alaska and" in clause (2).

(3) Such subsections (a) and (b), and subsection (c) of such section, relating to promulgation of Federal shares and allotment percentages, are each amended by striking out "(excluding Alaska)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(including Alaska)".

(c)(1) The last sentence of section 202(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 402(i)), is amended by striking out "forty-eight" and inserting in lieu thereof "forty-nine".

(2) Subsections (h) and (i) of section 210 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 410(h), (i)), relating to definitions of State and United States for purposes of old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, are each amended by striking out "Alaska,".

(d)(1) Paragraph (1) of section 1101(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 1301(a)(1)), relating to definition of State, is amended by striking out "Alaska, Hawaii," and inserting in lieu thereof "Hawaii".

(2) Paragraph (2) of such section (42 U.S.C. 1301(a)(2)), relating to definition of United States, is amended by striking out "Alaska,".

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

SEC. 33. Section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U.S.C., supp. V, sec. 183), is further amended by striking out the word "Alaska,".

FEDERAL REGISTER

SEC. 34. Section 8 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 308) is amended by striking out the parenthetical phrase "(not including Alaska)" and inserting in lieu thereof the parenthentical phrase "(including Alaska)".

AIRPORTS

SEC. 35. (a) The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is authorized and directed to transfer to the State of Alaska by appropriate conveyance, and subject to such terms and conditions as he may deem appropriate, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the public airports constructed and operated pursuant to the Act of May 28, 1948, as amended (48 U.S.C. 485 and the following), including all the land, buildings, structures, facilities, equipment, and other personal property appurtenant thereto and necessary for the operation thereof, except for such property, real or personal, as the Administrator may determine is needed for the performance of functions of the United States in Alaska after such transfer. Such transfer shall be without monetary consideration to the United States.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, any contract entered into by the Federal Aviation Agency in connection with its activities with respect to public airports constructed and operated pursuant to the Act of May 28, 1948, as amended (48 U.S.C. 485 and the following), which has not been completed by the date of enactment of this Act, may be completed according to the terms thereof.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

SEC. 36. Section 16(b) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 U.S.C., app., sec. 466(b)), is further amended by striking out the word "Alaska,".

REAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 37. Section 43(c) of the Act of August 10, 1956 (50 U.S.C., app., supp. V, sec 2285(c)), is amended by striking out the word "Alaska,".

RECREATION FACILITIES

SEC. 38. Section 2 of the Act of May 4, 1956 (70 Stat. 130), is hereby repealed. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, such sums as may be necessary to complete the construction of facilities described in section 1 of such Act, as amended by the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 510), if construction was begun prior to June 30, 1959,

and to maintain the facilities pending their transfer pursuant to such section.

AIRCRAFT LOAN GUARANTEES

SEC. 39. Section 3 of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 629), is amended by striking out the words "Territory of Alaska" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "State of Alaska".

DEFENSE BASE ACT

SEC. 40. (a) Paragraph (2) and (3) of section 1(a) of the Defense Base Act, as amended (55 Stat. 622; 42 U.S.C. 1651 and the following), are amended by striking out "Alaska;" in the parenthetical phrase in each paragraph.

(b) Paragraph (6) of section 1(a) of that Act is amended by striking out "or in Alaska or the Canal Zone".

(c) Section 1(b) of that Act is amended by striking the period at the end of paragraph (3), inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and adding the following paragraph: "(4) the term 'continental United States' means the States and the District of Columbia."

TIMBER REMOVAL

SEC. 41. The Act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1093), as amended (16 U.S.C. 607), is further amended by deleting the words "Territory of Alaska" and the words "or Territory" where they there appear and by inserting the word "Alaska," after the words "In the State of".

WAR HAZARDS COMPENSATION ACT

SEC. 42. (a) Paragraphs (2), (3), and (5) of section 101(a) of the War Hazards Compensation Act, as amended (56 Stat. 1028; 42 U.S.C. 1701 and the following) are amended by striking out "or in Alaska or the Canal Zone".

(b) Section 104 of that Act is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not apply with respect to benefits on account of any injury or death occurring within any State."

(d) Section 201 of that Act is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) the term 'continental United States' means the States and the District of Columbia."

BUY AMERICAN ACT

SEC. 43. Section 1(b) of Title III of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10c(b)), is amended by striking out the word "Alaska,".

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS

SEC. 44. (a) In order to assist the State of Alaska in accomplishing an orderly transition from Territorial status to statehood, and in order to facilitate the assumption by the State of Alaska of responsibilities hitherto performed in Alaska by the Federal Government, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President, for the purpose of making transitional grants to the State of Alaska, the sum of $10,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; the sum of $6,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1961, and June 30, 1962; and the sum of $3,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1963, and June 30, 1964.

(b) The Governor of Alaska may submit to the President a request that a Federal agency continue to provide services or facilities in Alaska for an interim period, pending the provision of such services or facilities by the State of Alaska. Such interim period shall not extend beyond June 30, 1964. In the event of such request, and in the event of the approval thereof by the President, the President may allocate, at his discretion, to such agency the funds necessary to finance the provision of such services or facilities. Such funds shall be allocated from appropriations made pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, and the amount of such funds shall be deducted from the amount of grants available to the State of Alaska pursuant to such subsection.

(c) After the transfer or conveyance to the State of Alaska of any property or function pursuant to the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339), providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, or pursuant to this Act or any other law, and until June 30, 1964, the head of the Federal agency having administrative jurisdiction of such property prior to its transfer or conveyance may contract with the State of Alaska for the performance by such agency, on a reimbursable basis, of some or all of the functions authorized to be performed by it in Alaska immediately preceding such conveyance or transfer.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY

SEC. 45. (a) If the President determines that any function performed by the Federal Government in Alaska has been terminated or curtailed by the Federal Government and that performance of such function or substantially the same function has been or will be assumed by the State of Alaska, the President may, until July 1, 1964, in his discretion, transfer and convey to the State of Alsaka, without reimbursement, and property or interest in property, real or personal, situated in Alaska which is owned or held by the United States in connection with such function.

(b) Structures and improvements of block 32 of the city of Juneau granted to the State of Alaska by section 6(c) of the Act providing for the admission of Alaska into the Union (72 Stat. 339, 340), shall include all furnishings and equipment in the structure known as the Governor's mansion, or used in the operation or maintenance thereof.

CLAIMS COMMISSION

SEC. 46. (a) In the event that any disputes arise between the United States and the State of Alaska prior to January 1, 1965, concerning the transfer, conveyance, or other disposal of property to the State of Alaska pursuant to section 6(e) of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 339, 340), providing for the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, or pursuant to this Act, the President is authorized (1) to appoint by and with the advice and consent of the Senate a temporary commission of three persons, to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and settle such disputes, and (2) to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to establish such temporary commission or as may be necessary to terminate such temporary commission at the conclusion of its duties. In carrying out its duties under this section, such commission may hold such hearings, take such testimony, sit and act at such times and places, and incur such expenditures as the commission deems necessary. No commission shall be appointed under authority of this subsection after June 30, 1965.

(b) The commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, employ and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems necessary to carry out its duties under this section. The commission is authorized to use the facilities, information, and personnel of the departments, agencies, and establishments of the executive branch of the United States Government which it deems necessary to carry out its duties; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized to furnish such facilities, information, and personnel to the commission upon request made by the commission. The commission shall reimburse each such department, agency, or instrumentality for the services of any personnel utilized. The commission may establish such procedures, rules, and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its duties under this section.

(c) No member of such commission shall be an officer or employee of the United States or of the State of Alaska. Any commissioner may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. A vacancy in the commission shall not impair the right of the remaining commissioners to exercise all the powers of the commission. Each member of the commission shall be paid compensation at the rate of $50 per day for each day spent in the work of the commission, shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary travel expenses, and shall receive a per diem allowance in accordance with the provisions of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, when away from his usual place of residence.

(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the commission to perform its duties under this section.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 47. (a) The amendments made by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 18, by subsection (a) of section 28, by paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 31, by subsections (a) and (b) of section 32, and, except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, by subsection (b) of section 24, shall be applicable in the case of promulgations of Federal shares, allotment percentages, allotment ratios, and Federal percentages, as the case may be, made after satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce for a full year on the per capita income of Alaska, and for this purpose such promulgations shall, before such data for the full period required by the applicable statutory provision as so amended are available from the Department of Commerce, be based on satisfactory data available from such Department for such one full year or, when such data for a two-year period are available, for such two years.

(b) The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (a) of section 18 shall be applicable, in the case of allotments under section 302(b) or 502 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, for fiscal years beginning July 1, 1959, and, in the case of allotments under section 302(a) of such Act, in the case of allotments based on allotment ratios, promulgated under such section 302(a), to which the amendment made by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 18 of this Act is applicable.

(c)(1) The allotment percentage determined for Alaska under section 11(h) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended by this Act, for the first, second, third, and fourth years for which the amendments made by this Act are applicable to such section shall be increased by 76 per centum, 64 per centum, 52 per centum, and 28 per centum, respectively, of the difference between such allotment percentage for the year involved and 75 per centum.

(2) The Federal share for Alaska determined under section 11(1) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended by this Act, for the first year for which the amendments made by this Act are applicable to such section shall be increased by 70 per centum of the difference between such Federal share for such year and 60 per centum.

(3) If such first year for which such amendments made by this Act are applicable is any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1962, the adjusted Federal share for Alaska for such year for purposes of section 2(b) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act shall, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3)(A) of such section 2(b), be the Federal share determined pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(d) The amendments made by paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b), by subsection (c), and by paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of section 18; by subsection (a) of section 24; by subsection (b) of section 28; by subsection (a), by subparagraphs (2), (3), and

(4) of subsection (b), and by paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 31; by paragraph (2) of subsection (c) and by subsection (d) of section 32; and, except as provided in subsection (b) of this section by paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 18, shall be effective on January 3, 1959.

(e) The amendment made by paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 32 shall apply in the case of deaths occurring on or after January 3, 1959.

(f) The amendments made by paragraph (1) of subsection (b) and paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (d) of section 18 shall be applicable for fiscal years beginning July 1, 1959.

(g) The amendments in sections 40 and 42 shall take effect when enacted: *Provided, however*, That with respect to injuries or deaths occurring on or after January 3, 1959, and prior to the effective date of these amendments, claims filed by employees engaged in the State of Alaska in any of the employments covered by the Defense Base Act (and their dependents) may be adjudicated under the Workmen's Compensation Act of Alaska instead of the Defense Base Act.

DEFINITION OF "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES"

SEC. 48. Whenever the phrase "continental United States" is used in any law of the United States enacted after the date of enactment of this Act, it shall mean the 49 States on the North American Continent and the District of Columbia, unless otherwise expressly provided.

OTHER SUBJECTS

SEC. 49. The amendment by this Act of certain statutes by deleting therefrom specific references to Alaska or such phrases as "Territory of Alaska" shall not be construed to affect the applicability or inapplicability in or to Alaska of other statutes not so amended.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 50. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the pending bill, S. 1541, was introduced at the request of the President of the United States. As submitted, the bill represents the considered thinking of all departments of the administration and it was evolved in close cooperation with all members of the Alaska delegation. S. 1541 was introduced by the able and distinguished chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the senior Senator from Montana, and cosponsored by Senators ANDERSON, GOLDWATER, KUCHEL, O'MAHONEY, and myself.

The purpose of this bill is twofold: First, it seeks to make many technical changes in the law which have as their only purpose the recognition that Alaska is now a State and not a Territory. Secondly, certain substantive changes are also included. In the main, these changes merely give to the State of Alaska that equality which is now enjoyed by the several States. Certain transitional grants are made and allocated over a period of 5 years to assist the State of Alaska in establishing its role as a full-fledged partner of the Union. The yardstick that has been used to determine the amount of money to be given is that which Alaska would have received had it remained a Territory rather than becoming a State.

H.R. 7120, a companion bill to the one which we are considering was passed by the House of Representatives on June 1, 1959. That bill differs but slightly from S. 1541, the bill which we are considering. For example, at the request of the senior judge of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals we have amended section 23 to provide for a field survey of the necessity for the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals sitting in Alaska rather than the mandatory language which had previously been a part of the legislation.

There is ample precedent for this bill in that following the admissions of Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico legislation was enacted by Congress enabling the transition to be made more easily, although it must be realized that this bill is much more complex, reflecting the many more federally sponsored programs.

S. 1541, reported unanimously by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, is recommended for prompt passage.

Mr. President, there are two technical amendments at the desk; and I ask for their immediate consideration.

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

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I send two technical amendments to the desk and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 20, after the word "inserting" it is proposed to insert the words "in lieu."

On page 13, line 16, in lieu of the word "except" it is proposed to insert the word "Except."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has a technical amendment to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, line 13, it is proposed to strike the period after the word "function", insert a comma, and the following: "the assumption of which function is pursuant to this act or the act of July 7, 1958, 72 Stat. 339."

Mr. GRUENING. I may state the purpose of the amendment. In the other body there seemed to be some fear that the transfer of property was too sweeping, and that it might include property which was not a part of the functions which would be assumed by the new State. Therefore, the House added an amendment, which is exactly the same as the one I proposed, with the exception of one word. The House amendment reads:

The transfer of which function is authorized in this act or the act of July 7, 1958.

My amendment reads:

The assumption of which function is pursuant to this act or the act of July 7, 1958, 72 Stat. 339.

We feel that it is accurate to use the word "assumption" instead of "transfer," because actually the Federal Government does not transfer functions to a State; the State assumes those functions when the Federal Government ceases to assume them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GRUENING

This amendment is submitted for the purpose of clarifying certain questions which arose in the other body upon passage by it on June 1 of the companion bill to S. 1541.

As passed by the House, section 45, which provides for the transfer of certain property by the Federal Government to the State government, was amended to modify conditions applicable to transfers of property to specify that property would be transferred incident to transfers of governmental functions from the Federal Government to the State.

Upon review of the discussion in the House it would appear that the real intent of the modifying language adopted would be better expressed by inserting a requirement that functions of the Federal Government, the termination or curtailment of which will occasion the transfer of property, must be assumed by the State government, rather than by specifying that there must be a transfer of functions from the Federal to the State government.

In reality, it is clear that the transition from Territorial government to State administration will not be a process of transferring functions of the Federal Government to the State. In fact, such a transfer is impossible, since under our form of government, functions which are the responsibility of the Federal Government cannot be transferred to the States.

The process of transition will, in fact, be accomplished as a result of the termination or curtailment of numerous Federal functions which were required for Territorial government, but which can now be undertaken by the State government. This act of termination or curtailment of Federal Government functions will be accompanied by action of the State in assuming responsibility for the activities formerly carried on by the Federal Government which are necessary to orderly and efficient government of the State.

The purpose of section 45 is to provide that, as the State develops greater and more extensive responsibility for governmental activities, the Federal Government will be authorized to transfer to the State such property as was formerly required for Federal operations but is no longer needed by the United States for such purposes. In view of the facts that (1) the Federal Government will no longer need the property; (2) the property in question will be required for efficient and orderly functioning of the State government; and (3) the State of Alaska will be the only agency which can make effective use of the property, section 45 would appear to be an eminently sensible and useful provision of the bill.

The important aspect of the amendment I am proposing here is that the section provides for transfer of property, and not for the transfer of governmental functions.

A second part of this amendment on which I would like to comment is that which provides that the property transfers to be made

under section 45 will be transfers incident to the assumption of functions by the State pursuant to provisions of this act or pursuant to the Alaska Statehood Act.

As this bill was passed by the House, and as it was reported by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, there are two conditions for the transfer of Federal property to the State, namely, that (1) the Federal Government functions concerned must have been terminated or curtailed; and (2) the State must have assumed responsibility for those functions. This amendment would further limit the scope of Presidential authority to transfer Federal property to provide that property transfers would have to be made with reference to provisions of the two statutes under which the State is required to assume Government activities. This provision is recommended in order to eliminate possible questions which may arise as to the nature of the property which the President is authorized to transfer to the State.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, as has been stated by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Washington, the chairman of the subcommittee, S. 1541 is before the Senate as a result of an executive communication of last July, shortly after the President signed the Alaska statehood bill. The President designated the Bureau of the Budget to make a study among all the Federal departments. That study resulted in the drawing up of S. 1541.

I wish to express my thanks to Dr. Harold Seidman and Mr. Howard Schnoor, of the Bureau of the Budget, and to Miss Ruth Van Cleve, Assistant Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, for their highly effective work in months of study and in the preparation of the proposed legislation.

Likewise, I should like to thank the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and all the other members of that committee, as well as Chairman ASPINALL and Representatives O'BRIEN and SAYLOR, of the corresponding House committee, for their consideration and reporting of the proposed legislation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 7120.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7120) to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, 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.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, H.R. 7120 is a companion bill to S. 1541, passed by the House on June 1. I move that all after the enacting clause in H.R. 7120 be stricken, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof the text of the Senate bill, S. 1541, as amended and perfected.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 7120) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 1541 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it passed H.R. 7120.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 7007, Calendar No. 321.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7007), to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "of," to strike out "$480,550,000" and insert "$485,300,000"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$53,050,000" and insert "$57,800,000"; on page 3, line 3, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$15,250,000" and insert "$20,000,000"; in line 4, after the word "Administrator", to insert "or his designee"; in line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "House"; in line 6, after the word "Astronautics", to insert "of the House of Representatives", in the same line, after the word "the", to strike out "Senate"; in line 7, after the word "Sciences", to insert "of the Senate"; in line 13, after the word "contracts", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated for 'Research and development' pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee notifies the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility."; and on page 5, line 13, after the word "Administration", to strike out "for any period prior to July 30, 1965".

SOVIET DIPLOMACY: A CHALLENGE TO FREEDOM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I am impressed with the address delivered by Hon. Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, before the American Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia. His address relates to the question of the future of Soviet-American relations. Because of the vast importance of this subject and the great understanding he has shown in his discussion, I will place it in the RECORD so that others may have the privilege of reading it.

Iowa is proud of the record which Mr. Wilcox has made. He was an outstanding student and athlete at the University of Iowa. He served capably on the staff of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and he is now one of our great national leaders.

I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Mr. Wilcox be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SOVIET DIPLOMACY: A CHALLENGE TO FREEDOM

(Address by the Hon. Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, before the American Academy of Political and Social Science at the Warwick Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., Friday, April 10, 1959)

I am pleased to have this opportunity to participate in your discussions this evening. For more than half a century the members of the American Academy of Political and Social Science have made a significant contribution to better public understanding of our political and social problems. There is no more important question in world politics today than the subject of this meeting, the future of Soviet-American relations.

I believe that the character of the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United States and our allies will determine the nature of man's life on this planet for generations to come. It may indeed determine whether that life itself will continue or be abruptly snuffed out. In resolving this question the role of diplomacy is highly important.

Therefore, I would like to explore with you certain aspects of Soviet diplomacy which have a significant bearing on Soviet relationships with the free world.

THE CENTRAL CHALLENGE

Reduced to its essentials, the key question confronting us is this: Can a democratic, free enterprise, open society successfully compete in diplomacy with a totalitarian, centrally controlled society which is able to marshal its total resources in support of its foreign policy objectives?

In a little more than 40 years, the U.S.S.R. has changed from a comparatively backward, agricultural country to the second-ranking industrial nation in the world. Its gross national product is now increasing between 6 and 7 percent annually. Mr. Khrushchev confidently looks forward to the day when the economy of the Soviet Union will surpass that of the United States. Soviet technical capacity is forcefully demonstrated by the fact the Soviet Union launched the first satellite into outer space. Soviet

development of intercontinental ballistic missiles underscores its present military potential.

Every facet of the U.S.S.R.'s regimented society—economic, scientific, social, cultural, and psychological—as well as political and military—is at the constant and immediate disposal of Soviet diplomacy.

In contrast, in the conduct of foreign policy, our Government is accountable to the Congress and the people of the United States whom its Members represent. It must also take into account varied sectional and group interests. Mr. Khrushchev, however, is accountable mainly to himself, and perhaps a few of his Kremlin colleagues.

Mr. Khrushchev's ability to take independent decisions enables him to move swiftly in using trade with other nations to advance the U.S.S.R.'s foreign policy objectives. The Soviets offer guns and grains to carefully selected countries in order to reap maximum political advantages. They extend long-term, low-interest loans. They buy up surplus commodities—which they may not need—if it is in their national interest to do so. Whether or not these transactions are essential to their economy is immaterial to the Soviets. "We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political purpose," Mr. Khrushchev has said.

On this basis it may seem that the struggle is an unequal one. A free society, which must constantly be responsive to the pressures of public opinion, cannot move with the speed and monolithic force of a totalitarian state.

Let me emphasize, however, that free societies have invariably proved more resilient, creative and enduring than those under the deadening hand of dictatorship.

The United States has simultaneously achieved the greatest industrial capacity and the highest standard of living known to man. We have built a defense establishment which protects us and the free world against the threat of surprise attack. In cooperation with other free nations we have developed a system of collective security arrangements which serve as a formidable deterrent to Communist aggression anywhere. Our Marshall plan prevented a Communist takeover of an economically exhausted and prostrate Western Europe after World War II, and our foreign aid programs have enabled free nations to develop on an increasing scale their economic and social well-being.

These achievements can scarcely be called the dying gasps of a decadent capitalism as the Soviets would have it. On the contrary, they offer to the free world its greatest hope for a just peace and a cooperative way of life for free men in the future.

Of course, the diplomatic arrangements of the free world may at times appear cumbersome. This is inherent in the nature of the alliance. Nevertheless, free world diplomacy has demonstrated tremendous strength. The position of the free world is based on real and mutual interests. Our allies are partners and not puppets. Each country understands the stakes. Each appreciates the basis for action. Each wants to cooperate in a positive way in the common interest. The recent 10th anniversary meetings of the NATO Council clearly demonstrate this.

The handicaps of freedom in this struggle are therefore apparent rather than real. Its strengths are great. Not the least of these is the faith of the free world's people in the virtue and durability of freedom itself, a faith based on experience. In my judgment, this faith—this belief in the dignity and worth of the human being—is an element of strength which gives our military power vitality and direction. This is an unbeatable combination which the Soviet Union does not have.

CHANGES IN SOVIET DIPLOMACY

In 1946 Josef Stalin asserted that the wartime partnership between the U.S.S.R. and its Western allies had been a mere expedient. This set the pattern of postwar Soviet diplomacy. He served notice that war was inevitable until international communism had supplanted capitalism. Stalin even went so far as to blueprint the economic planning which would give to the Soviet Union a mighty arsenal to wage the "inevitable" war.

Stalin's successors, on the other hand, have consistently preached the virtue of peaceful coexistence. Nevertheless, the long-range goal of Soviet foreign policy has remained constant—world domination. Soviet foreign policy has been made up largely of a series of probes seeking out free world vulnerabilities or attempting to create them. Its record is studded with such probes: Iran, Greece, the Berlin blockade, and through its Far Eastern partner, the Red Chinese, aggressive actions against Korea, Vietnam, Taiwan Strait, and Tibet, to mention only a few. The latest and most immediate of these is the current crisis in Germany.

THE GERMAN CRISIS

Let us examine just what the situation in Berlin involved.

First of all, it is a deliberately staged and carefully timed Soviet maneuver designed in part to divide the free world. The Soviet rulers are well aware that communism flourishes in conditions of tension and unrest. They have never hesitated to attempt to create such conditions when they considered this to be in their interest.

By artificially creating a crisis over Berlin, they seek to divert attention from the real issues of German unification and European security. They seek to draw us into negotiations on isolated aspects of these problems whenever they think they have an advantage. Berlin is but one aspect, and certainly not the basic one, of the German problem as a whole. Many suggestions have been advanced for a solution of the Berlin problem, including some involving the United Nations. However, for the reasons I have mentioned, the United States is not interested in discussing formulas for Berlin as an isolated question.

Second—and most important—the Soviet Union is hoping to build up the international status of the East German regime and thereby bring about the permanent division of Germany. This is the only way its puppet regime, the so-called German Democratic Republic, can survive. In the longer run, the future of the satellite empire of Eastern Europe likewise hangs in the balance.

Finally, the Soviet Union hopes to eliminate the monument to freedom which West Berlin constitutes deep inside the Communist bloc. However, as long as West Berlin and the Federal Republic of Germany are allied with the West and remain strong in their determination to maintain their freedom, they will stand as a symbol of the right of the German people freely to determine their future. Given this situation, the Soviets will not be able to achieve their objectives.

That is why the Soviet Union is now trying to launch a course of events designed to extend its rule to Germany as a whole and to exclude free world influence in the area. The aim of the Soviet Union is not only to bring about the withdrawal of all Western forces from Berlin but also the withdrawal of all American forces from the Continent.

Having said this, it should be clear how vital a stake we have at this moment in Germany and in Berlin. Our forces are in West Berlin as a matter of right, on the basis of solemn international obligations to which the Soviet Union is a party. Mr. Khrushchev's proposals mean simply that the Soviet Union is now threatening, deliberately, and unilaterally, to disregard these obligations if we do not agree to conclude a "peace treaty" with Germany on Soviet terms.

President Eisenhower emphasized an important principle in his speech to the Nation on March 16. He made clear that we cannot accept the right of any government to break unilaterally solemn agreements to which we and others are parties. This principle must be upheld.

You will recall that for more than a decade the Western Powers have been trying—in every feasible way—to bring about the unification of Germany. The Soviet Union has frustrated every such effort. One scarcely need ask why.

Establishment of a free, unified Germany does not coincide with the long-range objectives of the Soviet Union. At the least, it would mean postponing the communization of Europe, which remains a Soviet goal of long standing.

The course we should pursue in these circumstances is clear. We must never succumb to Soviet blandishments. Our heritage of freedom requires us to stand firm. At the same time we must make unmistakably clear our willingness and readiness to engage, as reasonable men should, in meaningful negotiations.

Such negotiations must have as their primary purpose the maintenance of our rights in Berlin until the unification of Germany is achieved under conditions which will assure its people of their right to a government of their own choosing. We cannot and we will not betray the trust of those millions of free Germans who depend upon the free world to protect them.

Since World War I we have repeatedly seen that hesitation and lack of resolution on the part of free countries invite aggression. As President Eisenhower recently declared, "All history has taught us the grim lesson that no nation has ever been successful in avoiding the terrors of war by refusing to defend its rights. * * * The risk of war is minimized if we stand firm."

Even with good faith on both sides—which the Soviet Union has not always demonstrated—we cannot hope to settle the complex problem of Germany overnight. We can, however, continue to expect that a sound beginning can be made. Firmness combined with reasonableness now may be the most important key to meaningful negotiations with the Soviet Union. To follow any other course would invite the gravest perils to all we hold dear.

DISARMAMENT

The problem of disarmament gives us yet another vantage point from which to view the challenge of Soviet diplomacy to the free world. Here, the use of diplomacy to achieve the objectives of international communism has been subordinated to certain traditional Russian attitudes and concepts. These apparently must be maintained in order to perpetuate the present Soviet system.

Traditionally, both Imperial and Soviet Russia have suspected, distrusted and even feared nearly everything foreign. They have normally regarded the outsider as a threat to the system imposed on the Russian people. We cannot afford to ignore this facet of Russian behavior, which is one of the driving forces of Soviet disarmament policy.

The United States and its allies have consistently sought agreement on comprehensive and balanced disarmament under effective international control. Such control naturally requires sufficient inspection on both sides in order to be reasonably certain that the terms of any agreement are in fact lived up to. In our proposals inspection involves entry into the territory of the parties to the agreement, although both the United States and the United Nations have made clear it must be carried out in such a way that no State would have cause to feel

its security is endangered. It is on the question of inspection, however, that we have encountered almost insurmountable difficulties with the Soviet Union.

We remain ready and willing to negotiate effective disarmament agreements. We are prepared to permit Soviet representatives to participate in inspection arrangements in our territory. We do not fear their presence. In the circumstances envisaged, we would have nothing to hide.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, continues to fear the presence and the impact of Western representatives in its territory. Consequently, it resists—almost psychopathically—effective international inspection.

Let me give you some illustrations. Shortly after World War II, when the United States had a nuclear monopoly, we submitted the so-called Baruch Plan for the international control of atomic energy. This plan—which was one of the most generous proposals made in the history of sovereign states—was designed to insure that man's new knowledge of the atom would be used for the good of mankind. It provided for certain inspection and control arrangements to this end. This would have opened the Soviet Union and the United States to foreign inspectors. The Soviet Union rejected the plan.

Since last October we have sought to negotiate an agreement with the Soviet Union for the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests under an effective control system. When free world and Soviet experts agreed last summer that it was possible to establish an effective control system to police an agreement to discontinue testing, we were hopeful that this indicated a significant change in Soviet attitudes. Now, after nearly 5 months of continuous negotiations with the Soviets, we find ourselves up against the same old stumbling block—the question of inspection and control.

The Geneva nuclear test talks are now stalled on three key issues. These are the question of the veto, the question of onsite inspection of suspected violations of the agreement, and the staffing of the control posts. On each of these issues the Soviet position reflects its traditional desire to deny or restrict access to Soviet territory to foreigners.

Let us look first at the problem of the veto.

The Soviet Union insists that there must be unanimity of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union on all matters of substance under the agreement. This would include amendments to the treaty; all matters relating to possible treaty violations; the findings of inspection teams; the dispatch of inspection teams to investigate possible nuclear explosions; changes in the control system; positioning of control posts; and all fiscal, administrative, logistic, and personnel questions.

Obviously, the application of the veto power on this broad scale would render the control system meaningless and ineffective. The Soviet Union has advanced various technical arguments to support its position, but it appears to me that its main interest is to be sure that the machinery of the control system will in no way impair the ability of the Soviet Union to isolate its people from external influences.

This Soviet attitude is further borne out by the Russian proposals concerning onsite inspections. Here, too, the Soviet Union maintains that any inspection of an explosion or an unidentified event should only be made on the basis of unanimous decision. But it is perfectly clear to us that unless inspection teams can be dispatched without hindrance, there can be no effective control system.

The Soviet Union objects to having teams of this nature cross its frontiers because, they allege, such teams could act as a cover for espionage. We have sought to meet this fear by expressing our willingness to have the host country prescribe the routes to be taken by onsite inspection teams and to assign liaison officers to insure that the teams do not exceed their proper functions.

The control mechanism to police an agreement to discontinue nuclear weapons tests recommended by the Conference of Experts provided for establishment of control posts in various parts of the world. We believe that the supervisory and technical personnel of such control posts should not be nationals of the countries in which the posts are located. We are quite willing to have such posts in this country supervised by Soviet nationals. By the same token, control posts in the Soviet Union should not be supervised by Soviet citizens, but by others.

It is true that the Soviet Union has expressed willingness to accept a limited number of non-Soviet personnel in the control posts located in the Soviet Union. At the same time, it has refused to clarify the duties and privileges of such personnel. Apparently they would serve as mere observers. It appears that what the Soviets really want is self-inspection within their territory, which, in turn, would insure continued Soviet isolation from outside influence.

Can anyone believe that such a system, made up of Soviet inspectors, would provide us with the safeguards we need? Can anyone believe that Soviet nationals would be permitted to report Soviet violations of the agreement and to report them promptly?

The Geneva nuclear talks will be resumed in the next few days. We sincerely hope that the Soviet Union may come to realize that the conclusion of an agreement for the discontinuance of nuclear testing, with an effective control system, is much more in its interests than its traditional policy of shutting off its territory from foreigners. Certainly if they really want nuclear tests discontinued, we can make progress.

Time is on our side. Technological progress and constantly increasing mass communications facilities are making it more and more difficult for Soviet leaders to maintain the isolation of their people from the rest of the world. As the Soviet Union expands its own industrial and scientific facilities, contacts between the people of Soviet Russia and the free world will continue to increase. It brings closer the day when the Soviet policy of secrecy will be abandoned and one great obstacle to controlled disarmament will be removed.

THE SOVIET ECONOMIC OFFENSIVE

Let us turn briefly to another aspect of Soviet diplomacy. I have mentioned the tremendously increased economic power of the Soviet Union. Armed with the formidable weapon of a totally controlled economy, Soviet diplomacy has not overlooked the golden opportunities inherent in the new wave of nationalism and the revolution of rising expectations in the underdeveloped areas.

To the Soviets in foreign trade as in every facet of foreign policy, the end justifies the means. Soviet foreign trade has always been an absolute state monopoly with Soviet leaders able to turn trade off and on or to shift its direction to suit their strategy. Nations that become dependent upon trade with the Soviet Union for their well-being may soon discover what a devastating weapon this is when it is placed in the hands of unscrupulous leaders.

Since 1954, there has been what might be called a strategic departure from the Soviet trade pattern. Eying the important prize of the newly developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the U.S.S.R. is making a determined drive to penetrate and eventually subvert them. Since that year the Soviet Union, its satellites, and Communist China have extended $2.4 billion worth of credits to these countries. In 1958, alone, these credits amounted to $1 billion.

During 1957, Soviet bloc trade with underdeveloped free world countries was $1.7 billion. This was more than double such trade in 1954. And the upward trend is continuing.

Nor is this all. There are now 4,000 well-indoctrinated and dedicated Soviet technicians operating in Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. This represents an increase of 65 percent in a single year.

In this connection, we should not overlook the increased interest which Soviet leaders have shown in the economic, social and humanitarian activities of the United Nations. For years they had only bitter criticism to offer for the U.N. technicial assistance program and the specialized agencies. More recently they have become active members of the International Labor Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the World Health Organization, and the International Atomic Energy Agency. If you can't lick them, join them, now appears to be their motto.

I might add that these economic weapons have been blended by Soviet total diplomacy with carefully calculated military assistance, propaganda, and political moves. Their short-range goal is to provoke and exploit friction between these nations and those of the West. Their long-range goal is to prepare for eventual Communist subversion and takeover.

We must not forget, however, that the United States pioneered the concept of helping the underdeveloped countries advance their social and economic well-being. Our efforts in this respect are not always publicized with the fanfare and headlines that Soviet assistance programs obtain. But our programs are designed to achieve results which are solid and lasting. Soviet foreign aid has as its purpose the furthering of the U.S.S.R.'s goal of world domination. Our assistance from the very beginning has had but one purpose, to strengthen freedom.

I do not think it becomes a great nation like ours to boast about the assistance we have given. It is a fact, however, that the Marshall plan constitutes only a fraction of our postwar foreign aid. If we were to add the mutual security program and the contributions we have made through the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and various other types of assistance including United Nations' programs, our total foreign aid would run to something like 72 billions of dollars since 1945. This figure serves as clear proof of our deep interest in helping to build a stable and a peaceful world.

Many people ask whether the United States can afford the mutual security program. My answer to them would be clear and unequivocal: Of course our economy can safely bear the cost of this program. The total mutual security appropriation for 1959, which amounts to $3.3 billion, is only 0.75 percent of the estimated U.S. gross national product.

Excluding military assistance, funds for our mutual security program for all economic purposes run to about two-thirds of 1 percent of our gross national product—which is less than we spend each year for cosmetics. Our mutual security program provides us with the greatest amount of security at the lowest possible dollar cost. It assists less developed free countries to build sufficient economic strength to maintain their freedom and sustain peace. I say that it is so vital to the conduct of American foreign policy that we cannot afford not to have it.

Neither we nor our allies have the complete identity between government and economy that the Soviet Union has—nor, I am

sure, would we wish to. But there is a long history in the West of an effective working partnership between government and private enterprise in times when the existence of our free society has been seriously threatened. We are now living in such a time. We will continue to for the foreseeable future. I suggest that the hour has come when we should find new, imaginative, and effective ways to implement a vigorous and voluntary working relationship between free enterprise and free government.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA TECHNIQUES

In the arsenal of Soviet total diplomacy, no weapons are more important than those of psychological warfare and propaganda. In addition to its own gigantic propaganda machine at home, the U.S.S.R. exploits the many opportunities to advance its objectives which are presented by the worldwide network of mass communications media, both free and controlled.

For example, every time Mr. Khrushchev makes a speech, the text is normally faithfully and fully reported throughout the free world in its press and by other mass information media. Similarly every Soviet diplomatic note of any importance is printed. Even the cocktail talk of Mr. Khrushchev is reported as news in the free world, thus presenting the Soviet Union with a tailor-made trial balloon device. His statements can readily be denied—and have been—when it suits the Soviet purpose. If the balloon floats, informal conversation may be elevated to the dignity of a pronouncement of state policy.

In sharp contrast, the addresses of Western leaders, and their press conferences, diplomatic correspondence and formal statements of policy, are almost never published in full in the Soviet press and often are not even summarized. On those rare occasions when they are published it is invariably after considerable delay. Even more, the texts which are quoted are frequently emasculated, interlarded with editorial comment and very often accompanied by lengthy rebuttal. President Eisenhower's recent address to the Nation on the Berlin crisis was reported in the Soviet Union in the usual selective terms. For example, his assertion that "the American and Western peoples do not want war" was not reported by any major Soviet media.

These are but a few striking examples of how Soviet diplomacy utilizes and exploits media of public information as a weapon. In spite of their talk about the ruling circles, the Soviet leaders are well aware that real power in the free world ultimately rests with the general public rather than any governing group. They know full well that every utterance or action of an American diplomat receives closest public scrutiny and criticism. Soviet leaders, therefore, seize every opportunity to appeal to the people of the free world over the heads of their governments. Such appeals, which are often accompanied by distortion and plain untruth, are a standard technique of Soviet diplomacy.

In combating this worldwide Soviet propaganda campaign, our information program based on truth has become a potent weapon. Its emphasis on fact and moderate tone have given it a growing reputation for reliability that has resulted in a vast and constantly increasing audience among the peoples in the Communist empire. The best testimony to the effectiveness of the U.S. Information Agency is the fact that the Soviets spend more money on jamming its broadcasts than USIA spends on its entire operation.

I might also add that each issue of the Agency's magazine, America Illustrated, is a sellout the moment it arrives on the Soviet newsstands. Obviously there is a growing number of Soviet citizens who want to know the truth. Indeed, their number may be much greater than we think.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In view of the frustrations we have encountered, some Americans seem to oppose any serious attempt to negotiate with the Russians. Given the unreasonable attitude of the Soviet Union, the argument runs, given their rigid approach toward world problems, how can we ever expect to arrive at any serious agreement with them.

Admittedly, there is much to be said for this argument. The fact is the Soviets are inflexible. They are rigid. They are unbending. They are difficult, uncompromising, stubborn, intractable, and obdurate.

But the facts also show that it is not impossible to find important areas of agreement with the Soviet Union. Three examples will suffice to make my point. In 1955, after 10 long years of frustrating negotiations, they finally agreed to the Austrian State Treaty. In 1957, after considerable opposition, they signed the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Finally, in 1958, after extremely difficult negotiations, they agreed to the terms of the Lacy-Zaroubin Exchange Agreement.

Now these examples demonstrate that perhaps it is not impossible to get blood out of a turnip. They demonstrate that, if we search hard enough and persistently enough, it is not impossible to find certain areas of agreement with the Soviet Union.

No one can doubt that the task ahead of us will be a long and tedious one. It will call for many years of determined effort and sustained sacrifice on the part of the free peoples everywhere.

In our negotiations with the Russians we should always remember that they are not an impatient people. They are never in a hurry to get away from an international conference. They believe that history is on their side. And they are content to bide their time, constantly testing and probing for soft spots.

On our part we must do what we can, therefore, to develop an infinite amount of patience. Moreover, if we are to throw back the Communist challenge, we must display at least as much firmness, persistence, and determination as the Russians.

If we will pursue this course, Soviet leaders—encouraged by world opinion—may come to realize that it is in their own national interest to relax tensions and to come to further agreement with free world nations.

Above all we must never give up our eternal quest for a just peace. We must never give way to despair. We must never allow ourselves to become fatalistic about the prospects of war.

Thucydides reminds us that fatalism tends to produce what it dreads, for men do not oppose that which they consider inevitable.

In these circumstances, free world strategy should be clear. If the free nations will hold fast to those policies which deter armed attack; if they will continue to support the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter; if they can, through constructive economic programs, prevent Communist subversion in the underdeveloped areas; and if they will demonstrate, by word and deed, the enduring values of freedom, then we can be sure the cause of freemen will prevail.

MEXICO AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, while the eyes of the Western World have focused on Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, developments of crucial importance for the future of Western civilization have been taking place in the countries to our south. Throughout all of Latin America, political and economic changes of a revolutionary character are occurring—changes which may well determine whether these traditionally good neighbors will remain with the West or will cast their lot with the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Since the end of the Second World War, and especially in the last 7 years, the old style caudillo-general has been replaced by governments having large mass support in Costa Rica, Argentina, Colombia, Venezuela, Peru, Bolivia, and Cuba. Communism was not an issue in the struggles of the liberal, democratically oriented governments which succeeded in throwing out the dictators. Corruption, poverty, and exploitation of the many by the few in the perpetuation of oligarchies, lay at the root of the seething discontent which culminated in the demands for widespread reforms. Whether the governments which have come to power in the last few years can achieve the reforms demanded by their people soon enough to insure the continuation of representative government will largely depend upon the United States and the support it is willing to supply. Failure to act, and act now, can only strengthen the conditions which will shift political power to the Communists.

While the Monroe Doctrine has served to preserve Latin America from external seizure by foreign powers, the Communists operate through political parties within a given country, attempting to gain political control from within, rather than from without. Unlike the Nazis, who sought to penetrate Latin America principally through trade before 1939, the Communists seek political control closely alined with the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. The surrender of freedom by any part of Latin America must have consequences of the gravest kind for the United States and for the Western World.

Before one may objectively assess the situation now existing in Latin America, he must comprehend something of its past and the turbulence which has marked the course of its history to the present. Considerations of time rule out the possibility of a thorough review which should be given to all of Latin America, in this regard, so I shall confine my observations to our great and good neighbor to the south, Mexico. I do so in the spirit of suggesting that Mexican-American relations in the latter 20th century furnish us with an excellent case study of how best to conduct our relations with the rest of Latin America. Moreover, because of Mexico's long cultural ties with my own State of California, I know this splendid storied land far better than the other nations of Latin America. It should be remembered that the rest of Latin America tends to judge our behavior toward them by the way we conduct our affairs with Mexico.

Like all of Latin America, Mexico did not share the smooth transition from colonial status to nation which marked our own development. Throughout the whole of the 19th century, Mexico's

struggles centered on the effort to establish a working government responsive to the greater needs of the mass population. Her success in this field did not come until the early part of the 20th century with the overthrow of Porfirio Diaz and the eventual adoption of a liberal constitution in 1917.

Mexico can be regarded as a developing democracy because of her representative governmental structure and her recent progress in the direction of responsibility to the people. The Mexican democratic ideals have been well known since the revolution—ideals of freedom, justice, human dignity, social welfare, representative government, well-known goals of American and European liberalism, and social democracy. The achievements along these lines have varied greatly.

First should be mentioned personal freedom. As Whetten has said, this "is probably the greatest achievement of the Mexican Revolution. In the long run, this may prove important enough to counterbalance whatever mistakes may have been made." Freedom of speech is a fact, as well as a provision. Even in the still unsettled days of the twenties, our distinguished colleague and historian, the author of the outstanding work, "Mexico and Its Heritage," Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska found that—

> The United States could learn much from Mexico in regard to freedom of expression and tolerance. And a saving grace about Mexico's worst abuses is that those who practice them are generally ready, humorously to admit the worst.

With notable exceptions, he found an atmosphere of personal independence unknown in most parts of the United States:

> In Mexico a man may live as he pleases, think what he pleases, say what he pleases—that is considered his own business. He is not ostracized for it.

Although this land is so accessible that one can walk into a dozen handy points from four States, Mexico still remains largely a terra incognito to the people of the United States. Its border communities have tended to give the pedestrian and taxi tourist a totally false picture of Mexico, with sometimes unfortunate results for friendly relations between the two countries. Such superficial contacts do not contribute to our knowledge and understanding of the second largest and most populous Spanish-American country in the Western Hemisphere.

We tend to forget some of the more obvious facts about Mexico. For one thing, it is not new. Mexico was colonized long before British America; and while some areas are still largely inaccessible, and underdeveloped regions remain, a great university had been flourishing in Mexico City almost 100 years when Harvard University was founded.

Mexico is truly noted for its diversity, as a land of spectacular contrasts, described by one student of Mexico in these words:

> Lush, barren, cragged, flat, solemn, capricious, gnarled, slashed, smoothed and painted, the landscape of Mexico unfolds like the shuffling of thousands of colored postcards, none the same, all extremes.

The multipatterned terrain produces a great diversity of climate and of flora and fauna; and it has conditioned a diversity of racial and population patterns. Saenz wrote:

> There is a note of tragedy in the Mexican landscape. The flat-topped, pyramidal hills seem to bear the weight of the skies. The mountains are bare and ragged, the highlands cut deep by gully and ravine * * * deep ravines and impassable canyons cut mercilessly into the broad and high central plateau where most of Mexico lives. Land on end, a tumbled down world, unfinished to look at, and yet firmly set.

It is a land of great beauty and charm.

Mexico is a country that lives on the land, but topography and rainfall conspire against her. Therefore, only about one-ninth of the land area is cultivated, much of it on erosion-prone slopes. Probably an equal area could be cropped if irrigation were provided. Pasture and forest lands together comprise nearly two-thirds of the land area. Centuries of thoughtless exploitation of the land have left a heritage of serious erosion over much of Mexico's area.

Much of agricultural Mexico lacks adequate rainfall. One estimate is that half the total area is deficient in moisture throughout the year, while another 36 percent has a moisture deficiency in the winter months. The areas having adequate moisture are in general tropical and more sparsely inhabited; but current governmental programs are emphasizing the development of these regions. Considerable annual variation in rainfall in various regions adds to the problems of agriculture.

Mexico is still a country of rural people, somewhat geographically and culturally isolated, despite the recent rapid growth of the larger cities. There is little immigration, and the natural increase in population was slow until about 1930. During the last three decades it has spurted. The increase was more than 18 percent between 1930 and 1940, and some 31 percent between 1940 and 1950, bringing the 1950 figure to 25,791,000. The present population is close to 33 million. The population density per square mile among the 29 states and 2 territories ranges from 0.2 to 27.5, with a national average of 5. The population is quite centralized, and is largely concentrated in the central highlands. This area is broken down into separate clusters of villages, each village the focus of a rural-urban community. The national life focuses on Mexico City, the beautiful Mexican capital, which, like other cities, is growing much faster in population than are the rural areas. This city is enormous—larger than Madrid, Barcelona and, with the single exception of Buenos Aires, all other cities that speak Spanish.

A salient feature of Mexico is her heterogeneous population. Historical influences have shaped the social and cultural landscape to mold a new people, the mestizos, a European-native amalgam. One estimate is that some 90 percent of the people are Indian or part Indian, with 60 percent mestizos. Over the past century, the Indian portion and the whites have declined, with the white percentage losing most—by half. The Indian world is being slowly modernized; but several million live in relative cultural isolation, and about 1 million speak only an Indian language. Another 2 million speak little Spanish.

One grouping by cultural divisions puts the "Indian world" at 15 percent of the people; the "transitional world" at 37 percent; the "modern world" at 48 percent. A relatively small well-to-do class heads the 48 percent; and a small, but growing, middle class is developing in the fast-growing cities. The culture of Mexico derives from the intriguing, romantic, and highly advanced Indian civilization of thousands of years ago, and also, of course, from Spain and France. The influence of the United States is growing, as our mutual respect and friendship widen. Withal, Mexico is still "many Mexicos," a land of local and regional cultures and patriotism.

Is Mexico a rich land or a poor land? She was long regarded as a fabled cornucopia; and her mineral resources have given substance to that view. Her potential as a producer of meat and dairy products is good. Her southeastern lowlands give promise of substantial agricultural development, and irrigation can open up other interior lands. The potentialities of her tourist industry are excellent, and this industry already holds high rank as a national income producer. But agriculturally speaking, Mexico is not a wealthy country; and her potential in this direction is limited.

For about the past three decades, Mexico has been in the throes of an industrial revolution. In manufacturing and industry, expansion has been rapid; but it has been uneven from one industry to another. Some consumer-goods production has boomed, while other more important lines of activity have lagged. The means of transport, especially roads, have increased; but they have not yet met the pressing demand. Agricultural output has long been a problem, but recently the picture has been improving. Per capita income and standards of living advance, but are still low, compared with those of the more advanced industrialized countries.

Like all Latin America, Mexico is engaged in an enormous and continuing undertaking to raise the standard of living for all her people. The average annual rate of increase in industrial production has varied over the past decade, but has remained at least 3 percent annually. It was calculated at 4.4 percent annually for 1929–39, 7 percent for 1940–44, 3 percent for 1945–49, 5 percent for 1950–55—including the 2 bad years of peso difficulties, and 8 percent for 1955. Such progress is needed to bring a rise in living standards in the face of a high rate of population increase, nearly 3 percent annually.

In the capital market of Mexico, the Government has played an important role in stimulating economic development—by encouraging private investment, by participating in development—through loans and through joint ownership in important firms with private

capital—and through wholly government-financed investments. The climate for private investment is favorable, because of relatively moderate taxes, important specific tax concessions, high rates of return on industrial capital, and the absence of exchange controls.

Mexico's principal goal today was best expressed by the distinguished Ambassador of Mexico to the United States, Antonio Carrillo Flores.

In speaking a few days ago at Rice Institute, in Texas, Ambassador Carrillo Flores declared:

> The principal goal in industrializing Mexico is to achieve maximum utilization of all of our human and natural resources.
>
> In these terms the conflict between agricultural and industrial development has been resolved, in practice, on the basis of complementary and simultaneous development in both sectors.

Great changes are occurring in the Mexican economy. Agricultural production has increased 10 percent over that a year ago. Production of crude petroleum and refined products has shown a 10 percent increase. Electric power generating capacity increased by 11 percent, and the production of steel ingots showed a 5 percent increase.

Capital originating in the United States has been calculated at slightly more than a billion dollars. Of this total, $825 million is long-term capital, which can be broken down as follows: $600 million, direct private investments; $120 million, Export-Import Bank credits; $81 million, public debt; $24 million, obligations with commercial banks. Direct public investment accounts for nearly 40 percent of the total; but much of it is in the fields—such as railways, highways, electric power, and irrigation—which are of aid to private investments. Import controls are also used to promote industrialization; there are restrictions on the importation of luxury goods, and concessions are granted to machinery, machine tools, and other capital goods. Machinery imports, irrigation developments, crop insurance, and agricultural credit are government aids to agriculture.

To a developing country such as Mexico, international trade on an equitable basis is essential. Yet to compete effectively in world markets, Mexico needs to step up her industrialization program and to diversify her economy. One step in this direction has been to enter into international agreements which, when necessary, would adjust production to the levels of consumption. A start in the application of this formula has been undertaken with respect to coffee; and an experimental program of developing a common market by six Central American nations may prove the means of finding a solution to the dilemma of overproduction of coffee. That there are dangers inherent in attempting to maintain artificially high prices for agricultural products should be readily apparent to every Member of the Senate who has to deal with our own agricultural surpluses created by government subsidies and price supports, and especially so in view of the fact that only a few minutes ago the Senate concluded dealing with the agricultural appropriation bill for the ensuing fiscal year.

In commenting on the need for access to markets, Ambassador Carrillo Flores said:

> We are aware of the difficulties, especially of a local, political order, that must be overcome, but we are firmly convinced that it becomes clearer every day that the interest of the great democratic nations, and I repeat, among them above all, the United States, lies in finding formulas that will allow the countries which are producers of raw materials to obtain, not through gifts, but through their own efforts, the resources necessary for their economic development, and specifically for their industrialization. And this requires, at the very least, an opportunity of access to the international markets under conditions of fair competition.

Our cheers go, indeed, Mr. President, to an independent and courageous diplomat speaking for an independent and courageous nation.

The new Inter-American Bank will help to furnish the credits needed for stepped-up industrialization.

The message recommending its creation and participation in it by this country came, Mr. President, as you will recall, from the White House within the last few weeks. I am glad to see it is here, and I hope the Senate and the House will take prompt action on it.

It will have an advantage for Mexico not available from the Export-Import Bank, and that is the opportunity to spend funds loaned by the International Bank in any of the markets of its member countries. Mexico will use those funds, as she has used previous loans from the International Monetary Fund and the Export-Import Bank, to strengthen large segments of its economy needed to make it increasingly independent. The great progress in transportation and hydroelectric power development were financed by such loans over the last 5 years.

Above all, Mexico, like all of Latin America, needs foreign investments from private capital. She needs price stability outside of Mexico. Violent fluctuations in prices paid for Mexican exports can have disastrous effects in these critical stages of her economic regeneration. Inflation in America is certain to produce consequences which can only undermine the long-term gains which Mexico especially has achieved since the constitution of 1917 went into effect. She has successfully resisted Communist aggression, and it seeks to demonstrate today that economic security and social justice are compatible ends; that democracy and freedom can survive without surrender to the garrison state.

Mexico's economic potential is, and its present high prosperity are, attributable to the political and social stability the country has enjoyed for the past quarter of a century. Under the able leadership of Mexicos' vigorous and distinguished new President, Adolpho Lopez Mateos, we can predict that this period of stability will be strengthened and enhanced. As many of my colleagues know, industrial strife was successfully avoided during the time President Lopez Mateos was Minister of Labor. Yet despite the very favorable climate of opinion in Mexico toward the United States, an undercurrent of resentment toward the United States is sometimes unhappily apparent.

For example, a leading Mexican lawyer, writing in a prominent Mexican newspaper, a newspaper with wide circulation throughout Latin America, has ascerbated old wounds when he says:

> Thus the United States, upon the expulsion of Spain from the Antilles and the construction of the Panama Canal, viewed our people only as inferior races of color—just like the European did—who were being exploited and harassed by the big commercial trusts, its ambassadors having no other mission than that of watching over these interests, always supported by dictators of the type of Estrade in Guatemala, Diaz in Mexico, Gonzales Blanco and Gomes in Venezuela, in addition to other less conspicuous figures, whose mission was no other than to protect the rather substantial investments by North American capitalism, which were, however, notoriously inferior as compared with those made by European capitalism, ending up not only in permitting but in requesting the intervention of North American troops in order to squelch any protest, any nonconformity of the large Spanish American masses committed to these interests.

It is unfortunate that occasionally that sort of comment is made. Bad feelings of the kind to which I have just alluded are generated by reports of tragic incidents like Little Rock, and by the attitudes expressed most regrettably by some Americans toward different races. Nothing serves to kindle the flames of hatred like the conviction that the representative of one race basically regards members of any other race as inferior. In this regard, deeds, whether in Texas or California, Arizona or New Mexico, or any place else, affecting Americans of Mexican extraction, are likely to have far more devastating effects than we have been willing to recognize. In this respect, the treatment of any racial group in our country, such as denying the right to vote to some qualified American citizens, or denying them the right to attend the same public schools available to others, undermines, weakens, indeed, tends to destroy the bonds of friendship and of amity between our peoples and our governments and the goals of human freedom which are common to both of us.

Mexico was more fortunate than much of Latin America. While she shares a common Iberian tradition with the rest of Latin America, she had, as I observed, an ancient and beautiful civilization of wonderful, unbelievable attainment, which enabled her to absorb and blend Spanish influences and to create a more fascinating culture, a passionate and devoted love of country and of the cause of man's freedom. Mexico consolidated the gains of its own revolution several years ago, and her path now seems marked out by the will of heaven to achieve the promise of a better life under government based on consent of the governed, in the fashion of the nations of the Western World.

It is our first duty to remove as much of the resentment toward us as we can, not only in the field of race relations, but

in economic affairs. We cannot, we must not, turn aside from friendly, neighborly consideration of the problems confronting Mexico or, indeed, the rest of Latin America. While it is unthinkable that the Communists would succeed in undermining Mexico, the recent expulsion of two Soviet officials from the Soviet Embassy in Mexico was a thundering example of the zeal by which the Mexican Government protects her people from foreign provacateurs anywhere in the world. Communist successes anywhere in Latin America must ultimately affect Mexico and, automatically, the United States.

We must concede that there is a continuing attempt by communism to penetrate the minds of the peoples of free nations. Those of us who witnessed the extraordinarily large and highly effective group from Soviet Russia who went to Mexico last November to participate in the ceremonies attendant on the presidential inauguration must be aware that we, too, need constantly to put our own best foot forward.

As a means of strengthening our ties with the Mexican Government, I believe the United States should now authorize participation in parliamentary conferences with representatives of the Mexican Congress. Yesterday the Senate joined the House of Representatives in passing a joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Canada. This is a valuable and significant means of working out problems of common legislative interest with our Canadian friends to the north. But I submit to my colleagues that we cannot, we must not, neglect our historic good neighbors below the Rio Grande. That is why the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] yesterday introduced a similar resolution with respect to Mexico. That is why I am proud to join him as a coauthor.

We have many problems of common interest with Mexico besides a common border. What better way can be found to build toward a prosperous future than to meet with the legislators of Mexico to discuss ways and means for solving common problems, for maintaining close and cooperative relations between our two countries?

From the experience gained with our two closest neighbors, Canada and Mexico, I look forward to the day when such parliamentary conferences will include all of the Americas.

The resolution, by unanimous consent, will lie on the desk until Friday. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 102) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That not to exceed twenty-four Members of Congress shall be appointed to meet jointly and at least annually and when Congress is not in session (except that this restriction shall not apply during the first session of the Eighty-sixth Congress or to meetings held in the United States) with representatives of the Chamber of Deputies and Chamber of Senators of the Mexican Congress for discussion of common problems in the interests of relations between the United States and Mexico. Of the Members of the Congress to be appointed for the purposes of this resolution (hereinafter designated as the U.S. group) half shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House from Members of the House (not less than four of whom shall be from the Foreign Affairs Committee), and half shall be appointed by the President of the Senate from Members of the Senate (not less than four of whom shall be from the Foreign Relations Committee). Such appointments shall be for the period of each meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group except for the four members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the four members of the Foreign Relations Committee, whose appointments shall be for the duration of each Congress.

SEC. 2. An appropriation of $30,000 annually is authorized, $15,000 of which shall be for the House delegation and $15,000 for the Senate delegation, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, the House and Senate portions of such appropriation to be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the House delegation and the chairman of the Senate delegation, respectively.

SEC. 3. The U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group shall submit to the Congress a report for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made including its expenditures under such appropriation.

SEC. 4. The certificate of the chairman of the House delegation or the Senate delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group shall hereafter be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers in the auditing of the accounts of the U.S. group of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the able Senator from Alaska, to whose magnificent work on Mexico I alluded in my comments. I salute my colleague as one who is intimately acquainted with Mexico and her great potentials.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, saving only those very flattering and generous remarks about me and my work concerning Mexico, I should like to associate myself with the remarkably fine comments the senior Senator from California has made about our neighbor to the South.

I feel that the resolution, introduced by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and other Senators, to provide for a parliamentary interchange with Mexico, is a most constructive step. In my opinion, it is of paramount importance in our foreign relations that we establish the best relationship with our immediate land neighbors. We have only two.

Mexico touches four of our States, one of which is represented, in part, by the distinguished senior Senator from California, who has just delivered this memorable address.

Our two nations have much to give to each other. There is much in the way of reciprocity, exchange of ideas, exchange of cultures, exchange of achievements and exchange of developments which will be mutually beneficial.

It has been very gratifying to me to note during the last 10 years, since the end of what might be called the more violent period of the Mexican Revolution, the tremendous evolutionary progress which has been made by our neighbor to the South. There has been progress in democratic procedure, cultural progress, economic progress, and perhaps most gratifying of all, a great progress in the good feeling which exists between the people of Mexico and the people of the United States. We want to further that progress. We want to do everything we can to promote it. We want the people of Mexico to feel as much at home with us as we want to feel at home with them, with the idea that the words "foreign nation" will relate only to differences in cultural matters, and that the conflicts which once beclouded our relations will always be solved by amicable discussion around a council table.

I am sure this is an attainable goal. I think the joint resolution which has been introduced represents an important step forward.

I wish to commend highly our colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], for his important part in promoting this splendid relationship. No one is better acquainted with or has a greater desire for neighborliness with the Mexican people. There are many people of Mexican origin within the Senator's State. He is familiar with them, and they love him. They trust him. He will be a great factor in promoting the true neighborliness which should be No. 1 on the agenda of our foreign policy.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am exceedingly grateful to our distinguished colleague for the comments he has made. The able Senator from Alaska has pointedly indicated the great need for having this country go forward in cementing relationships based upon mutual understanding and respect between the people who make up our country and the gallant population of our neighbor to the south.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the able majority whip.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished Senator from Alaska in commending the able Senator from California, the minority whip, for the speech he has made this afternoon. It was a speech about a great nation, a proud people, a good neighbor.

Though there have been in the past, and are even today, differences between Mexico and the United States, I express the hope, as I am sure was the intent of the distinguished Senator from California, that there will develop a greater sense of tolerance, mutual understanding, and closer cooperation. There is much we can learn from Mexico, and in return there are a few things which Mexico can learn from us.

I am happy the Senator has emphasized the dual nature of the Mexican

culture; the contributions made by Castilians and the greater contribution made by the Indians, the aboriginal inhabitants, to the present day Republic of Mexico.

Mexico, as the distinguished Senator from Alaska has pointed out, has made great strides since the revolution. It is our hope that not only will we be able to establish a Joint Interparliamentary Committee which will represent our people in their country and the Mexican people in this country, but also that on this basis we shall be able to bring about a closer degree of cooperation and a better degree of understanding, notwithstanding the fact that there may have been errors and grievances in the past, in the hope that today and in the future Mexicans and Americans, side by side, will be real citizens of this hemisphere, and together may be able to make the contribution which should be made to the development and betterment of the hemisphere as a whole.

I again commend the distinguished Senator for his very able speech about a very worthy project and certainly in relation to a very fine people.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the distinguished majority whip for his comments. He has been a leader in promoting the policy of good neighbor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ALASKA TO MARTHA L. BABINEC—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on January 9 of this year I introduced a bill (S. 168) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Alaska to Martha L. Babinec, as administratrix of the estate of Laurence Starns, deceased. The measure was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Subsequent information and developments have led me to conclude that further proceedings with this proposed legislation are not desirable. Accordingly, I have conferred with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the able ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. Both are agreeable that no further action should be taken on the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill, S. 168, and that further action on the measure be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the committee will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BARTLETT. 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.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H.R. 7007) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I should like to make a brief statement concerning the bill now under consideration. This bill, H.R. 7007, authorizes the appropriation of $485,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1960.

Before discussing the bill further, I believe a few comments are in order concerning the manner in which this bill was developed. As we all know, the space age is still in its very early infancy. Accordingly, the very able and distinguished chairman of the NASA Authorization Subcommittee, the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] divided the hearings on the bill into two major phases.

The first phase was devoted to detailed consideration of the scientific and technical aspects of the important elements of our national aeronautical and space activities as currently planned for the next 5 to 10 years.

The hearings then moved into the second phase, during which the specific programs proposed for fiscal year 1960 were examined in great detail.

Copies of the bill and of the comprehensive committee report are on the desks of the Senators.

Before proceeding further, I should like to commend the illustrious Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the other dedicated members of the subcommittee—the very gracious lady from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the very able Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the very able Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the very able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the very able Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

All these Senators were diligent. They examined into the matter thoroughly. The country can be grateful that in this hour of trial it had this outstanding group of dedicated Senators sitting in judgment and making these vital decisions.

Thanks are also due to the committee staff, and especially Mr. Kenneth E. Be Lieu, and Mr. Max Lehrer, who served as professional staff members of the subcommittee.

Since my esteemed colleague from Mississippi would be too modest to mention it, I should like to quote the comment made by Dr. Glennan, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, concerning the scientific and technical hearings:

> To my mind, the transcript of those hearings is the most comprehensive, understandable and educational document on the Federal Government's aeronautical and space activities that exists today. I hope that this record will be given wide public dissemination.

Since the Senator from Mississippi will shortly discuss the bill in some detail, I will confine my further remarks to a few of its highlights.

The $485,300,000 authorized in this bill is broken down as follows:

Salaries and expenses, $94,430,000.

Research and development, $333,070,000.

Construction and equipment, $57,800,000.

On the basis of all the testimony, it was the unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee—and I am proud of that fact—that the amounts requested, coupled with continued careful and imaginative management, would meet the currently foreseeable needs of the nonmilitary space program. I am proud to be able to tell the Senate, the country, and the world that this view is concurred in by the full committee, and that in this hour of trial, when the executive branch is headed by one party, and the legislative branch by another, in a critical field like this we can have hearings, reach accord in our views, and arrive at common understandings.

While the NASA Authorization Subcommittee was proceeding with its review of the specific space programs proposed to be financed in fiscal year 1960, the Subcommittee on Governmental Organization for Space Activities was conducting an investigation of governmental organizations involved. Although the hearings of this latter subcommittee developed a number of problem areas requiring resolution, its chairman, the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], advises that such findings do not question the desirability of proceeding vigorously and fully with the NASA programs proposed for fiscal year 1960.

Mr. President, the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee recommends that the bill as reported be given favorable consideration.

Mr. President, I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. Again, I express to him the thanks and the understanding of the Senate and of a grateful Nation for the outstanding, patriotic service he has performed throughout the long road which the bill has traveled through the subcommittee and the full committee.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the entire subcommittee, I thank the Senator from Texas for his most

generous remarks. I also thank the members of the subcommittee for the interest and attention which they showed during the hearings. At each sitting practically every member of the subcommittee was not only present, but paying attention, showing interest, and asking constructive questions. The hearings were extraordinarily illuminating as they related to the space program and the field of space science.

I call particular attention to the printed hearings. It is expected that they will be available some time this afternoon in two parts, the first part being "Scientific and Technical Presentations," and containing graphs, pictures, and other scientific illustrations. The second part of the hearings relates to the specific programs to be financed by the bill.

The value of the first part of the NASA authorization hearings has already been recognized widely. Orders for large numbers of the publication, subtitled "Part I: Scientific and Technical Presentations," have been placed by several agencies of the Government, including the Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Government Printing Office has anticipated a large demand and has already reserved 1,500 copies for future sale. The GPO will also describe and advertise the publication in its biweekly circular which is distributed to approximately three-quarters of a million people in the United States and throughout the world.

That part of the record will contain approximately 700 pages and will cost $2. It will be a matter of general interest to the public.

Mr. President, I do not think the amendments will be controversial. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of amendment. The Chair understands, as does the Senate, that such action will not preclude amendments being offered to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, H.R. 7007, as amended, which is now being considered by the Senate, authorizes the appropriation of $485,300,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1960.

I should like to state that this bill and the accompanying committee report were unanimously recommended by the subcommittee, on which it is my privilege to serve as chairman. As stated earlier by the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the bill and report have also been approved unanimously by the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Not only was there no real difference of opinion within the committee concerning the authorization covered by the bill, but there are only relatively minor differences between the bill before the Senate and the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. I shall discuss each of the amendments to the House bill later in my remarks.

As shown on page 1 of the committee report, the $485,300,000 authorized by this bill covers three NASA appropriation titles, as follows:

Salaries and expenses, $94,430,000.

Research and development, $333,070,000.

Construction and equipment, $57,800,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The salaries and expenses appropriation covers the day-by-day noncapital costs of operating and maintaining the activities and personnel of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

A total of $94,430,000 is projected for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 1960, compared with $74,316,698 authorized for this purpose in fiscal year 1959.

Of the $94,430,000 proposed for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 1960, $69,976,000, or 74 percent of the total, is devoted to salaries. This is almost 19 percent above the comparable figure for fiscal year 1959, and primarily reflects the increase in total NASA employment. Direct civlian employment is expected to increase from 8,961 at the end of the current fiscal year to 9,988 at the end of fiscal year 1960, an increase of 1,027 people. Average employment, however, is expected to rise from 8,300 in fiscal year 1959 to 9,600 in 1960, an increase of 1,300, or approximately 16 percent.

No increase in employment above the 1959 level is planned for the four research centers which were built up under the NACA and incorporated into NASA. The projected increase in NASA employment is limited to that required to handle the new duties and responsibilities imposed by the expanding civilian space program. This is shown clearly by the chart on page 2 of the report.

The various other items covered by the salaries and expenses appropriation total $24,454,000 for fiscal year 1960, compared with $15,339,798 in fiscal year 1959. In general, the increase from 1959 to 1960 reflect the increased employment level projected for 1960. Somewhat disproportionate increases have been projected for costs of travel and of communications. The large increases in these areas are directly attributable to the significant expansion in worldwide tracking and observation activities projected for 1960.

The projected distribution of the $94,430,000 for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 1960 is summarized in a table on page 4 of the report.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to make clear that NASA has taken over and has acquired all the activities and administration of what heretofore has been known as NACA; and NASA also has an expanding space program, although it has been in existence as an agency of the Government for a little less than 1 year.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The research and development appropriation provides the funds required for contractual research, development, operations, technical services, repairs, alterations and minor construction, and for supplies, materials, and equipment necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

A total of $333,070,000 is projected for fiscal year 1960, compared with $237,506,834 authorized for the same purposes in fiscal year 1959. This represents an overall increase of some 44 percent, which is not as great as it may seem, considering the fact that NASA, as such, was not even in existence at the beginning of fiscal year 1959. Again, this is due to the expanding program.

A summary breakdown of the $333,070,000 proposed for research and development in the fiscal year 1960, as well as a breakdown of the $237,506,834 authorized for the fiscal year 1959, is shown on page 5 of the report.

It is hardly necessary to point out that the space program is still in its infancy, and can be expected to grow significantly in cost and scope in the years ahead. As a corollary, it must be anticipated that the plans for, and estimated costs of, various individual research and development programs will be subject to continuing change. It is simply not possible to make precise forecasts for programs in which we are going beyond existing scientific knowledge.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to point out that although the committee has approved the authorization of the $333,070,000 requested by the administration for research and development in fiscal year 1960, substantial changes have been made during the past few months in the specific programs and items covered by these funds. As shown by the table on page 9 of the report, changes in the major research and development programs proposed for fiscal year 1960 have amounted to $98 million, or over 29 percent of the total funds involved. In addition, reprograming of the funds already authorized for research and development in fiscal year 1959 amounted to almost $45 million, or about 22 percent of the total.

In testifying before the committee, Dr. Glennan stated:

> At NASA we are consumed with the infinite possibilities of space, but we are determined to base our space program upon facts, not fancies. With this in mind, we will constantly be reviewing our program—and our budgets. It is highly probable that our programs will change rapidly during the first years of effort in this new medium simply because we are opening up a new frontier and most of the ground rules are yet to be worked out and understood.

Mr. President, at this point let me express my own opinion—and I believe it is also the opinion of our subcommittee which held these hearings—that we were exceptionally well impressed with Dr. Glennan, the Administrator of NASA, and Dr. Dryden, formerly the Director of NACA, and now the Deputy Administrator of the new agency; and we were well impressed with their staff, who are exceptionally capable scientists, engineers, and professional personnel of the very highest order and, apparently, of the very highest type of dedication—although that is an overused word. We

think this program highly important because of its many possibilities in the commercial and economic world, as well as the military; and those of us who followed the hearings felt strengthened as well as encouraged by the headway which is being made.

In addition to the summary table on page 9 of the report, an outline by Dr. Glennan of the major changes made in the 1960 budget estimates is quoted on pages 7 and 8. The committee wishes to commend Dr. Glennan and his associates for their continuing efforts to get the maximum effective return from the funds entrusted to them. At the same time, the volatile nature of the space program clearly demands close and continuing congressional oversight.

I shall now briefly cover the key research and development programs proposed for the fiscal year 1960. I do not believe it is necessary to cover them in any detail at this time, since they are all explained fully in the committee report.

The first item is support of NASA plant. This requires a total of $16,670,000 in 1960, compared with $11,726,102 in 1959. The reasons for the necessary increases are shown on page 10 of the report.

The next item, "Support of JPL plant," calls for $8,156,000 in 1960. The Jet Propulsion Laboratory is a Government-owned facility near Pasadena, Calif., which is operated on a contract basis by the California Institute of Technology. This installation was transferred to NASA from the Army on December 3, 1958, and is a key factor in NASA's future plans for research and development in support of the space program.

The program breakdown of this item is shown on page 11 of the report.

On pages 11 and 12 of the report there is a breakdown of the $5,200,000 authorized for research contracts. The next four pages cover the key programs under the general category of "Scientific Investigations in Space." These are:

Sounding rockets, $10 million.

Scientific satellites, $22,800,000.

Lunar probes, $7,140,000.

Deep-space probes $6,803,500.

Pages 16 and 17 of the report deal briefly with the programs involved in satellite applications investigations. While this area involves relatively modest sums—$10,800,000 for meteorology and $4,700,000 for communications—the programs are exciting, and the potentialities are enormous.

Mr. President, even though the space program of the United States is still in its infancy, it already has led to several promising applications that will benefit man directly. For example, Vanguard II, which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration launched into orbit on February 17 of this year, has proved the feasibility of the weather-satellite concept. One day, similar satellites will scan weather patterns around the globe, and will report the information by radio to ground receiving stations.

At present, weather observations are available only from a limited number of stations on land and from a few ships at sea. The vastly greater amount of information collected by satellites taking readings over the whole earth will increase to an incalculable degree the accuracy of weather forecasts. Besides improving day-to-day forecasting, meteorologists might be able to predict, months in advance, droughts and rainy spells.

The value of such information to our economy is beyond estimation. Relatively small improvements in the accuracy of forecasts can save literally billions of dollars in farming, food processing, public utilities, and in many other vital activities. And equally important, in terms of human lives, hurricanes and tornadoes could be spotted at birth, and their deadly paths predicted.

Indeed, in the foreseeable future, we may well be able to modify climate. According to Dr. Joseph Kaplan, Chairman of the U.S. Committee for the International Geophysical Year:

> Control by man of the earth's weather and temperature is within the realm of practicality now.

Another promising development on which NASA scientists are at work is the communications satellite. Several systems are under study, and initial experiments have been carried out successfully. One type, the so-called passive system, involves inflatable plastic satellites coated with highly reflective material that will deflect or bounce radio or television signals back to earth to areas that otherwise would be out of range. The other is an active system, involving a satellite payload that contains receiving and transmitting equipment that picks up signals and retransmits them as a relay station.

The NASA program will eventually provide systems of these communications satellites capable of transmitting programs across continents and oceans, and completely eliminating the so-called line-of-sight limitations that have restricted FM and TV reception to a few hundred miles, at most. For the first time, worldwide, not nationwide, radio and TV reception will be possible and feasible. Similarly, commercial communications can be expanded and speeded tremendously.

Our space effort has yielded much new knowledge about the earth and the universe. For example, geodetic measurements which NASA has made by means of satellites have led to more precise mapping of islands and continents, making for more accurate, and, therefore, safer, sea and air navigation.

Work is also in progress to employ satellites as actual navigation aids, to eliminate or greatly decrease the dependence of ships and aircraft on conventional navigation aids, such as radio beacons, radio stations, or sightings of stars. With techniques already known, a navigator can fix his position within an accuracy of about 1 mile. This accuracy can undoubtedly be increased through use of navigation satellites.

The next major item is manned space flight, better known as Project Mercury, for which $70 million is planned for the fiscal year 1960. This is in addition to the $58,411,200 authorized for the fiscal year 1959. Dr. Glennan has testified that "before we have completed this first U.S. effort to put man into space, the bill will have exceeded $200 million."

In the interest of saving time, I shall forgo further explanation of the other research and development programs that are contemplated under this bill. All of these are covered in the discussion set forth on pages 19 through 29 of the committee report.

CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

I now turn briefly to the "Construction and equipment" title. This appropriation title covers the construction and equipment at laboratories and other installations of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property.

A total of $57,800,000 is projected for the fiscal year 1960. Of this, $34,800,000 will be utilized for additions and improvements to existing NASA research centers and stations; $3 million will be used for specific facilities required by NASA at the Pacific Missile Range; and $20 million will be devoted to new facilities and to the improvement of global tracking and communications facilities.

These global tracking and communications facilities are very expensive undertakings. We have tracking facilities in connection with missiles, as well as with satellites. We have done what we could to look into the possibilities of duplications. On the basis of the available evidence, we are well satisfied that no outright duplications are included in the authorizations provided by this bill.

The $34,800,000 devoted to additions and improvements of existing NASA research centers and stations is equivalent to less than 9 percent of the total value of such plant, which currently is estimated at $390 million. Considering the rapid pace of technology, the committee felt that this does seem to warrant Dr. Glennan's description that "this is really an austerity program."

A summary of the 1960 construction program is shown on page 29 of the report, while the details of the individual construction projects are summarized on pages 32 through 42. It is in this area that we find the only dollar difference between the bill as reported by the House and the bill as amended by the Senate. Accordingly, I shall now proceed to discuss this item and the other two amendments made by the committee to the House bill.

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 7007

The committee made three substantive amendments to H.R. 7007. They are as follows:

First. Restoration of funds: The committee restored $4,750,000 to the "Construction and equipment" appropriation for a new central facility for high-energy solid- and liquid-fuel rocket propellants. The House Committee on Science and Astronautics, in deleting this item, stated:

> The committee recognizes that this type of facility is necessary for the testing of high-energy propellants. It is further recognized that such testing at present locations such as the Lewis Research Center and the Jet Propulsion Laboratory would be dangerous to the urban population nearby. Even so, the committee did not believe itself justi-

fied in authorizing funds for the preparation of a site, for roads and fencing, for a water system, and for other items, for a site still unknown. Once NASA has arrived at a decision as to the location of the site for this facility, the committee will entertain legislation for the authorization of funds for construction on the site.

It does appear that the NASA witnesses, in an effort to justify the total cost estimate of $4,750,000, gave an impression of greater precision as to the individual cost elements than is possible with regard to an unknown site. Dr. Glennan clarified this matter in his testimony before this committee and provided persuasive evidence as to the urgent need for this facility.

Some of the pertinent testimony on this item is contained on pages 43 through 45 of the committee report. This testimony boils down to the simple fact that failure to authorize the facility at this time could delay the development of urgently needed high-energy propellants. Since the earliest possible development of such propellants would benefit our military missile and space programs, as well as the NASA space program, the committee considered such delay to be unwise.

The problems faced by NASA in selecting a site for this research facility are similar to those faced by the military services. There is ample precedent with respect to the military services for authorizing certain projects even though the exact locations have not yet been chosen. The committee considers that NASA has exhibited an appropriate combination of speed and caution in proceeding with the site selection, and has accordingly restored the $4,750,000 to preclude unnecessary delay in this important program.

Second. Use of research and development funds for capital items: H.R. 7007 contains a new provision, section 1(b), which reads as follows:

Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts.

While the committee recognized the need to grant NASA additional flexibility in the use of its research and development funds, the language in question appeared to be unnecessarily broad and possibly subject to misuse as a means to avoid congressional scrutiny over, and the specific prior authorization of, major construction projects.

Accordingly, in order to assure that this flexibility would not be abused, the committee added a notification provision to section 1(b), which reads as follows:

Provided, That none of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee notifies the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

In pursuing research and development projects, there arise construction requirements which cannot be anticipated or authorized in advance, and a great deal of leeway must be provided. The committee merely provided that if the cost of any individual facility exceeded $250,000, there would have to be filed with our committee a report of the nature, location, and estimated cost of the facility. In that way coordination and cooperation would be maintained at all times.

Mr. President, we have no reason to suspect the present personnel would do anything else, but we thought, since this would be a permanent law, the better policy would be the one laid down by the committee.

Third. Authorization requirement: Present law requires the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to obtain legislative authorization before appropriations may be made. Under section 4 of H.R. 7007, this requirement was extended until July 30, 1965.

The committee agrees with the House concerning the desirability of extending the requirement for authorization of appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It seems obvious that close and continuing congressional review and surveillance is in order in this area. The situation was perhaps best summarized by Dr. Glennan, in his testimony quoted earlier in this statement:

It is highly probable that our programs will change rapidly during the first years of effort in this new medium simply because we are opening up a new frontier and most of the ground rules are yet to be worked out and understood.

Because of the nature of the space program, rapid and substantial changes as to magnitude, direction, and detail can be expected to continue indefinitely. For this reason the committee deleted the terminal date of July 30, 1965, in the authorization requirement, thereby making the requirement of indefinite duration.

I wish to point out to the Senate and to each individual Member thereof that this is a major provision in the bill. It is a major policy question to be decided at the congressional level. It is far-reaching in its effect as to any department. It is not a surveillance or a curtailment of any kind that the committee is trying to direct at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration because of any shortcoming of that agency. It is a strong, important principle of government which is being applied to an important function, and I think it is one that Congress should consider expanding and having applied to other departments, beyond what we have done in the past.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to express my sincere appreciation to the other members of the subcommittee for their continued interest and cooperation in considering and handling this bill. I refer to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

I desire especially to thank, for their very fine assistance, Mr. Kenneth BeLieu, who is staff director of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, Mr. Max Lehrer, who is assistant staff director of the committee and has been working closely with us in the subcommittee in the long and involved process of preparing and coordinating the hearings, and also the other members of the fine staff.

Mr. President, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences recommends that the bill be given favorable consideration, as reported.

Mr. President, that concludes my remarks, and I yield the floor.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the details of the pending bill have already been presented in an outstanding fashion by the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the eminent Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the beloved Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. For this reason, I do not propose to discuss any of the individual items in the bill, but I do want to say that I am in complete accord with the action taken by the committee and urge approval of the bill as presented to the Senate.

If I may, I should like to make a few personal remarks. It has been my privilege to be a member of this Chamber for the past 10 years. During this period, I have had the pleasure of serving with both the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Mississippi on both the Appropriations and the Armed Services Committees. When the new Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences was created last year, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Texas, I was delighted to have the opportunity to serve with them on that committee.

I must say that serving on the Space Committee has been a very gratifying experience. The new field of space is incredibly complex and demands the very best abilities that can be brought to bear upon it. I am heartened by the fact that this appears to be the case.

During the course of the subcommittee hearings, we have received testimony from Dr. Glennan, Dr. Dryden and all the key personnel, both at the NASA Headquarters and in the field. I believe the American people are fortunate in having such dedicated and able people providing their services for this vital program.

The Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee also has been fortunate in having an unusually able and hard-working staff. The staff has worked untiringly and effectively for all the members of the committee on a truly nonpartisan basis, in line with the policies established at the very outset by the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I am proud of the work that has been done by the committee under the inspired leadership of the Senator from Texas. I believe that the record of the hearings, and the committee report, fully attest to the fact that the committee's sole consideration, as stated by the chairman, has been to take

whatever action is required in the national interest. The bill now before the Senate meets this criterion, and I join in urging its approval.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I simply want to add my word of commendation of the subcommittee for the very excellent work it has done and for the report which it has submitted. I think it deserves the commendation of the full committee and also the commendation of the Senate. I hope the report will be adopted as recommended.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I believe we cannot overemphasize the importance of the bill for appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which has just been discussed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and other Senators.

Mr. President, it is of the utmost importance that the United States gain and keep the lead in the exploration of space. One of the most compelling reasons lies in the struggle for the minds of men. It is vital for us to achieve supremacy in space if we are to meet this challenge.

Obviously, technological preeminence in space will pay us direct dividends in the form of greatly strengthened national defense. It is equally certain that such scientific progress will bring in its train many technological discoveries which will mean a better way of life for the American people.

In our free society, the curiosity and imagination which are the hallmarks of the creative scientist are encouraged instead of being directed toward rigid totalitarian goals. Moreover, we have repeatedly shared the benefits of our scientific advances with other nations. It is no coincidence that nation after nation seeking independence has looked to our system as a model.

There is another aspect which we must bear in mind. Our persistence as a free and democratic state has provided a strong shield, ideologically as well as physically, for weaker countries. If we should fail now to progress, if we should give over leadership in science to a totalitarian nation, then we would have betrayed our traditions and failed the trust which the free world has placed in us. Beyond any question, if we slacken our efforts toward space exploration, for whatever reason, in the minds of men everywhere our position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union will be weakened immeasurably, perhaps disastrously.

The chance that space might become a theater of war requires that we consider this possibility. So long as other nations have the power to use space for aggression, we must be prepared to defend ourselves and our friends, and must maintain enough military potential to discourage any attack from this direction.

The Russians realize—perhaps more clearly than we do—how persuasive are spectacular accomplishments in space. They have missed no opportunity to impress upon all peoples the scope of their accomplishments in launching the sputniks and putting lunik past the moon and into orbit around the sun. We can be sure they will be equally alert to the values of any future Russian firsts in space.

How does our space effort compare with that of the Soviets? The blunt answer—based on information from Soviet publications and from our own observations—is that they are able to place heavier payloads into space than we can. The reason is simple. The Soviets began serious work in the ballistic missiles field 6 or 8 years before we did.

Our present lack of space-propulsion vehicles of high thrust limits our opportunities to expand our knowledge. It also limits advanced experiments which depend on such high-thrust vehicles.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which began operating October 1, last year, is at work on means to narrow the Soviet lead in high-thrust vehicles. To provide greatly increased payloads, range and reliability for future space experiments, NASA is developing a new family of rocket engines. This program includes a contract for a single-chamber engine of 1.5 million pounds thrust. Contracts have been let for other advanced general purpose vehicles to serve a wide variety of needs. They will be the basic power systems for NASA probes and satellites in the next few years.

We trust and hope that these and other projects in our national space program can be brought forward with as much speed as sound development will permit.

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

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

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. May I ask the acting majority leader if there will be a vote on the pending measure this afternoon?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is the intention of the majority leader to try to have a yea-and-nay vote on the measure tomorrow. At the present time I am endeavoring to get in touch with the minority leader, to see if a common agreement can be reached. If it can be reached, there will be an announcement to that effect.

Mr. STENNIS. There will be no vote on the measure this afternoon?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement that there will be no vote on the authorization bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration today, but there will be a vote on it as early as possible tomorrow after the Senate convenes.

NOMINATION OF LEWIS STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the State, a newspaper published at Columbia, S.C., Friday, May 22, 1959, printed an editorial entitled "Admiral Strauss Deserves the Support of the South."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed 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:

ADMIRAL STRAUSS DESERVES THE SUPPORT OF THE SOUTH

Adm. Lewis Strauss should be confirmed as Secretary of Commerce. Traditionally, the person nominated by the President to be a member of his Cabinet has been confirmed unless there was evidence of moral turpitude or total incompetence.

In the case of Admiral Strauss, there is no claim by his senatorial opponents of disqualification on such grounds. He has rendered signal service to the Government in the Navy Department and in directing the operations in the atomic field. He is an able administrator.

The State's Washington correspondent writes that opposition is led by Senators KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, and ANDERSON, of New Mexico. KEFAUVER's attitude is understandable, even if disappointing. Because of TVA, KEFAUVER is politically interested in public power. He wanted nuclear power development for peaceful purposes to be paid for by the taxpayers and to be located in Tennessee. Strauss believed that private enterprise, anxious to pay the costs of development, should bear the burden instead of the taxpayers.

The opposition of Senator ANDERSON is more surprising because he has not been as extreme as KEFAUVER in his views. Asserting he does not like the personality of Admiral Strauss, he makes a personal appeal to his colleagues to reject the man who now is serving as Secretary of Commerce by appointment of the President.

Strauss has proved himself friendly to South Carolina and the Southeast. When the Government first proposed to encourage the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes, Strauss advocated locating that development at Parr Shoals near Columbia. At the last minute a Pittsburgh company, supposedly backed by Westinghouse Electric Co., offered the Government such financial inducements that the Commission selected the Pittsburgh site.

A year later, when the power companies of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina pooled their interests and bid for the location of a similar plant in the Southeast, though the project was not favored by Senator ANDERSON, Admiral Strauss again favored the Parr Shoals site and is responsible for its location here, which means much for Columbia.

Recently when the textile industry complained that mills were losing money and workers were losing jobs because of the importation of cotton goods from Japan, our mill interests protested to the State Department against Japanese importations. Admiral Strauss was one of the few officials in Government to show sympathy for the South's position and give aid. Only last week, when a Senate committee, after investigation, urged the appointment of a commission to consider a solution for this problem, the President selected Admiral Strauss as chairman. The appointment has given hope to our textile industry.

In agreeing with the South in these two matters, Admiral Strauss undoubtedly did

so solely because he believed it was best for the interest of the United States. Nevertheless, his action proved that Southern interests can secure fair treatment at his hands.

It would be unfortunate for South Carolina and the Southeast if the Admiral should be dismissed from public service because of the personal antagonism of Senators KEFAUVER and ANDERSON.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was not particularly pleased with the editorial, because it states that the project which was located in the Southeast was not favored by the junior Senator from New Mexico, and that Admiral Strauss again favored the Parr Shoals site, and was responsible for its location, which meant so much for Columbia, S.C.

I wrote the editor of the State a letter under date of May 27, 1959, in an endeavor to point out that there were some inaccuracies in the editorial; that the project had come to the Joint Committee only because the Atomic Energy Commission was not doing anything with it; and that I was shocked to learn I had opposed it and somebody else had helped it along. I pointed out that the Senators from South Carolina had gotten in touch with me and with other members of the Joint Committee, and that the Joint Committee had interceded with the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and had tried to persuade him that the project should be pushed along and that the location should be in the area of Parr Shoals, S.C.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter as it was submitted to the editor of the State, Columbia, S.C., May 27, 1959, and printed by that newspaper on May 30, 1959, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY,
May 27, 1959.

The EDITOR,
The State, Columbia, S.C.

DEAR SIR: An editorial in the May 22, 1959, edition of the State concerning my opposition to the nomination of Admiral Strauss as Secretary of Commerce has recently been brought to my attention. Certain inaccuracies were contained in the editorial which I am certain you would wish to correct when you have the true facts.

The inaccuracies to which I refer were in the following portion of your May 22 editorial:

"When the Government first proposed to encourage the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes, Strauss advocated locating that development at Parr Shoals near Columbia. At the last minute a Pittsburgh company, supposedly backed by Westinghouse Electric Co., offered the Government such financial inducements that the Commission selected the Pittsburgh site.

"A year later, when the power companies of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Caroline pooled their interests and bid for the location of a similar plant in the Southeast, though the project was not favored by Senator ANDERSON, Admiral Strauss again favored the Parr Shoals site and is responsible for its location here, which means much for Columbia."

The statement that I did not favor the Carolinas-Virginia Power Associates project is completely untrue as is the implication that Admiral Strauss was responsible for its location at Parr Shoals, S.C., over my opposition.

First, let me say that your mention of the selection of Pittsburgh for the site of an early power reactor apparently refers to the Shippingport project which the Government built in cooperation with the Duquesne Electric Co. and Westinghouse. If Admiral Strauss had advocated the location of that project at Parr Shoals, as you indicate, it is news to me. According to a written history of the Shippingport project, prepared by the AEC, at a time when Admiral Strauss was Chairman and which is on file with the Joint Committee, the Commission, on March 11, 1954, selected Shippingport, a town approximately 25 miles from Pittsburgh, as the site. It was Admiral Strauss, on March 14, 1954, who publicly made the announcement of the Shippingport site selection.

The Carolinas-Virginia Nuclear Power Associates which includes Duke Power Co., Carolina Power & Light Co., Virginia Electric & Power Co., and South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. was officially organized and incorporated on October 4, 1956.

I am enclosing for your information a history of the Carolinas-Virginia Nuclear Power Associates which was prepared on April 11, 1958, by the South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. when they were concerned over a delay on the part of the AEC in supporting the project. This history was sent to me by Senator THURMOND on April 18, 1958, when he and Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, both of whom where especially active in support of the project, requested my assistance to overcome the Commission's lack of action. You will note from the enclosed history that although the associates had met and discussed their objectives with Admiral Strauss as early as January 18, 1957, and had officially submitted their proposal to the Commission on August 29, 1957, the Commission, under Admiral Strauss' chairmanship, had not as of April 11, 1958, made any recommendation.

At the time, I readily understood the concern of Senator JOHNSTON, Senator THURMOND, and other supporters of the Parr Shoals project and instructed the Joint Committee staff to ascertain the cause of the delay. There is in file at the Joint Committee a letter from Senator THURMOND to me thanking me for my interest in helping Senator JOHNSTON and him on this matter.

It was not until after I, and particularly Congressman CARL T. DURHAM, of North Carolina, the then Chairman of the Joint Committee, had several times inquired as to the delay that Admiral Strauss finally, on May 16, 1958, submitted the proposed cooperative arrangement to the Joint Committee as required by law. Previously Admiral Strauss, on April 30, 1958, had submitted two other proposals, one at Elk River, Minn., and one at Piqua, Ohio, for which he requested a waiver of the 45-day statutory waiting period required after their submission to the Joint Committee. He did not, however, request a waiver of the 45 days for the Parr Shoals project.

On May 23, 1958, within a week of receiving the Parr Shoals proposal from the Commission, the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Joint Committee held a hearing on the matter. Five days later, on May 28, 1958, the Joint Committee met and on its own initiative by resolution waived the 45-day waiting period in order not to delay the Parr Shoals project any longer than it had already been delayed.

At the time these actions were under consideration, I was vice chairman of the Joint Committee. Congressman CARL T. DURHAM, of North Carolina, was the chairman and was most active in assisting the Carolinas-Virginia Nuclear Power Associates in overcoming unnecessary delay in securing approval for their project. I was more than pleased to assist him, Senator JOHNSTON, Senator THURMOND, and the others who did so much in support of this project.

As to who was responsible for the selection of the site at Parr Shoals, I would suggest that you inquire of the officials of the Carolinas-Virginia Nuclear Power Associates. You will find, I believe, that the member companies of that organization made the selection rather than Admiral Strauss.

In the event the State's Washington correspondent wishes to see any of the Joint Committee's unclassified records in connection with the Parr Shoals project to verify the accuracy of my statements, I will be more than pleased to arrange for him to do so. I am certain that, having knowledge of the true facts, you will wish to publicly acknowledge the inaccuracies in your May 22 editorial.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, along with the letter I sent a report from the company itself, which is the South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., of Columbia, S.C. This was a "History of Carolinas-Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, Inc.," which had been sent to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and which he had furnished to me, showing the chronology of events. I assume it is as accurate as it can be, so far as the company knows. It was supplied to me on April 15, 1958. At that time, the able senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] was also working very hard and vigorously on this project, and he, along with the junior Senator from South Carolina, was most anxious that the Joint Committee do what it could to help the project along.

I was a little bit disappointed that the newspaper, which was so sure of its information, did not publish that chronology, but at this time I should like to submit for the RECORD, and ask unanimous consent to have printed, the "History of Carolinas-Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, Inc.," as supplied by that organization to the junior Senator from South Carolina and by him to the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS CO.,
Columbia, S.C., April 11, 1958.

HISTORY OF CAROLINAS-VIRGINIA NUCLEAR POWER ASSOCIATES, INC.

1. October 4, 1956: Carolinas-Virginia Nuclear Power Associates, Inc., officially organized and incorporated in the State of North Carolina. Associates include Duke Power Co., Carolina Power & Light Co., Virginia Electric & Power Co., and South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., organized as a nonprofit group to advance the art of power reactor technology through research, construction, and operation of a suitable reactor type. N. A. Cocke, president of Duke Power, elected president of associates.

2. November 26, 1956: Stone & Webster Engineering Corp. selected as consulting engineers.

3. January 18, 1957: Meeting in Washington with Admiral Strauss to advise him of associates' objective.

4. February 20, 1957: Selection of General Nuclear Engineering Corp. (Zinn) as nuclear consultant to associates.

5. April 4, 1957: Meeting in Washington with Division of Reactor Development, AEC, to procure information on third round requirements.

6. May 9, 1957: Selection of Westinghouse Electric Corp. to design and build nuclear part of nuclear plant.

7. May 29, 1957: Meeting in Washington with AEC to advise them of progress.

8. June 1957: Study of various reactor concepts and visits to several AEC installations.

9. July 1957: Detailed estimates and study of four types for comparison.

10. July 31, 1957: Selected pressure tube, heavy water reactor 17,000 kilowatts electrical capacity.

11. August 1957: Preparation of proposal to AEC.

12. August 29, 1957: Submission of proposal to AEC.

13. October 10, 1957: Meeting with AEC, Washington, to discuss proposal.

14. November 13, 1957: Public announcement of Parr site.

15. November 13, 1957: Meeting with AEC, Washington, to further discuss proposal.

16. December 20, 1957: Meeting with AEC, Washington, at which AEC outlined objections contained in proposal.

17. December 30, 1957: Meeting with AEC, Washington, at which associates and their consultants provided further detailed support to the proposal.

18. January 7, 1958: Letter from AEC enumerating, formally, three objections to proposal.

19. January 20, 1958: Letter to AEC accepting changes in proposal to remove objections.

20. February 14, 1958: Letter from AEC acknowledging changes and asking for further clarification on one point.

21. February 19, 1958: Letter to AEC clarifying one point to the effect that associates would reimburse AEC for all costs incurred by AEC in event of unilateral termination of project by associates.

22. Changes required by AEC increases cost to associates up to $26 million.

23. No official word from AEC since last letter noted above.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I regret sincerely that one by one we have to pick up these items and handle them. I never would have believed a claim would be made that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission had to fight this project through over the opposition of the junior Senator from New Mexico. There are many persons around the Capitol who know something about the history of this project, and there are many persons engaged in the utility business in South Carolina who are informed about the matter. If a campaign is to be made, I think it might well be made upon the basis of the actual facts and not upon an assumed set of facts, arising at a later date.

COMMUNISM: CULTURE OR CONQUEST?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in this day of stepped-up cultural exchange programs, including touring troops of dancers, I am glad that some voices are still raised to ask that we not let ourselves be brainwashed with all this show of sweetness and light. We must never forget that every Soviet move is for propaganda purposes, to attempt to lull us asleep and to throw us off balance. More to the point would be a real willingness for sincere negotiation at Geneva in an honest attempt to alleviate the world's tension spots.

One of the voices of warning to be heard is that of George Todt, whose column of May 26, 1959, published in the Valley Times, San Fernando, Calif., I recommend to my colleagues. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

COMMUNISM: CULTURE OR CONQUEST?

(By George Todt)

"They who love dancing too much seem to have more brains in their feet than in their heads" (Terence).

From the artistic and esthetic standpoint, few would care to argue the point that the Soviet Union's Bolshoi Ballet and its incomparable prima ballerina, Galina Ulanova, have been a marvelous success here in Los Angeles, as well as elsewhere.

This point is not to be debated; it is readily conceded. But there is another side to the coin—and thereby hangs a tale.

Recently I was conversing with one of our fair city's outstanding business and political figures, a gentleman whom I have long held in the highest esteem for his forthright speech and common sense, and this is what he told me:

"I just couldn't come to the party," he said. "A big lush was thrown for the Soviet representatives of this so-called cultural exchange, to which I had been invited, but it just didn't seem right somehow to me. Couldn't put my finger on it exactly—but I decided not to attend. And I didn't, either."

"Well, in that cool attitude you expressed on this matter," I replied, "you're not very far removed from the thinking of astute Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, who refused not so long ago to break bread with one Anastas Mikoyan, when he made with his latest snow job in Washington, D.C. The New England solon suggested that because the Reds held 11 of our downed fliers incommunicado, as well as for many other cogent reasons pertaining to the cold war, we ought to give all of them the cold shoulder."

"That makes sense to me," said my friend. "If it's a cold war we're fighting, let's not propose to win it by the 'buddy system' with our rough-and-tough opponents. That's not the right way to do it."

"The worst part of it all is that it is only an artful dodge," I suggested to the gentleman. "There is no denying that these fine artists are exceptionally competent and very effective in their field. That's the very point of it. These lovely and gifted dancers are sent here by their government with this paramount idea in mind: to distract our attention with their outstanding beauty from the ugliness of the Soviet regime—the cruelest gang of murderers and paranoiacs this world of ours has ever stomached."

"While the Kremlin shows us this better side of the U.S.S.R.," I was reminded by the gentleman, "we are supposed to forget about the innocent blood which the Reds have shed and their universal terrorism against humanity. Do you think that we will do so?"

"That's hard to guess upon," I replied. "Americans forget too easily, I'm afraid. Since Nicolai Lenin came to power in 1917, the Soviet leadership is reliably estimated by informed Russians to have liquidated—by war, planned famine, execution, and other means—more than 50 millions of their own people. That's some record of sweetness and light, isn't it?"

"I can't understand why some of us think we must play up to this murderous crowd with so-called cultural exchanges between our peoples," said my companion. "Let's face it: The American people and their Russian counterparts have no desire to fight each other. But what the Soviet citizenry may happen to think about the matter doesn't amount to a tinker's dam in the long run. War is in the hands of the scheming tyrants in the Kremlin today—not the cowed people they control."

"That's exactly it," quoth I. "And a good example of what you are talking about—on a scale just short of war, of course—happened with the armies of occupation in central Europe after the Second World War. We Yanks, British, and French were all getting along just dandy with Ivan when, out of a clear sky, the Soviet high command ordered: 'No more Tovarisch, period.' And that was it. The erstwhile friendship was turned off at the Red spigot overnight. It was phony, just an instrument of Soviet policy."

"Well, I think we ought to wise up a little bit on this score," said my friend, "before we lose all the rest of our marbles. Right?"

DECAY OF THE AMERICAN DOLLAR

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the present outflow of gold from this country provides a very graphic illustration of the gradual decay of the American dollar.

When foreign countries show a complete disregard for our current high interest rates and insist on removing their dollar credits in gold, and when American investors prefer stocks at lower interest rates rather than bonds, I believe the time is past due for a great awakening among those who feel that a little inflation is good for our economy.

An editorial which was published in the May 29, 1959, edition of the Boston, Mass., Herald presents a clear picture of the dollar's decline at home and abroad. I ask unanimous consent that this penetrating editorial be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and I commend it to the attention of all Senators.

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

THE DECAY OF THE DOLLAR

The dollar has lost standing at home and abroad. American investors prefer stocks to bonds. Foreign governments and investors prefer gold to dollar balances. The symbol of American greatness is a little tarnished. Are we going to wake up in time to the warning?

It is easy to say and true that America is still strong financially. Though our gold stock has been cut down to a 13-year low of $20 billion, it is still far above anything we had before World War II, and larger than the combined total of all official gold reserves in the free world. We could continue to lose gold for some time if the loss merely represented the natural adjustment of international exchanges.

But the evidence is strong that the gold outflow is in part a declining confidence in the dollar. Last year, when interest rates here were around 1 percent, the British and others had small incentive to leave their dollar balances here, so the gold outflow of $2.3 billion could be cheerfully explained away. But this year the United Kingdom and Japan, particularly, are ignoring high interest rates and taking their dollar credits away in gold. They are, in effect, doing what American investors are doing in choosing stocks at 2-percent return rather than bonds at 5 percent.

The rate of gold loss so far this year has been less than in 1958. But foreign nations are expected to obtain more than $3.3 billion

in net dollar earnings in 1959. If in spite of high interest rates they should decide to take $2.3 billion of this in gold, as they did in 1958, we would be in trouble. A drain at this rate would in 2 or 3 more years exhaust our free gold, the amount left after the 25 percent gold backing for Federal Reserve banks' notes and deposits.

But long before that happened, foreign nations and investors would become so alarmed over a possible embargo on gold or a devaluation of the dollar, that the run would be on, and we would be in the soup.

We have been so sure of the enduring value of the dollar that even to suggest such a disaster seems irresponsibly alarmist. But we ought never to think that we can lightly continue to tolerate inflation with impunity.

Economists can say that a little inflation is better than unemployment, or that labor must get enough wages to buy all that America will produce, or that the Federal Government can indefinitely spend more than it takes in taxes, but none of these excuses for inflation will satisfy investors. The run on gold, if it ever threatens, will not be halted because we seem to have good reason for inflation. It will be stopped only when we show a responsible concern for a dollar that is worth holding.

The dollar already shows a little decay. Have we in America the economic and political backbone to do something about it?

REPUBLICAN WOMEN OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it should be of interest to my Republican colleagues to learn that we recently had in New Hampshire the largest turnout of women Republicans in the State's history. Not only should this be of interest to Republicans, but also to Democrats as well, because it is an indication of the strength of our representative form of government.

In this day when we are so strongly challenged by a totalitarian-type of government, when the individual is of little concern except for his slave-labor capabilities, it is heartening that our society of free men and women stands so strongly in the cause of human rights.

This great turnout of New Hampshire Republican women is not a matter of accident. It is the product of an abiding belief in a representative form of government and the realization that this form of government can only be preserved by active participation. That is typical of New Hampshire women, but perhaps it was aided and abetted by the fact that our able national chairman of the Republican Party, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] was guest of honor for the occasion.

So that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle may have the benefit of the description of this gala New Hampshire occasion, I ask, Mr. President, unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an account published in the May 21, 1959, issue of the Exeter News-Letter in the column "Down in Our Corner," written by James P. Lynch, editor and publisher.

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

DOWN IN OUR CORNER

(By James P. Lynch)

That southern gentleman from Kentucky who now rules the roost of the Republican Party left New Hampshire the other day convinced that the GOP is an energetic organization as long as the women have something to say about it.

Even in his genial southern charm Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON was not overemphasizing the admirable contribution of the feminine workers of the GOP.

The men certainly had to sit back and take notice as the New Hampshire Republican Women's Clubs staged one of the most successful luncheons ever held by a political organization.

They flocked from all corners of the State to participate in this big event. There were liberals and conservatives and some who just didn't know where they stood. As a matter of fact it was unimportant at the time for all they were interested in was a united effort to show the national chairman that the Republican women of New Hampshire can organize into a very strong "army."

MORTON was emphatic in describing his views of their accomplishments in the early moments of his address.

SETTING EXAMPLE

He stated: "I am not here to tell you how to elect Republicans or how to choose attractive candidates or how to build an effective organization. You have demonstrated that you know how to do all of these things. New Hampshire today is the only one of the 49 States which has a solid Republican delegation in Congress, and, just as importantly, you also have a Republican Governor and a Republican legislature.

"Frankly I am here to learn, not to instruct. Your formula for political success is urgently needed in other States."

SURPRISED LEADER

Naturally MORTON had some idea of the good work being done year in and year out by the women's group. Regardless of all the laudable comments that perhaps were made to him prior to his arrival undoubtedly he was amazed at the exceptional turnout for this affair.

Presumably, too, he was quite impressed at the coordination between all groups. To an outsider this certainly must have been impressive but to those who have been around political circles for many years it has come to be more or less expected.

For the women within the GOP take their assignment seriously. Much more so than many of the male members.

EXCEPTIONAL TURNOUT

According to the figures there were 800 present and when one considers that the affair was mid-day it wouldn't have been surprising to find an even greater number in attendance had it been a dinner party.

MORTON received a good applause when he referred to Senator STYLES BRIDGES. "It has been a great honor for me to serve with your distinguished senior Senator STYLES BRIDGES, who is also chairman of the Republican policy committee and the senior Republican Member of the U.S. Senate. I know that all of you are proud of him as are his colleagues in the Senate," opined Senator MORTON.

DUE RECOGNITION

Assuredly by the response to this remark it was the understatement of the day for Senator BRIDGES and his wife are held in high esteem by the women's GOP clubs. But neither STYLES nor Doloris Bridges were around to hear the ovation due to unfortunate circumstances.

The national chairman then paid tribute to New Hampshire's other distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate. He mentioned: "It has been my privilege to serve both in the House and Senate with your able junior Senator, NORRIS COTTON, who has also rendered outstanding service to his State and to the Nation.

PRAISE FOR MERROW

"I had the honor of serving with Congressman CHESTER EARL MERROW, as well, and I know that he and Congressman PERKINS BASS give New Hampshire one of the most effective delegations in the House of Representatives."

He added: "No State is more vigorously represented than New Hampshire."

This tribute from the national chairman is not only praiseworthy to the two Senators and two Congressmen but it is a salute to the intelligence of the electorate in this State.

GOOD TRIBUTE

Instead of accepting it lightly the people should realize the importance of this close harmony within the delegation and how it is benefitting the State. During an off-year the voters have an opportunity to appraise the situation and thus when campaign time comes rolling around they will be able to overlook some of the political charges that are so prevalent during the heat of a campaign.

Of the four Members of the Washington delegation Senator BRIDGES is dean of the group. His long years of service in the interest of the State and the Nation is an assurance that New Hampshire offers to the Nation great leadership.

LONG TENURE

Next in line in longevity of representing the public from this State in Washington is Congressman MERROW. His years of faithful service to his constituency from the first district have won him reelection every 2 years.

NORRIS COTTON has served both in the House and the Senate and even though his tenure in Washington is less, this experience can't be matched by either BRIDGES or MERROW.

When NORRIS moved up to the Senate PERKINS BASS joined the quartet and has been carving out a good record in Congress.

The national chairman commented on the State political scene by paying tribute to the Governor and the Republican State legislature. He emphasized: "All of us who are in politics recognize how tremendously important it is to hold control of State and local offices."

WORDS OF CAUTION

The national chairman cautioned his listeners on the need to recapture losses suffered during previous elections. "Wherever the Republican Party lost governorships in 1956, congressional losses followed in 1958. A major Republican objective in 1960 must be the recapture of the governorships which have been slipping away from the party since 1952."

Because of this situation the new chairman called for strengthening our organization at the State and local levels.

NEW DRIVE

MORTON emphasized the importance of the "recruit now for 60" program which has started. According to him: "We are seeking to mobilize 2 million more party workers between now and September of 1960. I know most of it must come from Republican women's organizations such as yours to recruit these workers."

He placed on this project a stamp of high priority and he feels its successful accomplishment will insure a sweeping Republican victory in 1960.

The Senator described politics as being a composite of small efforts. "It's not the big jobs that always count. It's a consummation of little jobs. They may seem trivial but they are necessary," he remarked.

WELL AWARE

This was an assurance rather than a challenge to the New Hampshire Republican women for they are for the most part well aware of this type of planning. As a matter

of fact it will not be surprising if the national chairman follows some of the New Hampshire pattern when outlining plans for other States.

PRESENT PROSPERITY

The Senator reminded his audience: "This Nation has enjoyed 6½ years of expanding economy, prosperity and progress under the present administration. Measured by virtually every yardstick, they represent the best years in our history.

"Currently there is a tremendous upswing in employment. Some spots have a long way to go. General business activity seems certain to carry over into 1960. New records are being established on virtually every economic front."

The national chairman cited present employment. "In April of this year there were more Americans at work than in any other April in history."

GOOD SIGN

"Unemployment dropped by 735,000 in April, double the normal seasonal decline. At the same time, employment rose by nearly 1.2 million to a total of more than 65 million.

"There were 2.1 million more jobs than in April of 1958.

"At the same time, average weekly earnings of factory workers climbed," he reminded his listeners. He pointed out that these "represent real gains in purchasing power as the cost-of-living index continued to hold steady throughout this year. This stands in sharp contrast with the postwar years, when galloping inflation under former President Truman virtually wiped out wage gains."

But Senator MORTON was quick to remind his listeners: "Although unemployment remains a problem in some areas and some industries, there is continuing improvement in the job picture."

FAVORABLE CHANGE

He mentioned other favorable economic indicators, including the latest Federal Reserve Board index of industrial production. "This was at an all-time high of 147, up nearly 15 percent above a year ago.

"Gross national product, the measure of the Nation's total output of goods and services, is running at a record annual rate of $465 billion, up nearly 9 percent over the same period in 1958."

In regard to housing he cited that it was at an all-time high, with the figure for the first 4½ months at an annual rate of 1,390,000 units.

PEACE UNDER GOP

In outlining the Republican record of accomplishment he did not fail to mention: "The most important dividend is the fact that the peace has been maintained."

In closing, he emphasized, "We have a proud record which needs not defense but effective presentation."

That sentence seems to have much greater meaning than probably most of his listeners realized, for it presented an entirely new approach to the battle ahead for the Republicans.

NEW LIFE

"Not defense" is a bold approach and is far from being idealistic. The national chairman of the GOP has put it up squarely to the workers to get off the defensive side and be more convincing.

It's a good shift in strategy and could win more votes in the days ahead. Being on the defensive all the time tends to weaken a party. Thus, with the approach as suggested by the national chairman, the fighting spirit can grow within the organization.

FACING THE PROBLEM

It's realistic in the sense that it is telling an intelligent electorate that you don't argue politics; you discuss them. It has a twofold purpose also, for it tends to familiarize the people with the problems of government and produce better candidates.

The southern gentleman came to New Hampshire and left inspired by the work of the women's organization.

Before he left, he proved that Senator NORRIS COTTON's description was quite accurate. When the junior Senator was introducing him, he stated, "Senator MORTON says more with fewer words than any Member."

Perhaps the national chairman will establish a new concept in political campaigning in the months to come. Already he has proven that Yankee hospitality and southern charm go hand in hand.

CORNER POLITICS

While we are passing out bouquets to the women for their splendid contribution to politics, some of the fair sex from the area should get special mention.

One of the hardest workers for the affair was Mrs. Clara Gale, of Hampton. Long active in politics Mrs. Gale has been prominently identified with many of the successful endeavors of the women's organizations. Throughout the years she has been a tireless campaigner on behalf of the GOP ticket.

EXETER WOMEN

Others from the area who certainly strived to make Monday's affair a huge success were Mrs. Florence Gaudreault and Mrs. Dorothy Baird.

There were others too but the praise is due all for their united effort in making the affair one of national envy and definitely impressive to the national chairman.

SHORT VISIT

The Governor stayed only a short time as he had to return to his office in Concord for a series of appointments. As a matter of fact he wasn't around to listen to the praise from the national chairman.

The only one who made the slightest mention of any candidate for next year's presidential race was the Governor when he paid tribute to President Eisenhower and then gave equal tribute to Vice President NIXON.

This perhaps was a test to see the Nixon strength within the dining room. But there was no tumultuous ovation and undoubtedly when he realized this he refrained from further mention of the Vice President's name.

HAD OPPORTUNITY

Even though Congressman MERROW did not remark about Governor Rockefeller there were plenty of people talking to him before and after the luncheon of the possibility of a Rockefeller campaign in the State.

MERROW had the same opportunity to discuss Rockefeller's chances as the Governor had to talk about NIXON but MERROW preferred to keep the luncheon address away from presidential possibilities.

DWINELLS APPEAR

Former Gov. Lane Dwinell and his wife received a good ovation when introduced.

WIGGIN REPRESENTED SENATOR

Chet Wiggin, administrative aid to Senator BRIDGES, represented the senior Senator at the affair although he did not address the group. The capable aid was being greeted equally as much as any of the officeholders, for most politicians realize the important contribution Wiggin makes to the Bridges office.

Plaistow's Women's Republican Club walked away with a prize for increasing its membership.

The speed of air travel was demonstrated by the appearance of the national chairman. Saturday afternoon he was in Hawaii.

NORRIS NEEDLES

NORRIS COTTON had plenty of courage when he faced the women. He referred to Grafton County as the greatest.

There was quite a chuckle when NORRIS referred to Senator MORTON as having a grandfather on each side of the Civil War. He added that's a good idea, especially if you live in Kentucky.

Although it was a women's luncheon, there were plenty of male politicians in attendance. As one summed it up, the gathering consisted of the female brains and the male brass.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO REQUIRE A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in my 23 years in the U.S. Senate, I have always tried to strike the keynote of economy. There are various ways of striking that note, and one of the devices I have used has been to introduce a resolution for a constitutional amendment requiring that the President submit, and the Congress enact, a balanced budget, except in times of national emergency.

It may be said that the Congress has that present power, and, indeed, that is true. Nevertheless, I feel that writing the requirement into the Federal Constitution would have a salutary effect.

The deterioration of our currency should be a matter of concern to everyone. One of the best ways to prevent further deterioration is to provide for a balanced budget. The increasingly high interest rate for short-term borrowing reflects a lack of confidence in this country's currency. One of the best ways to restore that confidence would be to provide, by constitutional amendment, the requirement of a balanced budget so that the people of this country could be sure that their dollar would not be further depreciated by deficit spending.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the Washington Daily News of May 30, 1959, remarking on my proposal, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

BALANCE BY CONSTITUTION

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, wants to write into the Constitution a virtual ban on Government deficit spending.

He has proposed a constitutional amendment which would require the President each year to submit a balanced budget and Congress to adopt a balanced budget.

The Senator doesn't think this would guarantee a balanced budget—since even the best estimates frequently go amiss. But, as he says, "It would go a long way in that direction."

We are under no illusions that Congress will submit this amendment to the State legislatures, where it would have to be ratified. Although we think the necessary three-fourths of the States readily would approve it.

There are some notable individual exceptions, but the majorities in Congress obviously are not much concerned about deficit spending. If they were, they would put a stop to it. Moreover, Congress long has had a law of its own, requiring itself to balance the budget. The law merely is ignored.

Just the same, it is a good idea. And there seems to be only one other way to force Congress to do what it ought to do as a matter of simple duty. When the people get sufficiently tired of inflation, and sufficiently understand that the Government's red-ink spending is the main cause of inflation, the people will turn on the heat—and Congress will act.

In that event, if the people were riled enough, Congress might even pass the Bridges amendment.

SUGGESTION THAT THE MONKEY "ABLE" BE RETURNED TO KANSAS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion on the bill relating to the authorization for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I think it is fitting to read into the RECORD a telegram which I have just sent to Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The telegram reads as follows:

Dr. T. KEITH GLENNAN,
Director, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

Last week the citizens of our Nation were thrilled at the achievements of your organization in sending two monkeys into space and directing their safe return to earth. The people of Kansas are singularly honored in this historic event by having produced Able, one of the monkeys. I feel that it is only fitting that Able should be returned to her native State for preservation. We have at Kansas University one of the outstanding museums in charge of a nationally known curator who would properly mount and preserve this monkey for future generations. We in Kansas feel this should be a fitting tribute to Able, who has pioneered space flight and would be an historic reminder to all who came to see her. We will be glad to cooperate with you in any suggestions you may have.

FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. President, we in Kansas are truly proud to have participated in this historic event by having furnished a monkey, which was born at Independence, Kans., a few months ago. I trust that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will give serious consideration to the request I have made today on behalf of the people of Kansas.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HUMPHREY TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the morning business, and following the yea-and-nay vote on the so-called space bill, I may be recognized for a period of 30 minutes for the purpose of addressing the Senate.

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN LAWS AFFECTING THE STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the bill passed earlier today by the Senate, S. 1541, and a corresponding bill passed earlier in the week by the other body, will smooth and assist the transition to statehood of the 49th State, Alaska.

Shortly after signing the Alaska statehood bill, President Eisenhower directed the Bureau of the Budget to inquire among the several Departments of the Federal Government concerning the legislation which would be required in the light of Alaska's having become a State. Subsequently, the draft of the proposed legislation which became S. 1541 was sent to the Senate, and also to the House of Representatives, by Executive communications.

There is precedent for legislation of this type. It is true that similar but much more restricted legislation was passed after some of the earlier Territories entered the Union as States. But since the admission of the last previous Territories, New Mexico and Arizona, in 1912, the whole field of Federal-State relationships has been enlarged and changed. For that reason, and for another very important reason, the bill considered and passed today by the Senate was much more complex than any previous legislation of this nature.

The other important reason—the main reason, in fact—was that in the case of Alaska, the Federal Government never permitted the Territory to assume and perform functions which had been undertaken normally and naturally by other Territories. For example, Alaska was never permitted to care for its own mentally ill until about 2 years ago. Alaska was never permitted, until it became a State, to erect its own court system. Until the enactment of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956, Alaska never shared in the benefits of such legislation, which has been so important to the other States.

As a consequence, in this vast area of about 586,000 square miles, one-fifth as large as the earlier 48 States put together, Alaska has today only about 4,000 miles of roads. Under the 1956 act, Alaska joined the Federal highway system, but under special circumstances and special conditions. The bill passed today makes Alaska a full partner in the Federal highway system, except that she does not share in the benefits of the Interstate Highway System. Alaska will continue, as it has in the past, to pay taxes for that program, but will reap from it no benefits whatsoever.

In this connection, I was delighted to learn that the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] plans to visit Alaska this fall with his Subcommittee on Public Roads and there inquire into Alaska's highway needs.

The omnibus transition bill passed earlier today is, in the main, a statement of technical corrections to existing law, merely deleting the word "Territory" from ever so many laws, and including Alaska as one of the States. Certain transitional grants are authorized under the terms of the bill totaling $28,500,000 over a period of 5 years. I point out and emphasize that this amounts to only $3,500,000 more than the Federal Government would have appropriated had Alaska remained a Territory. Indeed, for the coming fiscal year—the fiscal year 1960—the additional charge to the Federal Government on account of the transitional bill will be only slightly more than $200,000. These appropriations, which I hope will be made in the full amounts to be recommended by the Bureau of the Budget from year to year, will go into the general fund of the treasury of the State of Alaska, and thus will give to Alaska a helping hand in its early and most difficult years of statehood.

Furthermore, the two international airports, the one at Anchorage and the one at Fairbanks, are to be conveyed to the new State. It is hoped that the transitional appropriations will permit the State government—and promptly—to extend the runways at both these airports, so that they will be suitable at the earliest possible time for the operation of jet airplanes. As is realized, many international carriers bound from Asia to Europe, or the other way around, go through Alaska and use particularly the airport at Anchorage. That airport and the one at Fairbanks must be put in physical shape to accommodate jet plane operations without delay.

I think it can properly be said that the people of Alaska approve the omnibus bill. However, they do not regard it—and neither do I—as any great gift from the Federal Government. All things considered, I believe that perhaps the majority of Alaskans would have preferred the continuation of the present system of road building under a revised formula for the next few years; and there was some sentiment that the continued operation by the Federal Aviation Agency of the two airports I have mentioned might have been desirable, so that the Federal Agency could have proceeded to put them in shape for the jet plane operations to which I have referred. But Alaskans are willing to accept the bill and to do their best—and their best will be successful, I know—to proceed under the terms and conditions of the legislation.

Mr. President, in conclusion, again I wish to express the very strong hope that the appropriation, which I understand has already been requested by the Bureau of the Budget, or will be requested within the next day or two, for these transitional grants for the fiscal year 1960 will be made promptly, because July 1, the start of the new fiscal year, is almost here; and those funds will be required so the State may enter into these operations in an orderly and proper manner.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 3, 1959, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 758. An act for the relief of Viktors Neimanis;

S. 1197. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended;

S. 1217. An act to add certain public domain lands in Nevada to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation;

S. 1228. An act to amend Public Law 85-590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic

Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1242. An act to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 4, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, you have endowed us with the power to speak, to utter syllables and to frame them into intelligible means of communication.

The medium of our daily deliberations is the spoken word. All of us know its power; words heal grief and open wounds, they lift us up and crush us, they bolster our confidence and they rob us of our dignity, used thoughtfully they enhance our regard for one another, used maliciously they splinter reputations. And yet the chaos of the Tower of Babel has reappeared in our time, the value of the spoken word has depreciated, its sanctity and clarity has vanished. For too often our words do not reflect the sincere sentiments of our heart and have become meaningless, subject to misunderstanding and misinterpretation.

Make us realize, O Lord, that words uttered in this Chamber are carefully watched by the entire world; once spoken they are no longer controlled by the speaker. Let us restore to words the value which they have lost. Let us resolve to weigh and not to count our words and to adorn them with the sacred garb of appropriate deeds. May the words of our mouth and the meditation of our heart be acceptable unto Thee, O Lord, our Rock and our Redeemer. Amen.

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

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND TAX COURT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 5805) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 425)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5805) "making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5 and 11.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 and 6, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$364,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,016,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$23,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$71,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,993,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$190,660,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$80,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN R. PILLION,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
ALAN BIBLE,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
MIKE MONRONEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
STYLES BRIDGES,
THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5805) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $22,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Division of Disbursement as proposed by the Senate instead of $21,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $364,250,000 for salaries and expenses of the Internal Revenue Service instead of $363,000,000 as proposed by the House and $365,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $4,016,000 for salaries and expenses of the United States Secret Service instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,032,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $23,250,000 for acquisition, construction, and improvements, U.S. Coast Guard, instead of $22,000,000 as proposed by the House and $24,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing for a limitation on expenditures.

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $37,400,000 for payment for public services as proposed by the Senate. The House bill carried nothing for this item.

The committee on conference concurs fully in the language contained in the Senate report, which reads as follows:

"The committee wishes to point out that the total amount of $37.4 million recommended for Payment for Public Services does not increase or decrease the obligational or expenditure authority of the Postal Department. This is merely a bookkeeping device to separate that amount of postal cost to be recovered from the users of the mails from that to be recovered from the taxpayer by means of reimbursement from the general fund of the Treasury.

"The committee wishes to make one further important point. Ever since September 24, 1950, the Congress has required fourth-class mail or parcel post to be self-supporting. This recommendation for a public service appropriation does not affect this principle or the manner in which it has been carried out in the last 8 years. Other than in the case of books, library books, and mail for the blind, the committee finds no public service costs attributable to fourth-class mail and believes that the Congress intends that fourth-class mail shall pay its fully allocated costs."

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $71,750,000 for administration, regional operation, and research instead of $71,500,000 as proposed by the House and $72,398,600 as proposed by the Senate. The increase agreed to in conference is to be used entirely for additional inspectors for investigative duties, and in this connection it should be emphasized that the conferees are alarmed over the large amount of noninvestigative work performed by inspectors. It is hoped that the Postmaster General will give consideration to the use of inspectors primarily for investigative duties.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $2,993,000,000 for operations instead of $2,988,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,998,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $190,660,000 for facilities instead of $188,660,000 as proposed by the House and $194,660,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $80,000,000 for postal modernization instead of $75,000,000 as proposed by the House and $88,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Deletes Senate language which would have permitted the appropriation for postal modernization to remain available until expended.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN R. PILLION,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the final amounts recommended by the conferees are as follows:

Treasury Department	$782,418,000
Post Office Department	3,859,410,000
Tax Court of United States	1,535,000
Total	4,643,363,000

This is $44,964,000 less than the budget estimates. The House originally cut the budget estimates $60,230,000. The Senate restored $35,900,600. The final figure agreed upon in conference therefore is $15,266,000 above the House figure and $20,664,600 less than the Senate figure. It will be seen therefore that the House conferees gained better than a 50–50 compromise.

The major increases agreed to in conference provide additional funds for the Internal Revenue Service and the Coast Guard in the Treasury Department and for operations, facilities, and postal modernization in the Post Office Department.

The increases of $1,250,000 for the Internal Revenue Service provides a total appropriation of $364,250,000 which will permit that agency to increase its average employment by approximately 550, and the conferees have arrived at this amount with the understanding that emphasis will be placed on the addition of revenue agents.

The increase of $1,250,000 for the Coast Guard is related primarily to the program for replacement of patrol boats and will permit economies through procurement in volume for that program. The action of the House has prevailed in deleting the provision for an accrued expenditure limitation under this appropriation item.

The conferees have accepted the Senate provision for incorporation of an item in the amount of $37,400,000 for payment for public services in accordance with the Postal Policy Act of 1958. This action is important in that it recognizes the rate concession concept of earmarking funds for public services. This action has no effect on total funds available to the Post Office Department nor on total funds to be withdrawn from the Treasury.

The conference report includes an increase of $5 million for the Post Office Department in the appropriation item for operations and is consistent with an increase of 3 percent in mail volume for 1960. The difficulty of accurately forecasting mail volume is manifest and the conferees believe their agreement represents the most realistic estimate possible at this time.

The House Members at this conference agreed to an increase of $2 million in the appropriation for facilities but were in general agreement with the Members of the other body that the vehicle replacement program of the Post Office Department should be carried out on a sustained basis and that large increases in funds such as those requested this year should not be supported.

The amount agreed to in conference for the postal modernization appropriation is an increase of $5 million over that approved by the House. This is a new appropriation item and is intended to enable the post office to place modern equipment into operation. The total figure recommended should support an active program of modernization in practically all of the post offices which the Post Office Department has planned for this program in fiscal year 1960. The House position has prevailed in striking out the language which would have provided no-year availability of funds under this appropriation item.

In the opinion of the House conferees, Mr. Speaker, the conference report presents a very satisfactory compromise of the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. It represents a unanimous agreement on the part of the conferees and I urge its adoption by the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCES WITH CANADA

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H.J. Res. 254) to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Canada, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, after "Congress" insert "or to meetings held in the United States."

Page 2, after line 7, insert "Such appointments shall be for the period of each meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary group except for the four members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the four members of the Foreign Relations Committee, whose appointments shall be for the duration of each Congress."

Page 2, line 14, after "made," insert "the House and Senate portions of."

Page 2, line 16 and 17, after "delegation" insert ", respectively."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we might have an explanation? What has happened in connection with this legislation?

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was passed by the House and on yesterday passed by the Senate with corrective, technical amendments which do not affect the substance of the resolution. Does the gentleman want me to explain the nature of each amendment?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. This deals with the parliamentary conference in Canada; is that correct?

Mrs. KELLY. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. How much is this going to cost? Does the gentlewoman have any idea?

Mrs. KELLY. $15,000 is the appropriation, divided between the other body and this body.

Mr. GROSS. Was there any objection in the other body?

Mrs. KELLY. None whatsoever. These are just technical changes, one with respect to the chairmanship and the other with respect to disbursements.

Mr. GROSS Let the record show that I am still opposed to this proposal. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LABOR REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, as most of the House membership know, a Joint Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor has been engaged for several months in hearings on labor reform legislation. Representatives of practically every phase of our society have been heard. It has not been possible to hear all of those who have requested the opportunity to present their views to the subcommittee, but we have endeavored to select a good cross section of those offering to testify in an effort to bring the best information possible to the committee members.

Within the last 6 weeks, more than 100 requests were received from various points on the west coast, requesting that they have an opportunity to present their views to the subcommittee, and the majority of these requests were from so-called rank-and-file union members, wishing to testify particularly on the section of the bill dealing with the individual union member's bill of rights. After careful study of the requests and consideration of all the problems involved in bringing people from the west coast to Washington to testify and with particular consideration of the very large industrial interests on the west coast, it was the decision of the chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member, concurred in

by the cochairmen of the subcommittee, that a special subcommittee be dispatched to the west coast for the purpose of hearing as many witnesses as possible from that section. Consequently, hearings were held in Los Angeles, Calif., on May 28 and 29 from 9 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock in the afternoon by a special subcommittee composed of the gentleman from Georgia as chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND]. Approximately 20 witnesses were heard and I believe the other members of the subcommittee will support me in the statement that the testimony delivered to us during the Los Angeles hearings was well worth the expense of sending the subcommittee out to California. We believe the information received will be of tremendous help in the writing of legislation, particularly with regard to the section dealing with the individual union member's bill of rights.

Some conversation has occurred to the effect that it is the intention of certain members of the House Committee on Education and Labor to delay and finally block the passage of any legislation in the labor reform field. I think I can speak for the entire committee membership in saying that no one of us has ever entertained such idea and I can assure you that the close association I have been privileged to have with the chairman of the full committee, the Honorable GRAHAM A. BARDEN, allows me to know that it has been his intention from the beginning of these hearings to report a good bill at the earliest possible time. As a matter of fact, the distinguished chairman has consistently urged the cochairmen of the subcommittee to expedite the hearings and get the committee into executive session for the purpose of writing a bill at the earliest possible date.

It is the sincere hope of the cochairmen of the subcommittee, the Honorable CARL PERKINS, of Kentucky, and myself, that hearings can conclude sometime next week, after which the committee will go into executive session and will work as diligently as possible and as long as necessary to report a bill for the consideration of the membership of this House.

The mail addressed to the committee regarding legislation in this field indicates that the general public is demanding that some measure be passed to protect the interests of the working union member, the businessman, and the general public. In my considered judgment, for the House to fail to write an adequate, meaningful bill in the field of labor reform would be a disaster.

LABOR REFORM LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] has just said is very important to all of us and we must answer the demand of the people for adequate legislation dealing with organization of labor. The Committee on Education and Labor has been holding hearings but our difficulty grows out of the fact that a witness will come in, for example Mr. Meany is on the stand today, and will read a long statement, a statement which should have been furnished us a couple of days in advance so that we might have time to read and consider it and to ask a few questions about it. The way it is now all we get is propaganda from a few top witnesses. We do not get as much as we should from the average employee and employer.

My hope is that we will report out a bill without delay then, difficult as it may be, with a comparatively simple bill on the floor.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report, including any supplemental or minority views, on H.R. 7523.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

Adair	Diggs	May
Alford	Durham	O'Brien, N.Y.
Baumhart	Edmondson	O'Konski
Byrnes, Wis.	Evins	Pfost
Canfield	Forrester	Powell
Celler	Green, Oreg.	Randall
Chamberlain	Hays	Rogers, Tex.
Chenoweth	Holifield	Smith, Va.
Coad	Kilburn	Wallhauser
Davis, Tenn.	Knox	Withrow
Dawson	Lesinski	
Denton	Madden	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 400 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 7454, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], a member of the committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this committee has had a very tough assignment and I assure you it has been a very tough job. We worked on this matter for over 5 months, mornings and afternoons; we heard over 500 witnesses; there are over 5,000 pages of testimony, and I want you to know that we gave proper attention to this bill, which is over 50 percent of the national budget. That is a lot of money in any language.

It will be $1 billion under last year's bill, and we cut the President's budget for this year $400 million. Unless this House has the good judgment to accept the amendments I will introduce later on and the amendments to be introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio on the Bomarc, we will give you a nice little package in which my amendments will increase, his amendments will reduce, and we will come out just about where we are in nice, round, fat numbers.

I want to say, and I want you to know, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has done a terrific job. I agree with him only about half of the time, but he is a hard worker; he has the patience of Job, believe me. First of all, he has to put up with me, and that is no picnic, and also with about six other Members on both sides of the aisle who are headaches in their own right, during these 5 months of hearings. When this bill is signed by the President, I think the taxpayers ought to give Mr. MAHON and his lovely wife a vacation at the taxpayers' expense and excuse him from attending the balance of this session. His was a tough job.

Now, let me add this. Everything all during this debate yesterday and so far today would give you the impression that this has been all sweetness and love; that everybody agreed upon this program; that this was a very duck-wucky arrangement. Well, nothing could be further from the truth. We spent 5 days marking up this bill, Mr. Chairman, and they had to practically call in the marines to get us off each other's neck. I want you to know that there were a lot of strong opinions both ways about this bill, and we hammered it out behind closed doors after great debate and hard work.

Now, there are a lot of things about this bill I do not like; there are a million things in this bill that I do not like. A few of them I will mention. But, we worked together, and I will introduce amendments only on matters of policy. That is the practice of our committee, a practice we agreed on, right or wrong. I want some things, they want some things, and we work it out that way except matters of policy. But, on matters like the end strength of the Army and the end strength of the Marine Corps, I reserve the right to amend it.

Now, let me tell you a few things about this defense setup. Talk about your

great Air Force—and thank God it is a great Air Force. Had it not been for the B–52 bombers, there would have been world war III. World war III never happened, and it is because of the B–52 bombers that it did not happen. But, that is world war III. We turn over that page. That is gone. It did not happen, and that is why. But, you talk about your great retaliatory Air Force, the bombers; that we are going to destroy the world with our bombers. What bombers? You have 2,000 in the Strategic Air Command; 500, in round numbers, B–52's; a great pigeon; none better in the world. What about your other 1,500? The other 1,500 are B–47's. Three-quarters of your SAC command is obsolete today. Do you know that? Three-quarters of your bombers are 10 years old. The life of a bomber is 10 years. Your B–47's are 10 years old. One crash, night before last, killed three men. I am disclosing information to the Russians? Do not be ridiculous. Everything I am telling you they know in spades. Do not worry about me telling the Russians. Now, that is your bomber command; three-quarters obsolescent. How do you like that? But, we have got to have them. We are going to have a mixed retaliatory power with missiles. Do not worry about what we can do to them. Anything they can do we can do better, if that makes you feel any better. They will kill a hundred million of you and we will kill a hundred million of them. Now, is that not ducky, especially if you are one of the hundred million? But, if that is the way you want it, that is the way it is. It is in the bill.

Now, what about your Navy? It is a great Navy; a wonderful U.S. Navy. It is wearing out with blocked World War II obsolescence; blocked obsolescence. It will wear out in one big chunk at the same time. Your fighting ships are 20 years' life. The whole block obsolescence of the U.S. surface fleet will wear out in 20 years from World War II ships at one time. But, in this bill you do not have the money to replace the wear-out. You cannot replace the annual wear-out of your fleet. So, your fleet is going down, down, down; not literally but figuratively. What about the manpower? You cannot man the fleet you have got. You cannot man it. So, you can man 80 percent of the fleet becoming obsolescent with no money to replace the wear-out. That is the fleet. How do you like that? Your Army. Well, if it was not for the parliamentary rules, I would use language to tell you what I think about anybody who will cut the Marine Corps and the Army at a time like this. Step out in the hall after I finish and I will tell you in real strong language what they have done to the Army and the marines. I am not sure who did it. I will start with the Secretary of the Treasury, then the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and finally the Secretary of Defense, in that order. I recommend that we approve a uniform for the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that has seven stars for that fellow, and that they be lit up with neon lights, that he have pink pants, a Luftwaffe cap, and a riding crop.

The good thing about the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and our committee, is that we have put our imprimatur at least upon the bill that came here. We did not squander any of this money; we did not squander anything; we are $400 million under the bill that was sent up. We just scattered it around a little more intelligently and put it where it should belong; only we were not quite intelligent enough, according to my way of thinking.

Let me give you a word about this Army for a minute. I want you to hear this. Do you know that this administration has cut the U.S. Army one division a year for the last 6 years? Do you know that? Five years ago we had 20 divisions in the U.S. Army. Do you know what you will have when you are through with this bill? Fourteen. That is your Army. This is your idea and the President's idea, not mine.

As for the Marine Corps, the administration has been after it for the last 6 years; you have been trying to emasculate the U.S. Marines and make them a police force or bellhops. Do you know how many combat units hit the beach at Lebanon—Marines? Do you know how many we sent into Lebanon? Six—one, two, three, four, five, six. That is what we hit the beaches with at Lebanon. Do you know how many you are cutting out in this bill? Six? That is a great way to run a railroad, the Marine Corps, or anything else. I guess there "just ain't going to be no more Lebanons." Somebody has a pipeline to heaven. Well, there will be; God forbid. But there will be, all over the world, and you will want marines to hit the beaches. And then they will come back with a supplemental or a sudden request, and they will get it. Everybody will be for it.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Of course.

Mr. FORD. Is it not true that the six battalion landing groups that hit the beaches at Lebanon were somewhat under strength; the ones that will remain in the Marine Corps in fiscal 1960 under this program will be at practically full strength?

Mr. FLOOD. Why, of course.

Mr. FORD. In other words, the battalion landing teams you will have under this program will be stronger than the battalion landing teams they had in the year they went to Lebanon.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. And let me give the gentleman a wonderful answer that I just thought up out of my own little head. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is a great baseball player. He played on our House ball team. He was a great ballplayer for the University of Michigan. I say to him, sir, that on a ball team you have got to have nine men. You may have hitless wonders or you may have world champions, but you have got to have nine men. You cannot play a ball team on the field with six or seven. If you try, you have no ball club. You have something else, but not a baseball team. That is the trouble. Now let me show you what happened.

Let me talk about the Army. Mr. Chairman, if this committee remembers no other one thing that I say, I beg that they remember this. Now hear this. Shame upon the makers of military policy of the United States of America. Do you know what happened? Our people in this Nation, from the dawn of history, abhorred mercenary troops. Shades of the Hessians that the British brought to America—the Hessian mercenaries. We despise and detest a nation that hires bodies to fight and die for it. Any great nation in the world that did that died, and should die. Well, you are eating pretty high on the hog here. You are pretty fat and sassy and lazy. So you have got to go and hire troops.

You have to hire infantry; do you? Is not that great? How many divisions do you have in Korea? You have two divisions in Korea. The divisions are the 1st Cavalry and the 7th Infantry Divisions. How do you make it up? Over one-third of the troops in this cavalry and the 7th U.S. Infantry Division, the great 7th Infantry Division of Korea, one-third of them are hired mercenary Korean infantry—integrated down to the squad level. How do you like that? I intend no aspersion against the brave Korean soldiers, our allies of proven loyalty. I speak only of integrating into U.S. divisions Koreans as individuals rather than of unit.

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

Mr. FLOOD. In a moment. My friend, you spoke for 1 hour and a half yesterday and you yielded to me once or twice; we are great friends, but just let me alone, will you? Just let me alone.

Now let me tell you, do you know what the Koreans are getting paid—integrated at the squad level? Now, remember, these are not battalions—not integrated Korean command units, but they are soldiers integrated at the squad level—the Korean soldier in your rifle platoon. Do you know what he gets paid by the Korean Government? He gets $1.44 a month—$1.44 a month. You give him a tube of toothpaste and a pair of pants once in a while—but $1.44 a month is what one-third of your combat Korean infantry is paid. The exact figures by number are top secret. I cannot give you the exact figures by division. But any of you men who are cleared at that level can get it. Go to the telephone now and call up. Go to the telephone. Call the Army and ask them. Could I lie to you here? With God's help and the great intelligence of the people of my district, I will be here a long time. I cannot lie to you. I cannot lie to you. But, that is what you have done. When we are considering the bill under the 5-minute rule, I will have more to say about the Army. I will not take much more time on it now. My friend, the gentleman from Ohio, is going to introduce an amendment on the Bomarc. Well, I hope he wins. That is as phony as a $3 bill—that Bomarc. I know that General Motors ran this town for 4 or 5 years when "Engine Charlie" Wilson was aboard. But, do you know who is running it now? Boeing. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] told us

that Boeing had a backlog of $2,100 million worth of contracts—$2,100 million. Do you know how much they are into you for Boeing now? Two and one-half billion dollars—and they have not shot down a starling from off the Archives Building in 6 years. That is it. Do you know how much more it will cost you? Six billion dollars more. Yes; $6 billion more. Well, they do not have that much money in the House administration fund here—$6 billion more—and who has a better right, ha? That is the situation. You have this Army and Marine personnel going up and down changing like the phases of the moon. How can you run departments that way? No wonder good men are quitting and getting out of the business. Why would they not—with the Bureau of the Budget breathing down their neck and setting up defense policy? Like an artist trying to draw beautiful designs on a mural from an activated pogo stick. That is what they are trying to do. That is what they are trying to make you do—here today and gone tomorrow. This House—oh, more praise to you—more praise to the House—more praise to the Congress—last year they tried to cut the Army and you would not let them do it—you would not let them do it. You said, "No—the Army was at an irreducible minimum. You are drawing blood. You have cut us six divisions a year. One-third of the Army you have cut. Leave it alone." God knows you are liable to need it at any minute. Now I belong to that school of thinking—in the minority now but increasing—increasing in size, I believe that the next fighting—the next war, if, God forbid, there is one, there will only be one kind of war that you are going to fight. Nobody is going to fight a missile war. What is the matter with you? Nobody is going to fight a missile war.

Snap out of that. Khrushchev and the sputnik scared you to death. What is the matter with you? He scared you to death.

Everything that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] wants in that bill for missiles I am for giving him; he has got to have it. Every bird he wants to fly I am for. ICBM, IRBM, Polaris—you have got to have them. The other side has got to have them; they have got them; you are going to have them but you are 2 or 3 years behind him, but you will catch up to him, so you will both be loaded; you will have missiles coming out of your ears.

It is then a standoff. Do you think anybody is going to fire one of those? If you do you are out of your mind. But they will fight. The Good Book says "there will be wars and rumors of wars to the end of time"—and there will be; that is "the nature of the beast," there will be.

Ah, somebody will say "You do not think you can fight Russian divisions, do you? We are not going to fight Russia on the ground." Then I am supposed to shut up and drop dead. That is the end of the argument. That is nonsense.

I know that. He has got two and a half million in his army, and they are better equipped than you will ever be the way we are going. He has done over his army, modernized it one and one-half times since World War II, one and one-half times, everything; he is terrific. You have not.

Fifty percent of your hardware in the Army, 50 percent is World War II stuff, 50 percent. Add 15 percent more and you have got obsolescent Korea hardware. Sixty-five percent of the hardware of the United States is obsolescent World War II and Korea hardware. And that is the kind of hardware you want to send your boys out to fight with?

Would you send the Air Force against the Russians with B-17's or P-51 Mustang fighters tomorrow?

What do you want to send the Army out like that for?

Did you see "Pork Chop Hill" downtown this week? That is what your Army will have to fight with, the wrong war, the wrong hardware. That was Korea. That was not good then, and certainly not now, and that is more than half of what you have got.

Two hundred million dollars in this bill to modernize the Army. Ha, ha, ha. Well, now, is not that a joke? We write into that bill $200 million to be used for Nike-Zeus or Army modernization provided there are promising breakthroughs in the long-haired development. Well, I know what the Army long-haired flat-heeled scientists are going to do with that $200 million. They will use three-quarters of it for Nike-Zeus. Oh, you ought to hear these boys: Nike-Zeus. What a field day these Olympians are having in this year of our Lord—Nike-Zeus. That is what they are going to do.

Why, the Army will not get even a new truck out of the $200 million. You wait and see; and, God willing, I will be back here next year to tell you what they did with that $200 million. You wait and see. Oh, they are fast on their feet.

And they are not so hot in R. & D. The Army spent millions of dollars to make us a new tank. Great deal. We go over to the proving grounds to see this great new American tank that R. & D. has got up for us—with a British gun. Is not that great? A great tank, but a British gun.

What happened to the American gun? Oh, somebody with birds on his shoulder said the English gun is better, the best we could buy.

Now, this is a serious matter. I believe—I believe this sincerely, I want you to understand me, I have been fighting about this all year in the committee—I believe the only kind of war we will fight will be limited war. We will not be fighting Russia. When they are set to have a cancer burst somewhere, when they are set to have a rash break out, it is going to break out at different ends of the world on the same day, 10,000 miles apart; and the local troops will have been infiltrated, and down to the battalion level there will be Russian commanders, and technicians, and logicians, every key position will be filled by Russians. In the line they will have their commissars. And in your line you will have your mercenaries. You two big brave boys. Great United States of America. Great Soviet Russia. How surely can you rely on the mercenaries?

You want to cut your Army; you have got to balance this budget. I want to balance the budget for you. Restore my 900,000 to the Army; give me the division back you have taken away. Do not take another this year.

You have taken this. The Army is hurting. Give me the 25,000 marines; give me back my 6 combat battalions that you used at Lebanon. I need them tomorrow; give them back to me. The whole thing will cost you $130 million. You still have $250 million under the budget. I am not going over the budget.

Now, a lot of people have said to me: "Look, FLOOD, do not introduce those amendments here because you will get licked. Let us wait until we go to the other body." I am fed up with that up to here. I am sick and tired that in the House of Representatives, the greatest deliberative body in the world, I must stand by when my conscience tells me what to do, and to permit a conference committee, a third house of conference, to act. That is an evil thing. The most dangerous thing under our system of government is this conference system. It is bad; I think it is unconstitutional; it should be examined and purged, something done about it. I am not going to withhold my amendments and let a conference committee write my law.

Not me. I will introduce amendments that I want to introduce and this House will act, if only I am the one who votes for them. I think it is time you did the same thing. Never mind about the other body. We have a right to debate and vote here. Never mind the other body; never mind the third-house conference committee. Do away with the conference committee. It is stultifying. Did you hear that, do you know that, it is stultifying. Wake up.

Let us vote amendments up or down; never mind this fancy footwork. It is a bad thing.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Chairman, it is most unfortunate that the committee did not see fit to include funds for an aircraft carrier. I should like to add my voice to that of the many persons in and out of the military departments who feel strongly that an additional aircraft carrier is vital to our needs. I make no more pretension to competence in this field than the members of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. However, it is my strong conviction that as laymen we should all give the most serious consideration to the views of the professionals in matters of this kind. It is my understanding that the Defense Department with its comprehensive view of the overall defense picture, balancing

the needs of the respective military, naval, and air arms, believes that such a carrier is essential. The Navy Department with its intimate knowledge of the requirements for maintaining our global security also is absolutely convinced that to do its job properly it needs such an aircraft carrier.

Our preoccupation with space matters and missiles has warped the judgment of many people in and out of government. Like the young student whose father recently complained that he knew all about space but could not add two and two properly, we are prone to neglect the conventional but essential aspects of military and civil affairs. Certainly ballistic missiles, however necessary they may be, do not render obsolete our conventional weapons either in a global war or particularly in limited local war situations. It is the latter with which we have been faced many times since World War II. On those occasions the aircraft carrier has been an essential part of our strategy. Carriers are extremely mobile and versatile weapons. Obviously, the developments in modern warfare have rendered our earlier World War II carriers obsolescent. The new types of planes carried aboard the ships require advance design and capabilities of the carrier. In almost every respect the supercarrier will do a better job in cutting down accidents in landings and takeoffs. They will have a capacity which was lacking in the earlier carriers that will make them incomparably more effective by reason of the amount of fuel, weapons of all kinds, and types and number of planes that they can carry.

The principal point that I am attempting to make is that we must have balance in matters of defense. I believe that it would be disastrous if we were to concentrate solely to missiles and similar weapons. The spirit, courage, and ingenuity of the American fighting man cannot be installed in a missile. We still have a great need for ships, especially aircraft carriers manned by the fine American personnel that have served us so well in all our military crises.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, as my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania has already indicated to you, I am going to offer an amendment to this Defense Department appropriation bill to strike from the bill the procurement funds in an amount of $200 million for Bomarc.

At the very outset, though, I would be remiss if I did not today say what an honor and what a wonderful education it has been to serve on the Defense Subcommittee of this great Committee on Appropriations. I can truthfully say that there is no committee of this House or subcommittee of this House that works harder and longer hours than does this subcommittee. I know that from my own personal experience.

I can also say that I know of no subcommittee that has considered legislation on a more bipartisan, nonpartisan if you wish, basis than has this distinguished subcommittee. We might have argued and pulled at one another's hair, as the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania said, on certain facets of this bill, and I agree in the main with the basics of this bill, but when the chips were down the vote was on a bipartisan basis.

Yes, I offered my amendment in the subcommittee and it lost by a very close vote of 11 to 8.

I also would be remiss, Mr. Chairman, if I did not say what a distinguished chairman, a most preeminently fair chairman, we have heading our committee in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. He has conducted the hearings with fairness, with complete candor, and I can say he is one of the finest gentlemen it has ever been my privilege to know.

Of course, I can say equally the same thing and equally as much for the distinguished ranking minority member of this committee, my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. As you all know he is one of the most able and well-liked Members of Congress. He has been very helpful to me. When I spoke to him about offering my amendment, he said, "BILL, you go ahead and do what in your good judgment you think is right." As to the amendment which I will offer later, I have these brief remarks to make.

Let us look at the record—in the defense of the continental United States—against a manned aircraft attack.

At the outset I want to emphasize that I have no ax to grind for any of the armed services—nor do I want to become involved in an interservice fight. But the facts must be pointed out.

Defense authorities feel we do need protection against manned aircraft today—and I agree. What do we have in the way of missiles fired from the ground against enemy aircraft? Aside from the Navy Talos and several other missiles with a capacity against low-flying aircraft, the Army has developed two Nike air defense missiles—the Ajax and the Hercules. The Ajax now is operational at approximately 200 batteries. It is no longer being produced, having been superseded by the Nike Hercules, a much improved air defense weapon with a range of approximately 80 miles and an atomic warhead. The Nike-Hercules now in operational at some 50 batteries.

The Air Force has initiated another antiaircraft missile system, a ground-to-air weapon—the Bomarc. The Bomarc program was started in 1951. It now is 4 years behind schedule. It was not until a little over a year ago that it finally successfully shot down a slow 300-mile-an-hour World War II B-17 Drone. The Bomarc A has had its only success against subsonic targets. Its only firing at a supersonic target was completely unsuccessful. In range even the Bomarc A has not approached its 200-mile objective.

After 9 long years, there is not yet an operational Bomarc site with the Bomarc A, the first missile in the system. Some Bomarc A missiles now are on order. With delivery of these, the Bomarc A program will be concluded. The present dispute involves only the Bomarc B. On paper, the Bomarc B is an improvement on the "A," having a different propulsion system, different guidance, and a designed hoped-for on drawing board range of 400 miles.

The funds of which I am speaking today include $200 million for procurement for the Bomarc B program and $84.6 million for testing and evaluation. My amendment takes nothing from Bomarc A which is completely funded. The Department of Defense sought an additional $162.7 million for procurement, but this amount was eliminated by the Appropriations Committee.

My objective is to eliminate the remaining $200 million for procurement for fiscal 1960.

The committee report on page 16 on the defense appropriation says:

> The committee would be willing to appropriate the full budget estimate and more if it had full confidence in the proposed Bomarc missile—if it had the assurance that the system would actually work. The contractor for the missile has already received over a period of years commitments in excess of $1.1 billion. Before further commitments and expenditures pile up, a hard, new look should be given to the proposed Bomarc and the whole air-defense problem.

The Defense Department concept of air defense in depth has obvious merit. Nike-Hercules would cover the distance of 80 miles from the area being defended. On paper, Bomarc B would reach out to 400 miles. Manned interceptors would cover ranges beyond this. If we could spend money today and buy this concept, I would be 100 percent in favor of it, and would not be offering my proposed amendment.

The fact is, of course, that no funds voted today would do any such thing.

The Air Force wants to produce the Bomarc B based on highly inconclusive tests of the Bomarc A. The Air Force doesn't even have a B ready for full testing. The Air Force claim that the manufacturer's first test flight a few days ago was highly successful is a gross exaggeration. If the B fails to meet its programed requirements to the same extent as the A, we shall have spent billions without improving to the slightest degree our National Defense against manned aircraft.

Even if the Bomarc B does live up to its programed requirements, it will be of little value by the time it becomes available in an acceptable operational role.

The Air Force's own date for the first operational Bomarc B is early 1961. Even if the program continues on schedule, the missile will operate with minimum capacity until 1964.

Who in this House believes that the Soviet threat in 1964 or later will be primarily a threat of manned aircraft? The long-range ballistic missile is not a threat today, but it will have become one by the time the first Bomarc B is operational in 1961 and certainly will be the major danger long before 1964 and certainly thereafter.

We thus are being asked to vote $200 million additional now in order to have a

weapon which will be outmoded and obsolete by the time it joins the U.S. defense arsenal.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that one point?

Mr. MINSHALL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman is aware with reference to Bomarc that if and when Bomarc B is operational—about a 2 to 3 year period—on or about the same date, the Russian Air Force will have operational, most probably, since we will, its Hound Dog air-to-ground missile; which means that the Russians will be firing an air-to-ground missile from Russian airplanes 500 miles away from the target, and the extreme range of the Bomarc is 400 miles. So on the day Bomarc is operational it will be 100 miles short of its target at maximum range.

Mr. MINSHALL. I am glad the gentleman brought out that point. I shall go into it later. But I should like to interject at this time, that Bomarc, even if an air-to-ground missile were within range, does not have the capability of hitting a Hound Dog-type missile.

These millions of dollars in the 1960 budget constitute only a fraction of Bomarc cost. The Bomarc program, by the Air Force's own estimate, already has cost approximately $2 billion. It is expected to cost between $3 and $4 billion more by 1962. This does not include the SAGE control system on which Bomarc B is completely dependent. SAGE will have involved a cumulative expenditure of another $7½ billion.

I cannot understand the validity of committing ourselves to additional billions of dollars or an additional $200 million for a weapons system which will not be available in quantity until its usefulness has passed.

Let me emphasize that Bomarc is not a missile which will knock down enemy ballistic missiles. This is not its purpose. Nor is it a defense against air-to-ground missiles which may be launched by enemy bombers against our surface targets. It would only have a capability against air-breathing, ground-to-ground missiles or manned aircraft. The Russian emphasis is on ICBM's against which the Bomarc is useless.

Never have the Congress and the public been subjected to a more professional sales and promotion campaign than has been characterized by this billion dollar boondoggle.

These high-pressure salesmen in and out of uniform have parlayed an unproven—and as yet unavailable—weapon into a $2 billion operation. They have every intention of doubling that figure if we in Congress do not call a halt.

Proponents have taken the Bomarc A—a miserably unsuccessful weapon—and increased its range and accuracy with a series of supercharged promises and veiled half-truths. A classic example of this is the full page advertisement on the Bomarc which appeared recently in publications throughout the country. To the uninformed, the impression is very definitely left that the Bomarc is on site—ready to fire to defend our homes. The truth of the matter is that after spending $2 billion on the program, we do not have one single Bomarc unit deployed in the defense of this country. After spending $2 billion and 9 years—we do not have one cent's worth of protection out of the Bomarc system. In fact, the Air Force will not even have a Bomarc A unit operational until this fall.

My conviction is that we should "wash out" the program completely. Since we have spent so much money on it already, perhaps it is discretionary to provide some funds for further testing and evaluation. So far as I am concerned, this program promises nothing except more promises. In deference to those of my colleagues who do not share my conviction, however, I am willing to give Bomarc enough rope with which to hang itself. This rope is in the $84.6 million for testing and evaluation provided by our committee in the bill now before you.

I do not pretend to be a military expert who is wise enough to tell the Defense Department what mixture of air defense weapons is desirable. I am quite prepared to agree with those who are authorities that our best defense system would be Nike-Hercules, Bomarc, present manned century series interceptors and such long-range to be acquired interceptors as the F-108. But the program we are asked to vote for today would not give us that mixture until the threat is no longer from manned aircraft.

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

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to say that I expect to support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Ohio. As I understand it, if the gentleman's amendment prevails, $200 million for the procurement of Bomarc will be stricken from the bill, but there will remain in the bill $84.5 million for testing and evaluating the Bomarc program; is that correct?

Mr. MINSHALL. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS. I certainly think we should stop, look, and listen before spending $200 million for the procurement of a missile that has never been produced, and never been fired, with no record of any kind but the miserable record of failure.

Mr. MINSHALL. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and I certainly agree with him.

The argument has been made that the Russians will follow a ballistic missile attack with an attack of manned bombers, using their own mix of attacking weapons. It is claimed Bomarc would thus be useful even in 1963.

This does not seem feasible to me. Bomarc B will be dependent upon a $7 billion SAGE system—semiautomatic ground environment. These electronic computer control centers are not scheduled to be hardened against attack by ballistic missile. So that the initial ballistic missile attack would deprive us even of the capability of using Bomarc in those later years against aircraft coming in after the first waves of ballistic missiles.

Mr. Chairman, to summarize:

Bomarc is a $2 billion failure.

The Bomarc program, launched in 1952, has cost nearly $2 billion, yet has not produced a single operational missile on site.

Tests of Bomarc A repeatedly revealed its unreliability against subsonic targets. In its one effort against a supersonic target, it failed miserably. It never reached its 200-mile-range objective.

Bomarc B was evolved from Bomarc A. On paper it shows changes in propulsion and guidance systems and an increase in hoped-for range capability. Like Bomarc A, Bomarc B is useless against ICBM's.

During the next 3 years, it will cost $3 to $4 billion more to develop the Bomarc system.

And today after spending 9 years and nearly $2 billion, we still are not receiving one cent's worth of protection from the Bomarc system.

Bomarc will be obsolescent before it is operational.

It will be at the very least 2 years before Bomarc B may become available. Even if the program is on schedule, it is expected that the missile would operate on minimum capacity until 1964. Our best estimates show that as early as 1961 the threat will be the ICBM. Bomarc is useless against such missiles.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to take this opportunity as a Member of the Ohio delegation in the Congress and the House to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL], for the hard work and the excellent study he has given to his assignment as a member of this very important subcommittee. All of us in the Ohio delegation are very proud of the record he has made here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MINSHALL. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, would be the last speaker.

Mr. MAHON. That is the understanding.

Mr. FORD. Does the gentleman from Texas have any other speaker?

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. FORD. That being the case, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues on the committee in the sentiments they have expressed as to the chairman and ranking member. This is my first year to serve as a member of this committee. It is an interesting, challenging, and frustrating experience. During the hearings, senior members of the committee often pointed out the impossibility of any one person ever being completely informed on all of the elements of our complicated and huge defense system. I was continually and progressively impressed with the importance of improving our systems of obtaining information and exercising informed control over the expenditures of funds so that Congress can make its

maximum contribution to an adequate defense system on the most economic and efficient basis.

Almost everyone, I believe, will agree that this country can afford and the American citizen is willing to pay for an adequate defense system to assure, insofar as possible in the world in which we live, our peace and security. The extent of our military undertakings, however, must be limited by common sense and our economic capabilities, with due consideration to other requirements of Government and the overall drain of Government on the economy.

We are considering a defense budget and appropriation, but it is not a war budget and appropriation. Rather, it is to provide for peace. All of us hope for more acceptable means. We must constantly continue to explore such, but for the moment the peace and security of the United States and of the free world must be maintained through strength; adequate strength to deter any possible aggressor.

Based on the unanimous, considered judgment of our military leaders, the budget submitted by the President and the Defense Department provides in the overall for an adequate defense posture. The committee, particularly the chairman, made certain that this question was specifically answered by each appropriate witness. In this respect, Secretary McElroy stated, at page 49, volume 1 of the hearings:

> Beyond 1962 I do not think there is too much value in our trying to guess. But in those years between now and 1962—which is as far as I think we can accurately judge—I think our position will still be one in which we will have adequate force to retaliate against an attacker, with the result that the effectiveness of that force will be sufficient to deter him from starting a general war.

General Twining, at the same page of the hearings, stated:

> I would like to concur in everything the Secretary said, but I would like to point out in addition on the military side of the house our planning is to do this clear down the road, even to 1964 and 1965, and to always have this under control. It depends upon the annual budget. That can change, but if we get the budgets we need to support the program we have in mind, the answer is "Yes."

He further answered "Yes" to the question, "Do we have in the present military budget, the groundwork, the necessary provisioning of ourselves that we can follow through and accomplish the objectives which you have suggested?" Each of the chiefs of the separate services, although having reservations about specific programs, similarly agreed to the overall adequacy.

That the budget as presented, as was the fact, is a good and well-considered budget, does not mean that there should be no changes in the provisions thereof. The preparation of budget recommendations is a long process. I am advised that work is already going forward in the Pentagon on the preparation of next year's budget. The fiscal year 1960 budget which the committee had before it was based upon conditions existing as of last summer and last fall. With the rapid changes in today's world, these conditions necessarily change. Secretary McElroy stated, at page 65 of the hearings:

> In all of these areas of new technology, Mr. Chairman, you find technical knowledge advances very rapidly, really almost month by month. As soon as we found that the program could be accelerated as our understanding of the technical problems involved advanced, we put in the additional funds. The reason we did not ask for these additional funds last year was that we did not know then how to make proper use of them. When we found that we could make proper use of additional funds we did so.

This was to explain the expenditure of an additional $114 million above the program for fiscal year 1959 on the Minuteman missile. The Defense Department regularly reprograms funds as conditions change, as it should do. Similarly, changed conditions between preparation of the budget and our consideration of it justifies some alterations.

There are many items which I would like to discuss with you, but I shall largely confine myself to the committee recommendations for changes in the Atlas and Minuteman missile program. General thinking is that these are weapons of general war rather than limited war. It must be recognized, however, that our ability in the missile field has a definite deterrent effect upon limited wars as well as general wars. The two, cannot be isolated and considered separately. Criticism has been made of the budget on the basis that it does not adequately provide for limited war forces. There can be no doubt of the desirability of improving our limited war capabilities, but the fact is, as per the testimony, that over 60 percent of this budget goes to those forces. The committee has made significant changes for the further strengthening of these elements.

Our objective is to deter, not to fight war, and thereby to preserve the peace. I refer to the missile as a deterrent weapon. To evaluate this, and particularly the numbers required, we must recognize the problems, questions, and differences of opinion which arise in determining what constitutes an adequate deterrent force. We most frequently hear that to deter war, we must have a sufficient military force, the will to use such force, and that any possible opponent must know and believe that we have both.

The real problem, though, is to determine how our various capabilities, as determined by the level of our military forces, will affect any aggressor in either starting or not starting a general or limited war, by reason of how he thinks that force would inflict damage upon him, or would affect our will to use that force. As the hearings moved along, I appreciated the complexity of this problem and the difficult decisions that lie ahead of us as to the size of a military force which we will maintain. Some believe that we would have an adequate deterrent force if we have sufficient response capability that with minimum warning of an attack, we could have enough on the way before the attack hits us, together with enough left over for surviving after the attack, to add up to a retaliatory strike that the opponent could not, or would not choose to absorb. Some believe that it is sufficient if we have such a retaliatory force to be capable of destroying the aggressor's population centers without regard to specific military targets.

It is most important that we analyze that on the basis of the effect that it would have on increasing the likelihood of limited wars. The important element, of course, is how it will affect the possible aggressor's thinking with regard particularly to our will to use our forces. This would have a very marked effect upon all of our diplomatic negotiations. Prior to this so-called missile era, we have endeavored to maintain a military striking force sufficient to destroy the military capabilities of any possible opponent. Therefore, in determining whether to start a limited war or a diplomatic position, any opponent must say to himself that we have the power to destroy him and his ability to destroy us. If, however, we are to adopt a concept with missiles that we have only a retaliatory force sufficient to destroy the opponent's population centers, then the possible opponent must, in determining whether or not to start a limited war or upon deciding upon the diplomatic position, determine whether or not we are willing to absorb destruction to stop him. In other words, instead of being in the position of saying to a possible opponent, "If you go too far, we will destroy you," we would in effect be placed in the position of saying, "If you go too far, we will destroy each other." Most important under such circumstances would be the possible opponent's estimate of our continued will to use the forces available to us, to either prevent or stop a limited war. For this reason, some people believe that in order to maintain an adequate deterrent force we must, in addition to our retaliatory capability, have sufficient missiles or other weapons to be able to knock out the opponent's significant military targets and means of devastating ourselves and our allies, as a means of stopping or preventing a limited war.

This also involves a most difficult problem of detecting the targets. I am inclined to believe that this is the type of deterrent force which we must develop. Whether or not this is feasible and whether or not we will undertake to develop such a force is the most difficult decision facing us militarily in the immediate years ahead.

Not so long ago, much was read in the press, giving specific figures of the so-called U.S. missile gap. I would first like to emphasize that these figures were not a fair basis for comparison. Figures used for the Soviet were based on their estimated capability, as opposed to what we will actually have in being. Estimated capability seldom measures up to what is actually done. A striking example of this is the previous estimated capability of the Soviet to have at this time a total of 600 or 700 advanced long-range bombers. They did not build them, have a much lesser number, and we have a clear superiority in this area.

Even if the figures were accurate, numbers alone form no sound basis for comparison. Recent studies have emphasized the importance of the effect of hardening the missile site. By hardening is meant the protecting of the missile in concrete and steel, underground. It appears to be proven that one hardened missile has the retaliatory effect of many missiles placed in an exposed position.

Some people have insisted that we should exactly match the Soviets in the numbers of our ICBM's. This is not the measure at all. If you contemplate what I have just previously said, you will appreciate that such could be too much for an adequate retaliatory deterrent force, and yet would be completely inadequate to give us a positive deterrent force capable of knocking out the aggressor's significant military targets and means of devastation.

It is important, I think, that we realize that the missile is a vehicle, a means to deliver a nuclear warhead. As such, it is only one of the means. Some have made an attempt to isolate the ICBM's and to judge the relative strength of the United States and the Soviet at a given time on this basis alone. This cannot be done. Basically, as a delivery system or a vehicle, the ICBM gains speed and time. The ICBM is capable of delivering its warhead to Moscow or from Moscow in 30 minutes, as compared to the 6-hour delivery time for the bomber presently in use. Its bomb load is smaller, but it eliminates much of the necessity for overseas bases. There are many other factors too numerous to discuss, such as reliability, reusability, and so forth.

The President's budget, as presented, I think provided for a well-considered program. Since that time, however, there have been substantial changes. When the budget was in its final stages of preparation, the Atlas missile had not been fully tested. Since that time, there have been significant developments as to the Minuteman. The Minuteman is a solid-propellent advanced missile. I think we must recognize, it is presently not a weapon in being, but is one under development. I think it is important to note that the full amount of the Air Force requests for both the Minuteman and the Atlas was approved by the Defense Department, and in turn by the President. Because of subsequent developments, however, it is estimated that additional funds could be expended on the Minuteman, and that we could thereby speed up the estimated time when it would be available as a weapon in our arsenal by approximately 6 months. To accomplish this, the committee has recommended an addition of $87 million to the program.

Although much is claimed for the Minuteman, with confident estimates that it will prove out, it was uniformly agreed that the best way of increasing our missile capabilites in the years 1961, 1962, and 1963, which were considered to be the critical years, was by acceleration and expansion of the Atlas program. This again becomes a reasonable consideration by reason of developments since the budget was prepared. Prior to that time, the missile had not been fully tested. Since that time, the studies on the effect of hardening of the launching site have been completed. As a matter of fact, a new guidance system has been developed which permits the hardening of the Atlas missile sites.

As a result of changes in the situation, the committee proposes to add $85 million for incremental financing of an additional eight Atlas squadrons. The Congress should not be misled with reference to the real cost of this program. In addition to the $85 million for the missile itself, there will be required to carry out this expanded program, again on an incremental financing basis, that $193 million be added in the military construction program, which is the subject of a separate bill. The total additional funds for this year is thereby $278 million. To fully finance the eight additional squadrons in this and subsequent appropriations will require $1,360 million. I believe that the committee is justified in making these funds available, on the information available to it; but in my opinion it should not be considered as a directive to the Defense Department or the President that these funds should in all events be expended.

What is the changed situation? There is now no doubt that the Atlas is a good weapon. General Schriever, then Commander of the Ballistic Missile Division and now heading the Air Research and Development Command, testified to this effect before our committee and recommended an expanded program. As a matter of fact, even more ambitious programs were suggested. Different proposed alternatives and their costs appear at page 629 of volume 5 of the hearings. General Power of the Strategic Air Command, which has operational responsibility for the Atlas as well as our strategic bombers, had this to say:

> I think you should produce the Atlas at the maximum logical, practical rate, because you are going to get it first. It is the only ICBM weapon system that has really fired up to now and it is a good weapon. It is almost a proven weapon. It has had a very successful R. and D. But read the papers, and you would think the missile had been unsuccessful. Actually, it has been more successful than we ever expected it to be. It has had a very high degree of success. I think we ought to get it as fast as we can, and get it in hardened sites. I think it is a very good deterrent weapon system.

There has been some suggestion that, because of its liquid-fuel characteristics, the Atlas would become obsolete in the very near future, or as soon as the Minuteman was operational. So far as I know, no responsible military opinion supported this. Refinements and improvements can be expected in the Atlas. Secretary McElroy summed up this very well when he stated that the Minuteman will complement and not replace the liquid-fueled missile. Both the Atlas and the Titan will carry a larger warhead than is programed for the Minuteman, which will be more suitable against certain types of targets.

Just as I have indicated, with new developments, there is and should be a continuing review and rereview of programs within the Defense Department. During the course of our hearings, we were advised that the Air Force was reviewing the requirement for additional Atlas squadrons. Before the bill was reported by the subcommittee, we were informed that following such review the Air Force had recommended to the Secretary of Defense the eight additional squadrons for which funds are provided in the committee bill. Although in January, when Secretary McElroy and General Twining appeared before the committee as our first witnesses, it was made quite clear by them that they were not recommending an additional or accelerated Atlas program by April; but when former Secretary Quarles appeared before the committee, he had this to say:

> We are, however, restudying it in the light of subsequent experience, particularly the test experience with Atlas, as the most significant aspect of the thing. I would say that it is still possible, we feel, within the next few months that there could be a better mix, shall I say, of these programs than the ones presented at that time.

On the basis of these and other developments, I think the committee and the Congress is quite justified in providing the funds required to carry out the additional eight-squadron Atlas program. These reviews should be continued. If the Defense Department concurs in the recommendation and the President agrees, they will be available to execute the program without delay. Should this concurrence not be forthcoming, then the funds need not be released and expended. This is as I think it should be.

Several reductions have been made in this bill which have resulted in it being reported at about $319 million below the President's budget request. Some of these specific cuts I did not support in committee. Others which I did support did not prevail. I think that we must strive for increased economy and efficiency, while at the same time maintaining an adequate defense. Thereby, we in fact contribute to the maintaining of the best possible defense. The reductions of 1 percent in operation and maintenance and procurement are, in my opinion, well considered. We, together with the Executive, should continue to strive for means whereby we can eliminate waste, duplication, and inefficiency.

Nevertheless, I do support the overall committee bill. I think it is most significant and important that the committee has stayed within the President's budget request. As I have mentioned, all responsible military opinion expressed to the committee suggests that this in the overall is adequate to maintain the necessary deterrent effect and the peace and security. As additional testimony is received and the bill is considered in the other body, there will undoubtedly be some restorations. There may be justification for some increases or decreases. Generally speaking, however, I think that this must be kept within the area of the President's budget request, and that our conferees should insist upon this. Failure to do so, in light of the military testimony, would appear to be completely irresponsible.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned over what has happened to the Army of the United States since the advent of atomic warfare. I need not remind the Congress, except briefly, of the impact of air power on military thinking and planning as a result of experiences of World War II. The Hiroshima blast started off a growing philosophy of doubt for the need for land troops which we subscribed to increasingly through the years, despite our knowledge of numerical superiority by the Communist bloc Korea should have taught us the advisability of maintaining, at all times, a sufficient, modern Army, ready for any war.

In this era of the space age our U.S. Army finds itself in a situation similar to that faced by David when he went down to fight Goliath. David was armed with a sling and five smooth stones, Goliath carried a shield and sword and wore body armor. Our Army is also being asked to face a better equipped opponent and I feel that this is unnecessary.

You may well ask how this situation came about. Why is our Army not the most modern, the most mobile, the best equipped Army in the world? I'm afraid that all of us must share some of the blame for this. Ever since the end of World War II, with a short respite during the Korean war, we have been engrossed in the idea of putting all of our eggs in the massive retaliation basket. We have allocated tremendous amounts of money to the atomic weapons stockpiles, we have developed and built hundreds of modern airplanes, we have developed a number of guided and ballistic missiles, but we have, to all intents and purposes, overlooked the requirement to provide our Army with weapons and equipment that is adaptable to the atomic battlefield of today. I admit that Congress provided funds in last year's budget specifically for Army modernization, but there has been no major initiation of this program by the Department of Defense to date.

Very basically this is the situation facing the Army: There is not enough procurement money in this year's budget to replace the equipment that is wearing out or becoming obsolete, much less to attempt any modernization program. If this situation is permitted to continue our Army stocks will be steadily decreased and our preparedness will correspondingly decrease.

The Army Chief of Staff, General Taylor, realizes that this situation if it is permitted to continue will eventually mean a poorly equipped inadequate Army. He has proposed a 5-year program calling for the expenditure of $2.8 billion a year, which would provide $1.2 billion for producing new weapons and equipment for all the Army's active divisions and some of the National Guard and Reserve divisions, and some $200 million for tooling and production facilities. The Army admits that this plan involves some risks, but it would be a starting point for a modernization effort and for that reason it should be supported.

I sincerely believe that the American people want their sons who are serving in the Army to have the very best and latest equipment that can be found, and that they would be appalled if they did not think that every effort was being made to provide this equipment.

We should insure that the appropriations for fiscal year 1960 includes adequate funds for Army procurement of modern equipment and we should strongly urge the Department of Defense to utilize these funds without delay. Only by taking such action can this body be certain that we have done everything in our power to provide for a modern hard-hitting Army.

I have heard much of the Pentomic concept of smaller forces with greater weapon, offensive or defensive, capacity. As I understand the concept, it cannot materialize unless the troops have the most advanced weapons, and the background training to use them with superiority.

We need sufficient troops.

We need superior weapons.

I have been informed that one of our military men has recently stated:

> In terms of dollars, approximately 60 percent of the Army's inventory today was procured during World War II or the Korean war. Ten percent of it is pre-World War II vintage.

Let us see what we know the Soviet has. I am sure our intelligence is incomplete, but we believe they have—

First, 160 to 175 divisions;

Second, standardize small arms at 7.62 millimeters and have equipped their forces with these weapons;

Third, recoilless rifles and antitank guns that fire shaped charges;

Fourth, an excellent family of tanks up to a heavy tank;

Fifth, tracked armored personnel carriers;

Sixth, a family of helicopters; and

Seventh, estimated stockpile of items adequate to support a 300-division army for 6 months or more.

Is the U.S. Army outgunned and outmanned? Some of our experts tell us so. They ought to know. If they are armed with World War II and Korean weapons, they are outgunned.

The Army did an excellent job at Redstone Arsenal. Shall we quit there?

What do we need beside more troops? I believe we need—

First. Honest John rockets in infantry and and armor division and Little John rockets in its airborne divisions.

Second. An air-transportable M56 90-millimeter self-propelled gun.

Third. New tanks that weigh less, have greater operational range, and carry improved guns.

Fourth. The new M60 machinegun, a general purpose weapon.

These are just a few. I am not an Army man but I am interested in having a good Army. Now, if we are not going to give them numbers, let us give them sufficient appropriations for modern, the best possible, equipment.

In order to effect ground mobility the Army needs jeeps, mechanical mules, and most importantly, a lighter and faster armored personnel carrier, like the all-aluminum M113 personnel carrier.

Weapons and machines that will give our pentomic divisions the mobility and striking power that they must have if our Army is to be qualitatively superior to the Soviet army are available for production. The problem has been and is to obtain sufficient funds to produce them in sufficient quantity to give us qualitative superiority.

I am not privileged to set on either Armed Services or Appropriations. I know they work hard. I also know they are beset by the responsiblities of watchdogging the defense of this country. I salute the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] for his hard work and dedication to high purposes.

My purpose is to incite us to do a little more for our Army. It is a great, a necessary service; it should be given the opportunity to do what we intend for them, defend; and if attacked, counterattack; and above all, win. They cannot do the job without sufficient troops or the best modern weapons.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, the committee action in recommending an increase of $200 million for Army modernization is exceedingly wise and deserves the wholehearted support of this House.

This Nation cannot forget that it must be prepared to meet the sudden threat of conflict at thousands of points across the globe. The United States is the principal guarantor of peace. It is a major concern that we be prepared to keep that peace.

Yet the budget submitted for the Army provided approximately $1.2 billion for procurement of missiles and equipment, while it takes $1.4 billion to permit the Army to maintain its present inventory. There is a gap there, too, that requires attention.

This is what the committee has done in putting the $200 million back into the budget. This sum will allow the Army to maintain its present level of inventory and stay even with the wear-out and obsolescence rates. Some new equipment can now be put into the inventory.

This is a positive step in the right direction. It is a most important step when you consider that more than half of the Army's equipment was procured during World War II and the Korean war. Of the $14 billion equipment inventory that the Army has now, $5 billion consists of World War II models or older.

There are many disturbing things about the forces that now are programed to maintain the peace. We see, for instance, that under present strength ceilings, the Army must plan to cut by one-fourth the force it maintains as its top priority strategic reserve.

We see that the United States can only maintain its 8th Army at full strength in Korea by using wholesale

infusions of Korean personnel to fill the ranks. In Europe, our 7th Army depends on a large number of foreign nationals maintaining its lines of communication.

We have heard a good deal in recent years about more bang for a buck. Yet, while there have been pleasing exclamations about the advanced firepower that can be put in the soldier's hands, the truth remains that it has not been put in his hands. As the committee notes on page 58 of its report, the budget does not make adequate provision for equipping the Army with the firepower weapons it has finally developed, particularly the new M-14 rifle, the new machinegun and the Davy Crockett weapon.

In fact, at the recommended rates of production in the fiscal 1960 budget as General Taylor testified to the Appropriations Committee, the forces in Europe will not be reequipped with the M-14 rifle until fiscal year 1962; the Strategic Army Corps Reserve until 1964 and the entire Regular Army until 1968 or later.

Let me point out a way in which this slowness of mobilization affects the readiness of our reserve military structure. We have heard in recent years of Trainfire, a system of rifle marksmanship training that has been introduced in the Regular Army. It is a combination of the old musketry and combat range techniques with new mechanical equipment that is available.

That method was widely introduced in the regular services last year. It is a matter of providing new ranges. Shortage of funds is slowing the building of these special ranges and it will take several years for the system to spread Army-wide. Yet it is a definite improvement over present known distance range training. To deny it to any soldiers is to slow down their training and weaken the effectiveness of our forces in being.

While it may slowly reach the Army as a whole, it will be still later in coming to the National Guard and Reserves that are a vital part of the Nation's strength. The National Guardman estimates this month, on the basis of advice from CONARC, that not until fiscal 1962 will funds be available for construction at active installations and State-owned camps to provide this type of training.

From training to the front lines, this slowness of modernization affects the Army. We have heard a good deal about the new Pentomic divisions and the advantages they are claimed to represent. Yet these divisions will reach maximum effectiveness only when modern equipment has been issued to each of them.

Their flexibility depends on the new mobility and communications equipment designed for the nuclear battlefield, but we have not yet been able to replace the World War II types of communications in the hands of troops. And what about the allied forces on which we may place heavy reliance in time of war?

In order to understand the Army's need for modernization, it is necessary to balance the present inventory of $14 billion against a $20 billion modern inventory required to support combat forces in the first 6 months after D-day.

Also, we must look at the Soviet Union and consider that, since World War II, the Soviets have re-equipped their 160 to 175 divisions with newly designed weapons, transport, and other equipment. In selected categories, the U.S.S.R. has five times the modern equipment that we have.

They have standardized their small arms—rifles, light machine guns, and submachine guns—at 7.62 millimeter and have equipped their forces with these weapons.

In addition to surface-to-surface missiles of ranges from 10 miles to 1,500 miles, they have developed a new family of guns and howitzers, mortars—one of 240 millimeter is judged to be capable of firing an atomic warhead—recoilless rifles, and antitank guns with shaped charges.

They have an excellent family of tanks up to a heavy tank with a 122-millimeter gun. They have tracked armored personnel carriers with an estimated range of 165 miles.

They have standardized on a diesel engine that they use in 15 pieces of equipment—tanks, self-propelled artillery, personnel carriers, and so on. It is estimated that a tank powered with one of those engines burns no more than a gallon of gas a mile. They have a family of helicopters similar to ours, except that they have also exhibited a giant one capable of carrying a 27,000-pound payload.

Despite the fact that they can plan to wage war with inner lines of communication, they are also reported to be building a large fleet of long-range air transports. Most, if not all, of these modern pieces of equipment are in the hands of their troops—not in a paper budget.

Competent authorities have estimated that the Russian stockpile of items in readiness are adequate to support a 300-division army for 6 months.

General Taylor has summed up Soviet advances in these fields by observing that the second generation of Soviet equipment now appearing "typifies simplicity in design, mobility, ease of manufacture, interchangeability, and standardization."

I have already pointed out that our own forces still largely are armed with World War II and Korean equipment. The noticeable exceptions are the surface-to-surface missile commands, and the question that may be raised immediately is whether we have enough.

But the most important question remains the armament of the pentomic division and the battle group. The combat effectiveness of these divisions is directly related to the modern equipment available within them. The Army has not been allotted funds in fiscal 1959 or in fiscal 1960 to obtain the equipment needed to modernize the divisions.

What does the Army need?

For atomic firepower, it needs Honest John rockets in infantry and armor divisions and Little John rockets in its airborne divisions. Atomic warheads are needed for 8-inch guns. These are first-generation, division-type atomic weapons. Funds are needed to provide enough production so that our divisions can be armed with them.

For conventional firepower, many more items are needed:

A conventional artillery piece similar to the versatile 175-millimeter gun which combines the advantages of a howitzer and a gun. New tanks that weigh less, can move farther and fire farther. New machineguns already approved, and new M-14 rifles just going into production. The present funding rate, incidentally, would stretch out rearming the entire peacetime Army with these new weapons until 1975.

Take communications. The Appropriations Committee has heard of new radios that represent a definite step forward. There are plans for new drones and battlefield surveillance instruments.

Take ground mobility. There is a lighter, faster, all-aluminum personnel carrier that has been approved that the Army should have. In the air, the Army needs more helicopters and light aircraft.

All of these items are ready for production. The problem is money. If the Government tries to stretch out this procurement too long, it runs a risk of having to duplicate sources of supply while two generations of weapons are in the hands of troops.

How much can we afford to spend on such modernization? How much can we afford to spend on survival? We have dispatched troops to all corners of the earth to maintain freedom and insist on peace. We owe it to them to see that they are equipped to carry out their mission, and to see that no lives are lost because of inferior arms.

Nor is this something that can be ended with one effort. We need to keep searching out new and better arms, and buying them when we are assured they are necessary. Modernization is never finished.

We are only making a start toward giving the Army what it needs. I wish we were doing a great deal more, but I commend the committee on having added $200 million to correct a serious deficiency in the Army budget. To those who would cavil over this cost, I would like to quote some words of Sir Winston Churchill, delivered in the House of Commons in the year 1675. This, quite obviously, was an ancestor of the present Sir Winston, but he too, stood up for adequate defense of his country when he reminded critics:

> Saving money is no argument, when saving the nation is the case.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have considered today a subject which is of great concern to every man, woman, and child in the free world. We have been asked to vote some $38 billion for the operation of our Defense Establishment. As we should expect when dealing with a subject so vital, there has been a good deal of controversy, both on and off the floor.

We can never be sure that the funds we appropriate for national security will be sufficient. We must rely on the best judgment of those who have held the hearings and worked on the bill and presented their arguments to us.

The committee has given careful study to the many provisions of this bill. I commend the members for their work and for the manner in which this bill has been handled on the floor.

Through the years, I have always supported every dollar that the Department of Defense and the committee felt was necessary for the defense of this country and I shall do so again today.

ARMY GROUND TROOPS NEED MODERN WEAPONS CAPABILITY FOR BRUSH FIRE WARS

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank and commend the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and members of his Defense Department Subcommittee, for their diligence and thorough study of these budgetary estimates and their patience during long hours of testimony from the top civilian and military officials at the Pentagon.

As a member of the full Appropriations Committee, I was particularly pleased with our committee's action in providing for more funds than was asked for in the budget for equipment modernization. Funds for Army procurement have been increased by $200 million to provide for advances in the Nike-Zeus anti-ICBM program and equipment modernization.

MANY NEW WEAPONS DEVELOPED AT SPRINGFIELD ARMORY

The research and development of many of these new and smaller weapons has been accomplished at the historic Springfield Armory in my home city of Springfield, Mass. The armory is now in pilot line production of the newly adopted M–14 Springfield rifle, and it is my understanding that the first of this type of shoulder weapon will be off the production line in about a month. In addition, the armory is also setting up the pilot line for the recently adopted M–60 machinegun.

Only last week, the Ordnance Weapons Command at Rock Island, Ill., awarded contracts to the Springfield Armory for pilot line production of the M–73, 7.62 millimeter tank machinegun, and the T175E2 .50 caliber machinegun.

ARMORY WILL PRODUCE NEW TANK MACHINE-GUNS

The M73 tank machine gun was designed and developed at the Springfield Army and was standardized and adopted by the Army last May 14. It is scheduled for use on the M60 tank, the Army's new main battle tank. The T175E2 .50 tank machine gun was also developed at the Springfield Armory for tank use. Initial delivery date for the M73 weapon from the Armory pilot lines will be in June 1960 while the T175E2 is scheduled for delivery in October 1960. It is my understanding that studies are currently being made by the Army on both weapons for further application to other ground combat vehicles.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation of an additional $200 million for equipment modernization is necessary if we are to have a program for limited war preparation, as outlined by Army Chief of Staff, General Taylor, before the subcommittee.

UNITED STATES FACES LIMITED WAR THREAT FOR MANY YEARS

Here we are dealing with the question of limited versus general war and, as the committee report states, it is doubtful whether this issue can ever be fully resolved. However, the United States must have the modern weapons at its command to deal with brush-fire type wars that may erupt. The threat of such warlike incidents, such as the crisis over Berlin, or those over Formosa and the Mid-East last year, may be with us for a long time. The Soviets will exert pressure on the West in any section of the world where they think we are weak, and one of their pressure exercises might result in shooting. Our Armed Forces, particularly the ground troops of our Army, must have a capability to cope with such incidents and make sure that the localized brush fire war does not grow into an all-out nuclear war. American troops must be adequately equipped with the best and most modern weapons.

FIRST M–14 SPRINGFIELD RIFLE TO BE PRODUCED THIS MONTH

Our distinguished colleague, Congressman SIKES, a member of the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee, pointed out on the floor of this House last August 19 that American ground forces were sent into Lebanon carrying the M–1 rifle that had been adopted by the Army in 1936 and Browning automatics adopted in 1918. In contrast, Arab Republic troops were carrying modern lightweight rifles and machineguns somewhat similar to the new M–14 Springfield rifle and the M–60 machinegun. It is gratifying to know at this time that this situation is fast changing and soon our ground troops will begin receiving supplies of the new M–14 Springfield rifle and the M–60 machinegun. The first M–14 will come off the pilot line at the Springfield Armory within a few weeks.

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Chairman, I am very much disturbed by the fact that the Defense Department appropriation bill before us does not carry the requested $260 million for a new aircraft carrier. I realize that the subcommittee has a large and difficult task in writing a bill of the proportions of this one, but they can err. I am convinced that they have erred in eliminating this vital item.

Providing for this carrier this year means that it would be available 5 years from now. I believe that we can rely on the statements of the Department of the Navy authorities when they tell us that in 5 years our *Essex* class carriers will not be operational and at that time we will have only 10 carriers capable of transporting the modern manned aircraft.

I am sure that a study of my record will disclose to the membership of this body that my record has not been one of wild spending; in fact, I am sure you would agree that my record is very definitely on the conservative side, but I have supported necessary defense expenditures. This carrier definitely falls in the necessity class. I want the House to know that I definitely favor the inclusion of funds for this carrier in the fiscal 1960 budget for the Department of Defense.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the remaining portion of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 33 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if this bill as passed by the House today fails in its objective there will shortly be no need to pass further bills of any character or spend more money for any purpose.

This is the one vital bill of the session under which the Nation survives or perishes.

And if we fail, if this bill fails to serve the purpose for which it is reported by the committee to the Congress and serve it adequately, it is merely a question of time before all these other purposes for which we are spending money and for which we are legislating, will revert to the Russians, and nothing else will matter.

Mr. Chairman, this is an annual bill. We have been passing these bills regularly every year. And the bills which we previously passed since 1945 have failed to achieve the purpose for which they were enacted.

Judged by the supreme criterion of results secured, they have dropped behind the objective. Every year we have been slipping. Every year we have fallen further behind; further behind in world leadership; further behind in our race with Russia; further behind in our capability and capacity for national defense, and further behind in the security of world civilization. If anybody has any objection to that statement, or facts which will contradict it, let us have them now.

At the close of the World War in 1945, upon the deck of a great battleship, we summoned the representatives of Japan and Germany, the two greatest military powers of their day; we said, "You sign on the dotted line." And they signed.

We did not negotiate with them. We did not go through all this rigmarole we have been going through over in Korea and at Geneva. We said, "Sign," and they signed.

Why? Because we were at that time the greatest military power the world had ever seen. We had the greatest Navy, we had the greatest Army, we had the greatest Air Force, we had the greatest undersea force ever mobilized.

We had developed that vast military potential, mobilized that magnificent Army and launched those armadas of seapower with just such bills here in this Chamber as the bill which we have before us today.

And America was safe, and the world was safe.

Now it is with no little trepidation that we view the world situation today. Time marches on. And we have not kept pace with it. We have been slipping while Russia has steadily forged ahead.

Oh, I know that high-ranking officers have come before the committee and said, "We are perfectly safe; we can win any war; we can destroy any nation. Have no concern about it at all." They have lulled us to sleep with that sort of sedative, and they got away with it until the Russians put their sputnik into orbit. They couldn't deny that. That set them back on their heels. They could not explain that away. We had

been trying to put a missile through the stratosphere over a long period and we had not been able to do it, and for more than a year after we were not able to do it. But they did it.

And it is still there. It is still there for the world to see—our allies, our enemies and the neutrals.

And we are still earthbound. Of course there are the monkeys. But the Russians made monkeys of us long ago.

So these last bills have failed. That is no fault of the great committee which reported them out, and which has reported out this bill. It certainly was not through any neglect of the great chairman who is in charge of this bill today, and who, in my opinion, after many years of observation is not only one of the greatest American statesmen of his time, but has ahead of him a brilliant career as one of the greatest American statesmen of the future—if we have any future.

No one can say today, not even these beribboned and bemedaled gentlemen from the Pentagon, whether we have any future. Certainly not unless this bill is superior to those reported out in former years.

That is the question before us this afternoon. Will this bill do the work? Will it retrieve the situation? If not, then we are nearing the end of everything. The shores of time are strewn with the wreckage of nations that thought they were impregnable—nations in which personal considerations were allowed to usurp the place of the national interest. So it behooves us to consider carefully what is before us. It could be the last war bill we will have opportunity to consider.

The amount of money in the bill is comparatively unimportant. It is not so much a matter of how much money the bill appropriates. You could have ten times the amount of money in this bill and still fail completely.

It is how you spend the money that you do have in the bill. It might be possible to take this bill and cut it down one-half and take the other half and spend it as it ought to be spent and get a better bill than you have before you today. The thing to be emphasized is how you spend it. And we have not been spending it on the right things during these last years. Nobody can deny that.

We have failed miserably in that respect. And as a result the United States is today a second-rate power. All we have is the chance of redemption—that is a mere chance. It is later—much later—than many of us think. We have been sleeping. We have not been spending the money in these bills for the right things and in the right way these later years. Too many other considerations have been allowed to affect our judgment when the bill was sent up here from the Pentagon.

And it must also be noted that even if we pass the bill that we ought to pass, a bill that will make us impregnable, a bill that will keep the Russians on the other side, that still does not mean that the war potential of our allies will also be taken care of.

The truth of the matter is that we might as well concede now that when we finally fight, if fight we must, we will have to fight alone. Now, none of our allies would willingly desert us, of course, but they will be in a position directly under the gun and will have no choice. Unless we in this bill make America strong enough to take care of ourselves, nobody else is going to take care of us.

In all of these last wars England and France protected us. After war was declared, England and France kept the enemy off us until we could get ready and arm ourselves and train an army. That is no longer possible. There is no longer any ally anywhere who can protect us for one day, one hour or one minute.

The war will be fought in America. Khrushchev has told us that. He said, "You have always fought in Europe and Asia, but, the next war will be in the United States." Now what does that mean?

A high official in the Armed Forces of the United States said just the other day that if we are attacked by missiles or by bombers, we might be able to knock down 10 percent or 20 percent of them. Maybe by good luck, we could knock down a few more. But he said that the rest were coming through. When they start from Russia do not entertain any misapprehension about that—more than half of them will hit the target.

What did he say about that? He said if we would could knock down 20 or 30 percent we might save 20 or 30 million people.

Mr. Chairman, we have no 20 to 30 million people to give them.

It would mean the wreckage of every American city. There would be no vestige of this Capitol remaining, and you who are here would go with it. Do not entertain any illusions about that.

Let us consider the elemental facts. First, if a war starts, Russia will start it; we will not start a war. So we are at a disadvantage to begin with; they get the first blow.

They would attack 84 American cities simultaneously, and 1 bomb to a city is enough. When we hit Hiroshima one bomb did the work, but that bomb was as a Model T Ford compared to a modern Cadillac. When they hit a city or an army this time it is all over. Let us entertain no doubt about that.

In the first place, Russia will start it.

In the second place, they will attack from the air. Does anybody have any doubt about that?

They are not going to bring an army over here; they are not going to bring a navy over here. What good would our Army do and what good could our Navy do when they attack 84 cities simultaneously from the air at midnight?

There will never be another war with rifles. Absurd. We will never send another expeditionary force to Europe. If war came the first big problem would be how to get out of Germany the men we already have there.

For us to talk about fighting Russia's 175 divisions on the ground is utter idiocy, Russia would be delighted if we tried. If they attack they will attack from the air.

The question before us this afternoon is whether this bill will protect us in such contingency.

I put in the RECORD, a year ago, a secret report by the Navy. The Navy never denied the authenticity of the report.

The report said that 12 submarines deployed along our coasts, could destroy 70 percent of our economy, 70 percent of our cities. It was an official statement.

You know there are a lot of things they do not tell us down there. Too often they go on the theory that what we don't know won't hurt them.

They held a very elaborate review a couple of years ago. Months were spent preparing for it. It covered some 12 States. The Army was divided equally—half took the part of defenders. The other half attacked. Within 23 minutes as reported by the newspapers which were not censored, the attackers (the supposed Russians) destroyed 80 percent of the home bases, knocked out half of the defender striking force, and took complete control of the air. The decisive phase of a world war was over in 40 minutes and the United States was helpless.

So in any event it will not be a long war. It is going to wipe you fellows out in a hurry. You will not suffer, you will not have much time to think about it. It will all be over before you know it.

One of the greatest enigmas of all time is the fact that the United States in 1945 was the undisputed master of the world, with the greatest force ever mobilized in the history of mankind, yet in the short time that has elapsed, since, we are hopelessly behind. We invented the submarine, we invented the airplane, we invented the atomic bomb. Then the Russians came in, took them away from us, and went us one better. Today they have more planes than we have, they have more submarines, they have more ground troops, and they are better armed. They are superior to us in every branch of the service.

How did it happen that in this bill every year, with the advice of the Pentagon, we have allowed Russia to outstrip us in every phase of warfare when we had the start and every advantage? How has it happened? Who can answer that? I ask any man here to tell us how it happened.

The Russians had hardly emerged from barbarism. They had no mechanics, no industry, no inventive geniuses, no scientists. And we had everything. We had it all. We were the most scientific, the most advanced, the most progressive Nation in the world. How has it happened that we have passed this bill every year to defend the Nation, and it has not defended the Nation? We have dropped steadily behind every year, every bill.

It is very simple. Our admirals were not interested in submarines. They do not want to go down in pig boats. So they came out with the great carriers. These carriers, the most expensive piece of machinery ever built in the history of any nation, cost more, took more strategic materials, required more sci-

entists and technicians. But were as vulnerable as an eggshell.

We have it from a supreme military authority, that those planes might get off the first flight but they would never get off the second time. Somebody says you can hide them and take the enemy by surprise. I was very much impressed by many things that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] said. We might read very carefully what Mr. FLOOD said. He said we were not going to take Russia by surprise. She knows as much about our plans as we know ourselves. She would know where that carrier was every minute of the day or night.

They objected so strongly to going down in submarines and so ignored our one chance of survival, that had it not been for one man, Admiral Rickover, we would be in a desperate situation today. We will never be able to fully evaluate the service he has rendered the Nation. He inspired the building of the nuclear-powered submarine, the *Nautilus*. It can penetrate under the polar ice cap and come up anywhere. And when they come up the Russians are at their mercy.

Now, another thing that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] said. I do not like to emphasize so many things that this truly great legislator has said, but he has emphasized the one deterrent which has prevented a third world war because, as he said, we had SAC, and the Russians, knowing that they would be destroyed by SAC, bided their time and deferred the attack, waiting until SAC is neutralized. The gentleman is right about that. We would have had a third world war if it had not been for SAC. But, time is running out for SAC. Russia has already developed a device which will, they claim, stop our bombers at the border. When they neutralize SAC, then the submarines will take its place. They cannot spot the submarine. They cannot find it, and when they find it, they cannot destroy it. A nuclear-powered submarine coming up under the ice cap within the range of Russian cities will take over where SAC leaves off.

They say we must be prepared for the brush wars. What brush wars are they winning today? They are losing every brush war in the world today. They will continue to lose them.

Communists are taking Iraq—second greatest oil producing center on the globe. Its loss will have a very serious effect on the war and even on our peace economy.

The Communists are in Afghanistan. They are building what they call civil air fields—only 50 miles from the border of Pakistan—obviously runways for Russian jet fighters. Soviet engineers are building motor roads in Afghanistan. Any casual observer can see that these roads are capable of carrying tanks and mobile guns through Afghanistan to India. The Communists have established training schools to train Afghans to reconnoiter over adjacent territory. These roads and these fields have direct access to Iran and Pakistan and both countries are warning us of what is going on. But our carriers are doing nothing about it. Of course they can do nothing about it. The carriers are losing the limited wars.

Over in Tibet the Communists have violated every agreement, every treaty, every tenet of civilized warfare and are crushing the Tibet Government and religion. It is the most pitiable outrage in all the long list of Communist atrocities.

What are the army and the Navy doing about it. Especially what are our vaunted carriers doing to win the limited wars. Some of our statesmen are claiming to be limited war men. How are they meeting these limited wars? How are they extinguishing these brush fires?

But our nuclear-powered, missile firing submarines—if we have enough of them—if we had been building them while we were wasting time and material and money and technicians building carriers—can rise through the Arctic ice cap at any selected spot and blow any Russian city off the map. The Russians laugh at our carriers and our improved rifles. But they do not laugh at submarines or missiles.

If Russia knows that attacks upon allies or neutrals can be followed—and will be followed—by prompt submarine retaliation they will control their hatchetmen both at home and abroad. Nothing else will satiate their appetite for world conquest and world slaughter, plunder, and rapine.

In West Berlin neither the Army nor the Navy can hold the 175 divisions of Russian troops—not to mention the innumerable Chinese hordes—when they get ready to move. Carriers could not get within half a continent of them. Submarines which they can neither find nor combat but which can rise in the polar wastes undetected and drop nuclear oblivion on cities and concentration centers of production, mobilization, communication, and supplies after SAC is neutralized will change world history.

The carriers are losing every limited war on the globe. But this bill wisely provides extra funds for submarines and missiles. It is a race against time but it is our only recourse, our last chance.

How are they resolving the limited wars in Indonesia, in Malaya, in Indochina, in Korea where the Communists are violating every promise and butchering Christians daily? How are they alleviating the bloody repressions in Poznan, in Hungary, in Muscat, and Oman?

The Russians have as much respect for the carriers as they would for so many rowboats.

Now, the most important consideration of this bill. This bill is not written or at least it should not be written to win a war. We do not want to win a war. We cannot afford to win a war. We cannot afford to have our cities wrecked and millions of our people destroyed even if we win. So, the purpose of this bill is to deter Russia from attacking us.

I want to say, my friends, that I am not an Army man; I am not a Navy man; I am not an Air Force man. All I want to do is keep the Russians out of the United States. And the only way to do it is for them to understand that when they attack us they, too, are going to be wiped out, just as we are.

Now, as to the submarines and the missiles, may I express my deep appreciation of the services of the great chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. His influence always has been to collaborate and to cooperate and to coordinate all of our forces, all of our committees. He had exceeded the budget on missiles and submarines, and those are the only two things which will stop the Russians.

Nobody will study this bill, nobody will study this report, as carefully as the Russians. They have been watching it. They will keep on watching it. They laugh at air carriers. They have not got one. They have copied everything we have produced which was effective in warfare, but they have not been foolish enough to build an air carrier. So if they find when they read this bill that we are going to depend on air carriers to keep them out of America, they will plan to be right over. But when they find our committee has laid the emphasis on submarines and on missiles, they will take a sober second thought.

Mr. Chairman, there is another phase which is to be considered here. Every newspaper is discussing today the question of a conference at Geneva.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask that in my time the Reading Clerk of the House read a resolution which I offered this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that, for the present, the peace of the world will not be served by a conference of heads of nations at Geneva or elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret I do not have time to say why this resolution has been offered at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

Military personnel

Military Personnel, Army

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except those undergoing reserve training), expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and members absent without leave, including payment of rewards of not to exceed $25 in any one case, $3,233,063,000, and, in addition, $281,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the Army Stock Fund.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. I have a series of amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: On page 2, line 12, strike out "$3,233,063,000" and insert "$3,292,063,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have three amendments dealing with this same problem. Because of the budget structure, one is personnel and the other is operation and maintenance.

I ask unanimous consent that the third amendment and the first amendment be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. Do both of these amendments to which the gentleman refers pertain to the increase in Army personnel strength from 870,000 to 900,000?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. That is all?

Mr. FLOOD. That is all.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we are going to have the other amendment read; are we not?

Mr. FLOOD. I am going to ask now to have the second amendment read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the second amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania referring to the so-called third amendment?

Mr. FLOOD. I have not yet asked the so-called third amendment to be read yet.

Mr. FORD. Then we are now limiting ourselves to the first and second amendments, and the first is as to military pay for the Army and the second has to do with O. and M. for the Army; is that correct?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the so-called third amendment, which has been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which under the unanimous consent request will be considered with the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: On page 3, line 13, strike out "$596,900,000" and insert "$632,400,000."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that the amendments we were to consider en bloc at this point were amendments only to the Army section, one to the Army military pay and second to the Army O. and M. As I understand the amendment which has just been read, it refers to Marine Corps military pay.

Mr. FLOOD. May I say, Mr. Chairman, there is at the Clerk's desk a series of amendments, and the chances are they may be intermingled. May I ask the Clerk to examine the amendments and make certain that only the two amendments are read which deal with Army personnel and O. and M.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] to select the so-called third amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object until I have heard the amendments read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] reserves the right to object.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FLOOD: On page 2, line 12, strike out "$3,233,063,000" and insert "$3,292,063,000."

On page 8, line 14, strike out "$3,065,390,000" and insert "$3,108,390,000."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it one of these amendments goes to page 8 of the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct. Under our budget structure, you are dealing with the operation and maintenance under our new system, and the first amendment deals with personnel. They affect the Army, and I am asking that these two amendments be considered en bloc, if the gentleman will bear with me, so that instead of doing this twice, they deal with the exact same subject so that it can be done together. I assure the gentleman there is no intent at any evasion of any sort. One is for operation and maintenance and the other is for personnel. I am merely trying to save the time of the House by dealing with both subjects at the one time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I submit that the Clerk has not read beyond line 15 on page 2 of the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that despite the fact that the Clerk has not read beyond page 2, in view of the circumstances as to the budget structure in this bill that both of the amendments that have been read by the Clerk be considered en bloc since they deal with precisely the same subject.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in my direct argument I dealt at length with the subject. This is a problem with which you are all well acquainted. I will not be impertinent and presume to instruct you with reference to this, but we have dealt with this amendment for several years and for the same purpose. Last year this committee and the House of Representatives in its sound judgment passed this amendment. We raised the Army to 900,000. You will hear it said that quality is better than quantity. Mr. Chairman, this Army has been cut one division a year for the last 5 years. Five years ago we had 20 divisions in the U.S. Army. If this bill passes, as it is, you will have 14 divisions. You have lost six divisions—one-third of the Army.

You cannot cut it any more. Quality, that is not the point as against quantity. I have listened to that argument once a year for 6 years, and down, down, down has gone the Army. I want you to leave it at 15 divisions. God knows that is bad enough, bad enough.

This amendment will restore a division. This amendment will give us one Battle Group to be moved any place in the world at any time. It will strengthen the logistics and the combat effectiveness of the four great STRAC divisions which are the defense to be left in the United States. Just a few years ago I heard the Pentagon say, "We will give you four great divisions in reserve in the United States to be flown any place."

Do you know which division they cut? One of those four. This bill cuts out one of the four. There will be only three. Ridiculous. Dangerous.

They speak of the Reserves. We are putting a floor under the reserves of 300,000 and a floor under the guard of 400,000. Mr. Chairman, my State has one of the greatest guard divisions of the country, the 28th; one of the four or five best divisions of the guard; yet we cannot put the 28th in the field in less than 4 months. If you cannot put the 28th Pennsylvania guard division in the field in less than 4 months, you cannot put others in the field in less than 8 months. That is the testimony I developed in the hearings; and the Reserves, great as they are, are to be integrated into builtup divisions; they will not, except in a few cases, be sent in as units and groups.

With all due and great respect to the guard and the Reserves I am talking about the Regular Ready U.S. Army, to be ready at once.

We will not have them. We will not have them.

You talk about the Marines; and we will talk about them later. But the Marines at their greatest and their best, and God knows they are great and the best, are sent in to hit, not to hold. The Marines went into Guadalcanal and hit it; you sent the Army in to hold it for the long pull. The Marines are not intended to hold. They are a limited high-combat attack unit that establishes beachheads. The Army holds when they move in over the longer period. That has always been the practice; they work together, but the purposes ultimately are different.

Quality goes only so far. General Taylor said to us in the committee:

We are at the point of no return with the Army. This is the irreducible minimum, 900,000 men; you cannot take any more or you will bleed the Army.

You cannot take any more.

I remember my grandfather saying that a million men would spring to arms overnight. A great American tradition. Take the rifle from over the mantelpiece and fight the enemy. Not in this man's

war, grandpa, not in this man's war you will not do that.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has conducted an exhaustive penetrating study of our defense structure, its needs, its strengths and weaknesses. To those of you who have not had the opportunity to digest the committee report on the defense appropriation bill, I recommend it as required reading. I believe the Congress and the Nation at large is indebted to the illustrious chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and all the members of his subcommittee for a masterful analysis of the state of our defenses.

The committee recommends $200 million above budget recommendations for Zeus, the anti-ICBM missile and for modernization of Army equipment. This is a completely sound recommendation based on thoughtful judgment.

On page 34 of the committee report, the committee states that it regrets that the funds appropriated last year to maintain the strength of the Army at 900,000 men were not used and that strength reductions are being applied. In commenting on the reduction, the committee language was admirably restrained.

It is, indeed, regrettable that defense authorities have seen fit to reduce the Army from 900,000 to 870,000, although the Congress has provided the funds to maintain the higher strength and has expressed its desire that this strength be sustained. The committee states that it gave serious consideration to providing funds for a 900,000-man Army in the fiscal year 1960 bill.

I can understand their ultimate decision not to do so, for the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff steadfastly maintained that the lower strength of 870,000 was adequate. On the other hand, the Secretary of the Army and General Taylor recommended an Army of 925,000, and stanchly held that the very minimum should be not less than 900,000. It is difficult, indeed, to make a judgment and recommendation to the House under these trying circumstances. Obviously, the committee was seriously disturbed on this point and calls to our attention its regret that the Army is being reduced today.

I submit that the gentlemen of the committee require the active support of this House. Last year we expressed ourselves as opposing this cut in the Army. The international situation is no less perilous now than it was last year. Let us assume some of the burden which the committee has borne and demand, even require, an Army of proper strength. We know in our hearts it is not logical or sensible to reduce the Army now. Let us say so now, and let us applaud the strength and judgment of the committee in pointing out this problem for us.

I have heard the Department of Defense arguments in justification of the reduction: greater personnel stabilization, improved reenlistment rates, higher quality personnel, more effective weapons, improved disciplinary situations. These are splendid accomplishments, I certainly agree, but however you measure it, an Army of 870,000 will be composed of just that many and no more, regardless of improved quality in men and weapons. If it takes two good men to man an improved weapon and you have only one good man available, the improved weapon is of doubtful use. What we must have is an Army of adequate strength with adequately modern arms and equipment. Anything less will give us a second-rate defense; a second-rate defense, for example that depends upon the soldiers of a foreign nation to maintain the strength of two of its divisions overseas. What a dreadful condition for us to have to own.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania because in my judgment the 870,000 Army strength recommended by the President in January for fiscal 1960 is sufficient for our national security.

Over the last few years the Congress has been asked by the executive branch of the Government, and we have responded, to pass certain legislation which would improve the quality of our Armed Forces.

We passed the Military Pay Act in 1958 which added millions and millions of dollars to the cost of operating our Military Establishment. In 1957 we passed the Servicemen's and Veterans Survivors Benefit Act, and it added substantially to the cost of the Army.

In 1958 we passed the preinduction screening program which was aimed at improving career quality of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This, of course, has cost considerable money in order to get a real career service, a service of tested personnel.

What has been the result? The result is precisely this: From January 1957 to September 1958 there was a tremendous capability improvement in the personnel of the Army. In January of 1957, 28 percent of the Army was in what we call category 4, that is a group who by test are considered to be of low potential. By September of 1958 this figure had gone from 28 percent to 16 percent; in other words, the quality of the Army has improved substantially under the legislation which we enacted and which has been implemented by the Departments.

The pay legislation and other fringe benefit legislation which we have passed has resulted in a tremendous increase in reenlistments. In every category reenlistments have gone up substantially. This has brought about a combat improvement as a result of a lesser training burden. I can recall one colloquy between a member of our subcommittee and the Secretary of the Army where he said that as a result of a certain improvement in reenlistment rates they were able to reduce their induction by some 3,000 and as the result of the reduction of that number of new inductees the training load, the number of trainers, had been reduced something like 600. In other words, by keeping people in on the higher reenlistment rate we improved the Army's experience and lowered the training burden for the Department of the Army, which means you transfer people from noncombat assignments to combat assignments. That is where we want them to be.

It is interesting to note since this legislation I referred to has been enacted that the number of people in the Army, the enlisted personnel, with 4 or more years' service went up from 30 percent in 1957 to 37 percent in 1958.

In addition to the improvement of personnel quality we have had a tremendous improvement in a number of other areas. Specifically, let us talk about the issue of fire power. The Army is procuring in 1960 what we call the Davy Crockett, which is an atomic weapon for the field soldier. It will come into the inventory in substantially larger numbers in 1961 and 1962. This increased fire power will be a tremendous asset to the Army, and, of course, when you have a greater fire power you rely to a lesser degree on large numbers of personnel. Obviously you can reduce the personnel provided they are of the quality we want. We are now getting that quality.

If you will look through the hearings and turn to page 407 of volume I, you will find that General Taylor said the Army had improved substantially its mobility and its communications ability.

Of course, we are all familiar with the improvement of the National Guard and of the Army Reserves. At the present time the Army National Guard is approximately 400,000. Compare this, if you will, with the size of the Army National Guard in 1950 when it was 326,000, plus the fact that the Army National Guard has the best equipment and they are better trained than at any time in the history of that organization. Of course, the Army Reserves are in the same category. The Reserves are an increasingly important asset in our defense program.

Because of all the factors I support the President's view that Army strength should be 870,000 and therefore oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, and that I have the concluding 5 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FLOOD. Depending on the outcome of the vote on this amendment, I have another type and kind of amendment to the same line, same section. Would I be restricted under this motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The request of the gentleman from Texas pertains to the pending amendment and all amendments thereto.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] to provide funds to maintain our Army at 900,000 men. I would also support any move to write into this bill language which would prevent the Pentagon from cutting the figure back to their proposed 870,000.

First, I should like to commend the committee on the fine job they have done in this bill. They have made judicious cuts in the bill proposed by the administration so that the total recommended is about $400 million less than the budget request, and more than a billion dollars below last year's figure. At the same time, they have provided some increases above the budget which were most vital to the national defense, and I have in mind funds to maintain civilian components at 700,000, the $200 million added for Army modernization to meet the Nation's most likely threat, limited war—even though this is less than one-tenth of what is needed—and to advance the Nike-Zeus which is our Nations' only answer to the most terrible threat that faces us, assault by intercontinental ballistic missiles with hydrogen bomb warheads.

Still more must be done if we are to plug the gaping holes which still exist in our national defense. The greatest of these holes is our vulnerability to limited war threats, essentially ground conflict.

All of us can agree with the statements from our top leaders quoted by Mr. MAHON and summarized in the committee report that, as expressed by Secretary of Defense McElroy, "a limited war is more likely than a general war." Now, while I am going to talk mostly about limited war, I fully realize that this is but one facet of our defense and that America must be able to fight and win, no matter what the time or place or weapon of the Soviet attack, in the air, on the sea, or in the sea, or on the ground. Unfortunately for us, there are advantages to being the aggressor. These advantages, we have learned in tactics, accrue to the attacker, who seeks surprise and chooses the time, the place, and the weapons of conflict. We must be prepared to meet, and defeat, every Communist aggression, whether political subversion, economic warfare, all-out nuclear warfare or limited war, each of which, by threat or action, has won the Soviets victories in the past. If the Communists can defeat us in any field, with any weapon, they will. There is no one-shot defense, no easy way out, no way to slash the budget and still provide for the national security.

We are in a vulnerable position, in some ways a weak position, because we have fallen victim to the siren's song that we could concentrate on the means of massive retaliation, that we could develop weapons so horrible that all men would recoil from their use, that with the products of our research laboratories, our factories, and with the aid of our physicists, our nuclear scientists, our rocket men, and our production men we could meet all threats with a "push button" defense. We have believed that it would not be necessary any more for men to fight and die on the battlefield, we have not even provided the men or the means to adequately carry out our worldwide commitments for mutual defense. We have been wrong in thinking that our intercontinental bombers, or intercontinental missiles can maintain peace in Laos, or Korea, or Berlin. We have cut back our Army and its means to fight so far as to endanger our national security. Russia is not making this mistake. She is putting twice as much of her national product into the military effort as we are. She regards the army as the dominant service and the army gets the lion's share of the Russian budget. The Sino-Soviet bloc has 8 million men in her ground forces. She will use them if she thinks she can profit by that use. As an example of how ground war could develop, let us examine the situation in Berlin: We have over in Berlin a group of American military forces, probably less than a division of men. Facing them and the few troops that our allies, France and Great Britain have in Berlin, is, in fact, an armed force of more than 100,000 men in the so-called peoples' police who are in barracks in East Germany. This East German force, ruled by the Russians, is equipped with tanks, aircraft, and heavy armament. To call this army a police force does not change the facts. This Soviet East German element is in addition to the 20 to 22 Soviet divisions stationed in East Germany. Contrast that, if you please, to the equivalent of less than one division of allied combat troops in Berlin. True, we have about 15,000 to 16,000 West Berlin police, but these are strictly city-type police. The forces of the United States, Great Britain, and France in Western Europe are about 10 or 11 divisions, well armed and trained and backed up with sizable tactical air forces. If war comes over Berlin, it will start as a ground war. If nuclear weapons were not used, it is obvious that the three Western powers would have only about one-half the strength of the Soviet and East German forces.

The Soviets would not hesitate to use their soldiers and conventional weapons if they knew that we would not use our nuclear weapons. In the Soviet Union the air force and the navy are considered to be mere adjuncts of the force which the army will use to seize ground and control populations—people. The biggest air force in the world, the biggest intercontinental ballistic missile, the biggest aircraft carrier on the high seas—not one of these can seize the geographical area itself and exercise control over the people of that area. Obviously, all our military forces, integrated as a team in any conflict, are vital to our ultimate success. Each has a significant and essential role. In the concluding battle, however, the fighting will be man to man.

These limited wars, or brushfire wars, require a force in being ready for combat. That in the 7th Army in Europe, plus the so-called STRAC force, and the U.S. Marines. These forces have the major responsibility for dealing with limited military outbreaks. It is these men in uniform who must be able to deal with the emergencies on the ground.

How can we meet this manpower threat posed by the Communist high command?

We do have STRAC, the Strategic Army Corps, consisting of four divisions kept in the continental United States. STRAC was formed with the idea of being ready to go anywhere on the globe in a hurry and ready to hit hard. STRAC was planned to be the Army's thunderbolt in this atomic age when the swift extinction of a small fire is just as important as the power to expand a large one until whole continents are fried to a crisp. by nuclear attack. Yet STRAC does not have enough modern equipment, it does not have enough air transport, it does not have enough sea transport. If the Pentagon goes through with their budget cutting, it will no longer be four divisions, but only three. Not only will STRAC forces be below minimum safe strength levels, but they are not sufficiently mobile.

STRAC airborne troops could be ready to move within 24 hours, but with present planning and equipment it would take 17 days to airlift a single division. By that time, as you well know and can understand, the Soviet divisions could have pushed through and seized their objectives in that part of the world.

This is the confusing, sometimes contradictory picture that the public sees, that the world sees—that Khrushchev is going to take advantage of if he can—not by waging war, but by waging blackmail. The best reaction against blackmail is not to say "We will pay only $1,000 of the $10,000 you demand." The effective answer is to refuse to pay and to be prepared to strike back effectively.

We need to make STRAC the effective force it was planned to be. We must accept the fact that the initial stages of any conflict, at any time in the next couple of years at least, will be between ground forces. We must be prepared to equalize the present disproportion of manpower with tactical atomic weapons. We must be prepared to win a limited war.

Out in my home State of Montana we are still close to pioneer days, and I have known some of those frontiersmen who carried a Colt six-gun in the days when it was the protector of life and property. They had a name for that Colt—"the Equalizer"—because it made the little man the equal of any 6-foot, 200-pound bruiser. We have just such an equalizer in the tactical atomic weapons that today are flowing into the hands of our troops along the Iron Curtain.

With this "equalizer" we can and will carry out the sword-and-shield concept of NATO defense, but we need to restore the Army to 900,000 men.

Whether or not there is any use of mass destruction weapons, and I do not see such use during the next 2 years at least, a Soviet or satellite ground offensive will be inevitable in any imminent conflict. The basic objective of our

sword-and-shield concept is that this offensive or penetration must be blunted, preliminary to isolating the salient and defeating the enemy piecemeal. This is clearly the first combat role of ground forces in Europe. It can be accomplished best by the use of small yield tactical atomic weapons with discriminating characteristics. Use of large-scale nuclear weapons, with great disaster imposed on friendly countries and their peoples, would not avail in this situation in the theater of operation, Western Europe. Nor could we hope to meet the flood of Communist manpower with our smaller forces and conventional weapons.

Do not expect that any possible conflict with the Communists would develop in such a way that we could choose an all-out nuclear attack on the U.S.S.R. as an alternative to limited war. The U.S.S.R. by clever use of her satellite troops will see that we never have that choice. Like it or not, the blackmail today is based on satellite ground forces, and that is the threat we must meet.

And do not conclude, either, that this limited war must or would necessarily develop into all-out war. Bad as limited war under these circumstances might be, it is still better than incinerating the world with general use of hydrogen bombs. Certainly our planning should take into account the possibility of localizing the conflict, because we could win that limited war and no one could win a general war.

In the summer of 1950 we committed U.S. ground forces to action in Korea. There followed a grim period when these forces were crowded back into the Pusan perimeter and all but pushed into the sea by a relatively primitive enemy. The Army's 2d Infantry Division was rushed from Fort Lewis, Wash., to Korea as the first reinforcement of U.S. troops committed from Japan. I say they were rushed, and they were. But before they could be rushed, the Department of the Army had to draw equipment and men from all over the continental forces to fill up this division before it could move. We almost lost this war at its start, and yet, of all the places in the world where the Communists could have instigated a local war, Korea was the one place where the United States could respond in any positive degree. This was so because of our forces and logistic base in Japan.

Why did we come so near to losing at the start? The U.S. Army was neglected and inadequately supported. I state this as an historical fact and, please understand me, without recrimination or pointing a finger at anyone. I intend nothing more than to state a fact.

The reason I state this fact is that I am seriously concerned lest we repeat our mistake. I am concerned over the evidence that is again on the road to stripping the Army of its means to meet its assigned missions.

Let me draw your attention to the situation which is causing my uneasiness. In 1955, we had an Army of 1.4 million men with 20 active divisions. This force has diminished at present to 900,000 men with 15 divisions. Now it is being reduced further to 870,000 men with 14 divisions in fiscal year 1959.

This reduction below 900,000 and 15 active divisions, it is obvious, does not reflect the judgment of the Department of the Army, nor does it reflect the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They did not approve the reduced strength of 870,000.

The Soviet threat today most surely does not indicate we should reduce the Army below 900,000. I need not dwell long on this threat. The bare headlines of your daily newspaper manage to convey much of the story. We cannot shut our eyes to the Soviet military forces of 4 million men, which includes an army of 2½ million. To this must be added a Chinese Communist force of another 2½ million.

Consider, now, the 15 active divisions we presently have—5 in Europe, 2 in Korea, 1 in Hawaii at reduced strength, and the remaining 7 in the continental United States and Alaska. This is little enough for the Army to meet its commitments. A reduction from 900,000 to 870,000 means one less division, which must come out of the strategic Army force here in the United States, and the loss of essential combat and logistic support for oversea and continental forces.

This means reduced ability in the Active Army to carry on training and to support a paid drill Reserve force of 700,000 which we most certainly must have—a National Guard of 400,000 and a Reserve of 300,000. Viewed against these basic necessities, it is my firm conviction that to reduce the Active Army to 870,000 or the Reserve force below 700,000 is dangerously unrealistic.

This continuing reduction in our Army and the lessening of its capabilities results in a continued sole reliance upon a strategy of massive retaliation, thus greatly reducing our capability for dealing with any aggression short of general war; weakening our collective security system; encouraging neutralism among our allies; and encouraging aggression by the Communists. To stop such a trend, I sincerely believe we must have an Active Army of 900,000, including 15 divisions, which are well equipped with modern weapons and the latest equipment, and a 700,000 paid drill Reserve force structure with units equipped and organized exactly the same as our active units.

Always, Mr. Chairman, we are faced with the question: How much is enough; what does it cost, and can we afford it? To my mind, we are now faced with an obvious fact that this proposed Army of 870,000 is not enough. The present 900,000 with 15 divisions is a bare minimum. I do not think there is a question of whether we can afford to spend $59 million to keep the Army force at 15 divisions. The question is whether we can afford not to spend it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOWALSKI].

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I not only learned a great deal from his talk, but I enjoyed it very much. However, I rise in opposition to his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment for two fundamental reasons: First, I cannot vote for any program which will draft a single young man that we do not need; and, second, I cannot vote for one dollar that the Army does not need. I think this program requires unnecessary expenditures, and the men are not needed in the Army. I am convinced the Army is adequately staffed.

Let me give you some figures. As of March 31, 1959, only 2 months ago, the Army had 878,692 men. It had 15 divisions. In other words, it would appear from the Army report that 878,692 men are sufficient to support 15 divisions. Today we have 14 divisions and approximately 870,000 men. If the amendment is for the purpose of giving us 15 divisions, then let us amend this bill so that it will give us 15 divisions and not increase the number of men.

I would like to also tell you where I believe the Army can find these men. In my survey in Washington, limited only to three Army installations, one large and two small, I found about 500 enlisted men performing nonessential duties, working as servants for colonels, generals, and other officers, working in officers' clubs and in messes and sorting groceries in commissaries. The Navy, Air Force and Marines are in the same boat. These 500 men are available for the 15th division. By extrapolating these findings, I am convinced that throughout the Army the 8,692 men that are needed for the 15th division can be found and should be found, and that the Army is not playing ball with the country and with the Congress.

Therefore, I shall support only such a program as will give us the 15 divisions, but will not support an increase of 1 penny or one drafted soldier when we do not need the money or the men.

I cannot vote for any personnel increases in the military service until they utilize the manpower they now have effectively and efficiently.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close the debate on the pending amendments.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment which has been offered by my able friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. FLOOD. The amendment provides for an increase in the bill in the sum of approximately $100 million. We cannot let budgetary matters predominate when the security of our country is involved. But we are interested in budgetary matters and in the taxpayers' dollars and in fiscal responsibility. Most of the appropriation bills that have been brought in this year have been brought in below the budget. It seems that we are making a fairly good record for economy. We should continue to do the best we can.

I would hesitate, after we had made a $400 million reduction below the budget in the pending bill, to wipe out one-fourth of that reduction in this instance unless the reasons were most compelling.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out clearly what the issue is here. The

issue is whether or not we will provide funds for 30,000 more men in the Army than we will have on June 30 when this bill is scheduled to become effective. Last year we had a controversy over this matter, but at that time the Army was approximately 900,000. Today it is approximately 875,000, and at the time when this bill will take effect, on July 1, 1959, we will have 870,000.

To say that you have got to go out and draft 30,000 additional men and pay them, train them, and buy the equipment for them, does not seem necessary under the circumstances. This could not, in my judgment, be a decisive action in any future conflict in which we might become engaged.

I was interested in the discussion of the gentleman from Connecticut who just preceded me. He is, I understand, a graduate of West Point, a former Army colonel. He says that he will not sanction the drafting of additional men or increasing the size of the Army as long as the Army is failing to utilize appropriately several thousand people which it now has. I understand he and others of the Committee on Armed Services are working on legislation which may be fruitful with respect to the question of more effective utilization of Army personnel.

So I trust that the House will support the position of the committee, the position of the Secretary of Defense and others. The bill provides funds to continue during the coming fiscal year the same size Army, manpowerwise, as we shall have at the end of the current fiscal year.

That seems to be a sensible conclusion, particularly in view of the fact that in order to be better prepared for limited war we are already considerably over the budget with respect to the Army. And not only that, in an effort to take precautions for a limited war of some duration and to strengthen our position in this field we have gone above the budget in the Reserves, and we have gone above the budget in maintaining 400,000 men in the National Guard. So I trust, Mr. Chairman, the committee will be supported and that this amendment which calls for an additional appropriation of $100 million will be defeated.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Who decides this question as to what will be the size and strength of the army—the Committee on Armed Services of the House or the Committee on Appropriations? Whose responsibility is that?

Mr. MAHON. We have before us a budget for supporting an army during the coming fiscal year of 870,000 men. We have provided funds for that number. It is up to the Congress to decide what it wishes to do with respect to funds.

Mr. BONNER. Has the present size of the Army been designated by the House Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. MAHON. I do not believe the present size has been fixed. There are members on the Committee on Armed Services present who might comment in more detail.

Mr. BONNER. I am just trying to find out who to follow in this matter.

Mr. MAHON. I do not believe there is a definite fixed ceiling with respect to the size of the Army.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. In this bill we are putting a floor under the Guard of 400,000 and under the Reserve of 300,000. My purpose is to do the same thing for the Army and for the Marines.

Mr. MAHON. But, we have a reserve strength now in the National Guard of 400,000 and we provide in this bill for continuation of the same strength as of June 30 of this year.

Mr. BONNER. The only question that I want to have answered is—whether it is the prerogative of your committee or the prerogative of the legislative committee to set the size of the Army.

Mr. MAHON. I would say it is the prerogative of the legislative committee to set the size of the Army, if we are going to set the size of the Army. What we are doing here is to provide the funds for an Army of 870,000.

Mr. BONNER. So if there is any dispute in this matter, then the legislative committee should hold hearings and determine the question; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLOOD), there were—ayes 43, noes 131.

So the amendments were rejected.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: Page 2, line 12, strike out "$3,233,063,000" and insert "$3,233,000,000, to be disbursed in such manner that the military personnel, Regular Army, shall be maintained at not less than 900,000 during fiscal year 1960."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have just offered, instead of raising the bill and adding money, reduces the amount of the appropriation and is in the nature of a retrenchment. I take the position that it is, first, germane to the bill, obviously. And, secondly, it is obviously a retrenchment because it reduces the amount of the appropriation instead of adding to it, and it directs that the funds be used for the purpose of keeping the Army strength or making the Army strength at 900,000. The only question that would be in debate on the point of order made by my friend, the gentleman from Texas, would be as to the latter provision. Certainly, this amendment is germane. Secondly, I submit it is a retrenchment. I refer the chairman to rule XXI, paragraph 2. The Chair is aware, of course, that it says:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill, or amendment thereto, changing existing law be in order except such as, being germane to the subject matter of the bill, shall retrench expenditures * * * by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that on the first two points I am flatly in point and I submit to you, sir, in the bill itself there is a provision under the general provisions thereof stating that the funds in this bill cannot be used for any other purpose than those declared in the bill, and no other funds can be used for that purpose.

I submit, sir, that this is a flat, and intended by me to be a flat, limitation upon the Department of Defense. It permits no discretion to be utilized so it can be abused. It is a flat limitation upon the expenditure of funds.

It is not trying to do indirectly what I cannot do directly. I submit, therefore, that this constitutes an exception to the so-called Holman rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, all limitations on the size of military personnel have been suspended by Public Law 86-4, section 2, until 1963. Therefore there are no limitations—ceilings or floors—in effect during fiscal year 1960.

The amendment proposed would have the effect of establishing a floor as to the size of military force.

This amendment imposes additional duties on the executive branch since it would require them to maintain a specific number of troops, a requirement which does not exist at the present time. The amendment therefore is legislation on an appropriation bill.

This does make a reduction of $63,000 in the amount carried in the bill but funds would have to be disbursed on the deficiency basis which will require the appropriation of additional funds for this same purpose during fiscal year 1960 which is the period covered by this bill. Therefore, this is not a retrenchment as provided by the Holman rule. The language itself does not show retrenchment on its face.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly in rebuttal?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, what I say will be a complete rebuttal. The only element the gentleman brings in is the question of the use of the funds. Certainly this affects the use of additional funds unless the Department of Defense came in for supplemental appropriations which would have to be by act of the President as an affirmative act.

The amendment is a limitation on the expenditure of funds in their discretion.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment to the pending bill which seeks in addition to reducing the amount by $63,000 to add language directing that the appropriation be disbursed in such manner that the military branch of the Regular Army shall be maintained at not less than 900,000 for the fiscal year 1960.

While in the opinion of the Chair this amendment does in effect seek to retrench expenditures, it does by the language added impose upon the executive branch a mandatory duty of maintaining personnel at a figure greater than provided in the pending bill; and in the opinion of the Chair constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except those undergoing reserve training), and expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and members absent without leave, including payment of rewards of not to exceed $25 in any one case, $596,900,000, and, in addition, $15,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the Marine Corps stock fund.

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

Mr. Chairman, I sought this time in order to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee. I should like to know where in the bill funds are provided for MATS, the Military Air Transport Service?

Mr. MAHON. The principal provision for MATS is in operation and maintenance under the Air Force, which is carried in a later section of the bill. However, wherever there is travel in the various sections of the bill there is money for MATS, because the Military Air Transport Service is under an industrial-type operation, and the various services which utilize MATS pay for these services.

Mr. GROSS. The funds are scattered all through the bill?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And cannot be reached in one amendment?

Mr. MAHON. Not very well.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask this further question: Is MATS reimbursed for plane travel by Members of Congress?

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. GROSS. I do not mean by Members of Congress; I mean reimbursed by the Congress.

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. GROSS Or by any committees of Congress?

Mr. MAHON. Whatever service MATS performs somebody has to pay for, and it is paid for from other appropriations, from these various funds.

Mr. GROSS. The reason I ask is because one of MATS four-motored jobs was wheeled out last night to take a load of Members of Congress over to London to a meeting of the U.S. Committee for the Atlantic Congress. I am informed that the meeting is sponsored by a so-called nonprofit organization.

I have checked and I find no resolution has been passed by Congress, no legislative action of any kind taken by Congress to provide for this meeting in London. I called MATS this morning to find out who is going to reimburse, who is going to pay MATS for the use of this plane that went over last night to London carrying this bunch of junketeers.

MATS says it is not going to be reimbursed; that by some hocus-pocus this junket to London is called a defense meeting. I say again it has no sanction in Congress, and no funds have been provided by the Congress.

As I understand it from reading the hearings, these MATS planes are carpeted from wall to wall, they have a compartment in the front end which has special seats and accommodates 10 people. I understand that compartment is designed to take care of the VVIP's—the very, very important people. But at any rate this MATS plane which was wheeled out last night is one of the four jobs that fly back and forth across the Atlantic hauling junketeers, among others.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman forgets the beautiful blond Wafs who are on board.

Mr. GROSS. Is that something the gentleman inquired about during the hearings?

Mr. Chairman, with or without the blonds or brunets, it is high time that this matter be looked into. I find that this plane was ordered out by the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN]; that is, he wrote a letter to the Secretary of Defense requesting use of a plane for this junket. I say to you it is high time that Congress takes note of what is going on. It should not be within the authority of the chairman of any committee of the House of Representatives or of the other body to be able to order out a four-motored plane to go off on a junket that has not even been sanctioned by the Congress. I want you to know that I am going to pursue this thing to find out how MATS is paid for this trip and who is picking up the check for the so-called Atlantic Congress meeting in London.

Mr. MAHON. This is the first knowledge I had of this trip.

Mr. GROSS. There are others.

Mr. MAHON. I am not able to answer this particular question as to who pays for it, or if the State Department is calling upon MATS to perform the service.

Mr. GROSS. I said the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee had got this job done insofar as the plane is concerned.

Mr. MAHON. If it is a request of the Congress and it has something to do with the military budget, it may be taken from the contingent funds of the Department of Defense. I do not have enough information at the moment. I shall be glad to cooperate with the gentleman in getting the facts.

I may say that while there are some abuses by Members of Congress in using military means of travel, the abuse by Members of Congress is infinitesimal when compared with the abuses of the military themselves in the unwarranted use of aircraft.

Mr. GROSS. That is like saying that because the military does something wrong, it is less worse if done by Congress, and I do not buy that at all.

Mr. MAHON. I am not defending the improper use of Department of Defense aircraft by Members of Congress or others. I regret I cannot give my friend a better answer at this moment.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty while undergoing Reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, $231,700,000.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the Clerk's desk, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving any and all points of order, I will be glad to have them read en bloc, but I would like to hear what they are and, therefore, reserve a point of order against both of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendments, then the Chair will put the unanimous-consent request of the gentleman from Florida.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: Page 4, line 9, after the figure, strike out the period, add a semicolon, and the words "*Provided*, That the average strength of the Reserve personnel, Army, shall be maintained at not less than 300,000 during the fiscal year 1960."

Page 5, line 16, strike out the period, add a semicolon and the words, "*Provided further*, That the Army National Guard shall be maintained at not less than 400,000 during the fiscal year 1960."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida that the reported amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendments. I have no objection to their being considered en bloc, but I still reserve a point of order against them, either en bloc or singly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may make his point of order after the unanimous-consent request has been granted. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order so that I may discuss the reasons for my amendments?

Mr. FORD. Of course, I will accept the request of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, of course these amendments are subject to a point of order. We all recognize that fact. I trust, however, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, who is a friend of the Guard and a friend of the Reserve, will not press his point of order, and here are some of the reasons why I trust he will not do so.

I would like to emphasize to the membership, Mr. Chairman, the fact that these amendments will not cost one additional red cent. All the money that is needed is in this bill to maintain the Guard at 400,000 and to maintain the Reserve at 300,000. Therefore, to make the language mandatory adds no cost to this bill. It does insure, however, that we will have a National Guard of 400,000 and a Reserve of 300,000. I submit that is a very important consideration in view of the fact that the Regular Army is being cut back year after year after year. We are now down to 870,000. We are now down to 14 divisions. If we want to insure that the Guard and the Reserve, which are the lowest cost military forces that we have, will be maintained in a position to step in and help the Regular Forces, this is the way to do it.

Now, I submit, Mr. Chairman, that last year the Department of Defense wanted to cut back the Guard as they do this year, wanted to cut back the Reserve as they do this year, wanted to cut back the Army as they have done. In the Congress mandatory language was written to make it prohibitive that the Guard and the Reserve be cut back. Money was carried in last year's bill for the maintenance of the strength of the Guard and the Reserve and the Army, but since there was no mandatory language, to protect the strength of the Army, the Army was cut by the Department of Defense while the Guard and the Reserve were maintained at the levels specified by Congress. So, if we want to be sure that the Guard and the Reserve will be maintained, that this money in the bill may not become simply a meaningless gesture, the only way we can do it is to write in the mandatory language I offer. I hope that the gentleman from Michigan or any other Member will not see fit to press for a point of order. The Guard and the Reserve are your people back home, and America has never won a war without them. Now let us give them a break.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the present Reserve program as it is constituted is not one which gives the United States the kind of security that we should demand of it in this period in our history. The fault is not with the Reserve officers and men who belong to the various units around the country. Rather it is the fault of the Regular armed-service officers in the Pentagon who refuse to assign an important role to the Reserve arm of our military forces.

Last winter I had the pleasure to appear before a Reserve Air Force officers' group in Milwaukee, Wis. Mr. Chairman, these men are bored with their training. Their training is clearly silly and has no connection with the national defense. They are angry with their Government because their Government has not given these men serious tasks to perform even though these men are highly trained and skilled officers.

What were these men ordered to do? They were to study effective public speaking. What does that subject have to do with national defense? Who are we kidding in these programs? Ourselves? The Russians? I am afraid we are kidding ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, we live in fearful times. We talk and think national defense and national security. We spend billions for national defense. But I doubt if we really have an adequate defense. We are drifting. We are clinging to the habits of the past like desperate men, refusing to reexamine our basic defense system. We refuse to ask if we are not heading for mass destruction by building more and more weapons and missiles and hydrogen bombs without considering that mankind is at stake. This, I feel, is the basic question.

But even accepting the frame of reference that we are all operating in, I fear that we are throwing out millions without stopping to ask if we are utilizing our manpower in the ways that it can best be used. And a good example of this is our present Reserve programs where men come to meetings, sit around and study handbooks which have such chapters as the following in them:

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF PUBLIC SPEAKING MANUAL NK45-0001

Chapter 1. Effective Speaking Essentials.
Chapter 2. Speech Preparation.
Chapter 3. Effective Speech Introduction and Conclusion.
Chapter 4. Delivering the Talk—Platform Etiquette.
Chapter 5. Expression in Conversation.
Chapter 6. Conference Methods.
Chapter 7. Effective Expression in Writing.
Chapter 8. Preparation of Correspondence.
Chapter 9. Preparation of Orders.

Day after day I receive mail from very serious military reservists who are extremely critical of our Reserve programs. I sincerely hope that the military leaders and Congress will look seriously into this program and see how we may improve our national defense posture by making the Reserve a significant part of our defense system.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill. I believe there are ample precedents to sustain such a point of order.

May I say, however, that I join the gentleman from Florida and others on the subcommittee in increasing the appropriation for the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve, to raise the number on active duty in the guard from 360,000 to 400,000 and for the Army Reserve from 270,000 to 300,000.

I am in full accord with the desire for larger strength, but I do feel that it is unwise to put this kind of language in an appropriation bill. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida desire to be heard further?

Mr. SIKES. No, Mr. Chairman. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class on active duty while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, as authorized by law, $24,300,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise simply to say that I think the RECORD should show that it is the sense of the particular subcommittee that worked on this bill and, in my opinion, it is the sense of Congress, that the Army National Guard should be continued at 400,000 and the Army Reserve at 300,000. We have provided funds for that purpose. It would not be appropriate in this bill to provide mandatory language, but I want the RECORD to show that it is the wish and the desire of Congress that the Guard and Reserve be maintained at this level. I am constrained to believe that the Department of Defense will follow the will of the Congress in this matter.

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

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would the gentleman also indicate to the membership that if this fund is not expended for this purpose, it is the intent of the Congress that it shall not be diverted to other purposes?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Last year we appropriated money for a 900,000-man Army. Would it not equally have been the view of the chairman of this subcommittee that the Department of Defense should have used that money to provide a 900,000-man Army?

Mr. MAHON. I felt that the Army should have been maintained at 900,000, in view of the fact that Congress provided funds for an Army of 900,000, but the Army, nevertheless, has been reduced to 870,000.

I have been in touch with some of the people in the Pentagon who have to do with Reserve and National Guard matters, and I am of the opinion that as a compromise with respect to this issue of the strength of the various forces that the will of Congress will be carried out with respect to the National Guard and with respect to the Reserves.

It does seem to me, though, that if we are going to have mandatory strength levels, we ought to have hearings in the

Committee on Armed Services and we ought to come in here and vote on these matters and fix the policies and the strengths. We should not do it by amendments on an appropriation.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. In the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member, the Department of Defense definitely gave us the impression that unless such floors as proposed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], were inserted this year, they would cut the Guard and the Reserve to the lower figures of 270,000 and 360,000.

Mr. MAHON. I hope that reconsideration will be given that position, and I am inclined to believe it will.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee has done a good job in making available funds for the National Guard and Reserve units, but I am confident what the gentleman from Montana [Mr. ANDERSON] just said is true. Defense witnesses told us in committee, or just as good as told us, that they expected to cut back.

I would like to call attention of the Members of this House to the record, which speaks for itself. In case we get into a limited war, such as the Korean conflict, in my judgment we will be in worse shape or are in worse shape today than we were then, if they limit us on the weapons that can be used to fight the war. We were limited in the Korean conflict. Let us make no mistake about it.

I think the record should show that the Congress of the United States and the American people supported the Military Establishment in a policy of keeping us out of war or of winning a war if we had to get in one. It was the administration under President Truman that cut back the funds for airplanes and other weapons that Congress had appropriated, and, therefore, did not give us the strength that Congress called for. I recall that he called in then Mr. Eisenhower who was head of a university, as a civilian adviser to Mr. Forrestal and Mr. Louis Johnson, and upon the recommendations that he got, we were cut back. The record will speak for itself.

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

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a very important contribution to this debate. I would like to call attention to the fact that in the hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee not one Army officer, after he had been freed from the requirement that he support the budget, said that the Reserve and the Guard should be cut. Every one of them said they should be maintained at present levels, regardless of the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense. And I assume that that is exactly what happened in the gentleman's committee.

Mr. WINSTEAD. That is exactly so. Some time ago, they came before us to brief us—I believe in 1955—and I believe they asked for something like 600,000 National Guardsmen, as well as great numbers of active reservists. Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and the various secretaries, and others in the administration said, "If you do not do this, it will be necessary to reappraise the whole thing."

But do as you please about it, I do not think Congress can make the President of the United States spend the money on the National Guard or on the Reserves, either. We could not do it under President Truman, and I do not think we can do it under the Eisenhower administration. I want the record to speak for itself, so far as I am concerned. I think the American people should know that it was not the Congress of the United States that cut the military back prior to the Korean war. All we could hear in our committee at that time were the admirals and generals and secretaries saying, "If Congress will appropriate the money, we will be able to meet the situation." We had previously appropriated money which was never used.

I say to you, if they are going to limit us on the weapons that we can use, as they did when we sent the troops into Korea and Lebanon, we will find ourselves in a critical plight. They sent conventional war equipment in these places. We heard a lot about the use of atomic weapons prior to that time, but we heard nothing about their use around the time when they were firing on Matsu and in other sections of the world. I say that the testimony from Secretary McElroy, before our committee, on questioning by myself and others, shows that he admitted there is far more danger of being involved in a limited war than in a general war.

As far as I am concerned, we have the right kind of weapons today if Russia wanted to start a global war. Thank God, the President took a firm stand in the situation in Berlin in Western Europe. I think he did a wonderful job when he made his position clear. I am not afraid of actually winning with the weapons that we have and would use in case of a global war with Soviet Russia.

I have not taken the same position about rockets and missiles as some others have taken because I think they are talking about a few years from now. But, I say to you, I am concerned with our limited warfare capability. What I say today is only to point up in the RECORD that the administration should take the responsibility if they refuse to keep our National Guard and Reserves strong enough to meet the situation. It is the cheapest manpower that we can have to meet the situation. I just wanted the record to be definitely clear. So far as I am concerned, I hope the administration will not do as they have done time after time. We provided for a Reserve of 300,000, and a National Guard of 400,000 last year but neither the Guard nor the Army Reserves have been maintained at those strengths. The Army was reduced to 870,000 and they are cutting back the Marine Corps from 188,000 to 175,000. Frankly, that does not suit me, in view of all this talk of what might happen in Berlin and elsewhere.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with deep appreciation to the fine explanation given this bill by members of the committee. The chairman, Mr. Mahon, concluded his remarks with the observation that he favored neither big wars nor small wars—he favored no wars. Certainly he speaks for every member of the House, and every responsible American, in this statement.

The pending bill represents one-half of all the money this Congress is likely to approve this session. In considering this measure, we are acting on our constitutional obligation to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

The Preamble of the Constitution clearly provides that the purpose of our Government is to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come in our national existence when we must reexamine the meaning of common defense. We now have in our arsenal weapons in the name of common defense which, if used, will prevent us, and prevent the world, from having any posterity who might enjoy the blessings of liberty. Certainly we must consider all of our duties as harmonious rather than as mutually inconsistent.

What does it mean, then, truly to provide for the common defense? If our Nation used its atomic arsenal, and our adversary did not retaliate, we would destroy not only our adversary but hundreds of millions of neutrals, and millions of our own people as well, from the effects of radioactivity. Similarly, if our adversary attacked us, and we did not retaliate, millions of neutrals as well as people in the attacking country would still be destroyed. This represents a practical reason, in addition to the overwhelming moral reasons, for ruling out any preventive or preemptive war. If our adversary were to retaliate, as many as half of the population of the United States might well be vaporized within 6 hours after the outbreak of hostilities, and another one-fourth might also be stricken by radioactivity.

In view of these circumstances, it is not surprising that the sober military judgment is that there is no defense against warfare which includes nuclear bombs. There is only the capacity for mutual extinction. To speak of preparation for such a war as common defense is to believe that neither side will ever resort to the use of the weapons with which each is provided. Yet it is the history of every arms race that it has ended in hostilities in which the arms are employed.

Mr. Chairman, this generation has a rendezvous with destiny. We must provide for the common defense, not merely

of our Nation, but, even more, of the right of human life to exist on earth. It is tragic that our Nation has been so gripped by fear of communism we have spent as much on military programs since the war as we spent on World War II.

Many of this generation seem to believe that the most significant event in history was the Communist manifesto and its aftermath. Other sober students of history would still insist that the American Revolution, the Declaration of Independence, and the U.S. Constitution have been more profound influences on world history. I am one who believes that the greatest event in history took place in Bethlehem over 1,900 years ago.

Under the law, before that time, it was said that justice consisted of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. There have been those who raised that law to a life for a life and a city for a city. In this budget, and what it represents as part of the great powers' arms race, we are preparing to raise that law to a civilization for a civilization.

And yet the man from Galilee gave us a new law that you overcome evil with good; that we should not give ourselves up to vengeance; indeed, that we should love our enemies. With this as our moral principle, let us take another look at the Federal budget.

Mr. Chairman, the total national defense and mutual security budget this year will require about $260 per capita in the United States. The world's population today is something over two and a half billion persons. Each year we are spending about $18 for every man, woman, and child on the face of the globe in preparing for man's destruction.

Yet the Congress appropriated last year only $50,000 for the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament to work on alternatives to the arms race. The Communist offensive now is increasingly one of economic aid and penetration. For economic aid, for technical asssitance, for all the refugee programs, educational exchange, atoms for peace, all our donations of agricultural surpluses to needy people abroad in about 80 countries, and for the Development Loan Fund, these appropriations amounted to little more than $1.4 billion. That represents $8 per U.S. citizen, or about 50 cents per capita globally.

For the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, and to encourage the growth of world law through the United Nations, our expenditures for the fiscal year 1958 were approximately 10 cents for each U.S. citizen.

When we add the specialized agencies for food, health, children, refugees, the United Nations Emergency Force, the grand total for the United Nations agencies and programs last year came to a $120 million, or about 68 cents per each U.S. citizen; or about 4 cents for each person in the world.

The high cost of defense is the strongest argument against adequate schools, hospitals, and other essential services at home. Have we examined fully the other costs of this program in the waste of material, in the support of dictatorship and tyranny, and in other ways?

Are we concerned with the growing power of the military establishment over the national economy, over research and over the allocation of so many of our resources?

We are told this is a peace budget. Peace will be built, not by terror, but by the settlement of disputes by peaceful means—however difficult negotiation may be—by all-out support of the United Nations in establishing the rule of reason and the rule of law, and by earnest support of general disarmament. The hundreds of millions of hungry persons in Asia and Africa cannot eat our bayonets, do not want to be blanketed with fall-out from our bombs, but do want our sympathetic help in establishing healthy economies and in overcoming hunger, misery, illiteracy, disease and poverty without the totalitarian methods of communism.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in providing for the common defense we are operating too heavily from our fears and too little from our faith. This generation has it within its power to attack successfully men's ancient enemies—hunger, misery, illiteracy, disease, and poverty. If we could significantly reduce this military budget and apply only a third of the reduction to a global war on these enemies, I believe that we would by so doing more truly provide for our common defense.

An all-out assault on illiteracy, for example, would take but a small portion of our present military budget. Yet it would be the finest investment we could make in the cause of world peace and human freedom. Indeed, without such an all-out assault, our efforts at economic development will be faulty and inadequate.

If another portion of the reduction could be applied to improving the well-being of our own citizens, this would contribute to our common defense and to the peace of the world.

Several billions of dollars a year here at home would soon get rid of our slums, clean up our streams; eliminate air pollution and purify the very air we breathe; help develop decent housing for all our citizens, give us better highways and systems of mass transportation; and provide adequate park and recreational facilities for our people.

By devoting a portion to these purposes, the taxpayer would enjoy a higher standard of living at no increase in taxes. I submit that the remainder of any saving should be used to balance the budget, retire debt, and reduce personal taxes.

If the world saw the United States earnestly pursuing this course of action, and so changing its budget, in the years ahead, our prestige in the world would rise tremendously. The fears of war would be greatly abated. The hopes of the world would be given a tremendous lift.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude simply by quoting Adlai Stevenson at Urbana, Ill., on May 12, when he said:

> What we seek is a world in which our children need not live under the atomic shadow. We need it as much as anyone else, we have more to lose than anyone else, and no exchange of benefit is involved. And if it is the cost that is in question, I suggest that what we do to lift our neighbors' living standards is entitled to the same priority as what we do for our defense.
>
> And in the same measure we should be neither sure nor proud. We are part of a human experiment that may founder. We have all set our hands to a science we cannot control. We all stand on the edge of the mysteries of outer space. We all live under judgment before an infinite Godhead. It behooves us, therefore, to express in all our dealings with the other peoples our sense of belonging to one endangering family, and sharing with it our part of hope and aspiration, our part of error and shame. Then perhaps our voice will be tolerable, our wealth forgiven, and men will sit down with us in amity to work for a better, safer world.

Mr. Chairman, it is with heavy heart that I must say to the House that I believe this appropriation measure represents 1 more year of neglect of the course of action I believe this Congress and this Nation must pursue in the interests of providing for the common defense, promoting the general welfare, and securing the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

We say we are buying time. Yet, as General Bradley has properly warned: "Time is running out—with the speed of a sputnik." The time for more constructive action is now.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes. He was promised time in general debate, but as things developed it was not available to him.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty while undergoing reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law, $54,000,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to respectfully direct questions to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] relative to a matter that he and his colleagues have taken up in committee on a number of occasions. I have endeavored to follow as much of it as I can in volume 1 of the hearings and I have been studying this subject, I might say, for quite some time inasmuch as it also affects my district. I am talking about the cancellation of the Regulus II missile. The gentleman from Texas spoke of this, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] just directed his attention to this.

I could refer directly to the testimony in the hearings but I think it better just to ask the question and then refer to the testimony if the answers are not adequate.

Mr. Chairman, then, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas this first question: In the committee hearings did it develop that there did seem to be a timelag or a time gap, rather, between

Polaris coming into being, coming into reality, and the use of Regulus II as a missile in being? In other words, creating a gap between the two.

Mr. MAHON. The evidence, I believe, will show that this Regulus II of the Navy is a surface-to-surface missile to be used aboard ship. In trying to get as much defense as possible from a limited amount of money, as could safely be done, the Secretary of Defense had various programs surveyed, and it was determined that the Regulus program could safely be eliminated, because the Polaris program of the Navy was moving forward so rapidly and the Polaris would be available much earlier than previously anticipated. It was felt that considerable money could be saved without any great hazard to national defense by canceling the Regulus, and that was done. The Regulus is a good missile, but it was stricken for reasons of economy, and under the circumstances I think it probably was the correct decision.

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

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman refers to the chairman's answer to the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is that there will be a definite gap between the operation of the Polaris and the operation of the Regulus already in being. The Regulus is a great missile. We are concerned about the Russian opposite number of the Regulus. The Russians have the opposite number of the Regulus to be fired from submarines. We are worried about it. It is a dangerous weapon, and we have nothing in its place against these short-range Regulus missiles. So if the gentleman is worried, keep on worrying; you should.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman. I think all of us are concerned to know what our position will be if we limit our use of operational missiles successfully tested.

My second question of the distinguished gentleman from Texas relates to the comparison or differences between these two missiles, as it is sought to replace one with the other. I understand that the Regulus is in being and that is proven; that the other is not yet operational. Do not these missiles fall in different categories and is not one supplemental to the other? I talked to the Chance-Vought people and they told me categorically that one missile would not replace the other but that they were complementary missiles each supplementing the other. The Regulus, unlike the Polaris, can be guided throughout its flight.

Mr. MAHON. To some extent I think Chance-Vought is right; there is considerable difference between the two missiles. They are more or less complementary. But in view of the great deterrent power of the Polaris missile as compared with the Regulus, and this is a question of opinion, all we could do was to accept the decision of the Secretary of Defense to cancel this missile. It is not possible for the Congress to decide what types of missiles should be utilized by the armed services.

Mr. ALGER. I appreciate the gentleman's answer very much. May I ask the Chairman if he feels there was any difference of opinion, recognizing that there could be honest differences of opinion, of the people dealing with these weapons in the office of the Secretary of Defense and the Navy, respectively, and that the Navy wanted the Regulus II?

Mr. MAHON. Unquestionably the Navy people interested in Regulus wanted to concentrate on Regulus. This was a decision made by the Navy, feeling that they had to live within a reduced budget and that this was the best action they could take to carry out the missile program with the funds at their disposal.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, all of us are interested in maximum defense for the money spent. We also expect a well rounded defense program. For these reasons I am very concerned over the cancellation of the Regulus II missile. I have studied the hearings, that which has not been deleted for security reasons.

On page 94 and elsewhere in the hearings statements are made in which the Polaris has been cited as a better weapon as replacement for the Regulus II. It is to be expected, of course, that weapons become outmoded and replaced. Weapons do become obsolete. That is precisely the situation in the Regulus II situation but the vital objection or criticism which I make is that the Polaris is not ready to replace the Regulus II. The Regulus II has had 48 flight tests most highly successful and is much nearer readiness to protect us than is the Polaris which was intended to be ready in 1963, though now this date has been accelerated somewhat. On page 94 of the hearings the Polaris is cited as "virtually overtaken the Regulus II." Well, virtually is not good enough. By terminating Regulus II it seems to me we have created a gap of 2 years or more in this area of our defense program. Several references are made to the promise of ballistic missiles, as on page 220 of the hearings. "Regulus II and its overall weapons potential has similarly been overtaken by the 'promise' of ballistic missiles." Well, it's better to have a weapon in being than the promise of one to come.

Secondly, an air breathing missile like the Regulus II which can be guided throughout it flight can perform a fraction which the ballistic missile cannot. If there are indeed supplemental or different programs rather than similar programs how can Polaris replace the Regulus II? Certainly, unless this is explained and clearly understood, which the hearings do not explain, it seems too hasty a decision, this matter of canceling the Regulus II program.

Third, during my investigation of the Regulus II cancellation, and from studying these hearings, I am not able to learn whether economy in the defense budget, is or is not, a basic reason for this cancellation. Although it is mentioned on pages 581, 605, and 607, either it is an important factor or not. It is unthinkable to me that, while we spend money lavishly in welfare programs, we should cancel a deterrent weapon of the demonstrated success of the Regulus II.

Finally, I fail to see why the Navy, which has found the Regulus II to be a good weapon, should bow so readily to the wishes of the Secretary of Defense. The very fact that there can be honest differences of opinion, and there obviously were in this program between the Defense Department and the Navy, is reason enough for the Committee on Appropriations to have investigated the differing viewpoints more thoroughly.

A perplexing problem in our defense system obviously is the time lag between weapon research and the production model. In the case of the Regulus II and Polaris missile program it seems to me that the future hopes for Polaris caused us to cancel a successful present program. In defense we may not be permitted many mistakes. Even as we compliment the diligence of the Appropriations Committee, we are reminded of the ceaseless need for Congress to investigate and evaluate all factors of our overall defense program at all times. How tragic it would be if we indeed cancel worthwhile programs for future hopes in new weapons. In war we can use only those weapons that we have then in being. The Regulus II program was tested, in production, and ready to do its part in protecting our Nation. The Polaris lags behind and is a different type of system.

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

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 265 of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, as authorized by law, $234,961,000: *Provided*, That obligations may be incurred under this appropriation for the foregoing expenses for training of units designated for early deployment under mobilization plans or for antiaircraft defense of the United States and Hawaii without regard to section 107 of title 32, United States Code.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee have done a good and a thorough job in preparing this bill. However, I would like to make one point that I think is quite important. I believe very definitely if these committees had larger staffs and if those staffs were enabled to investigate better, even though it would cost more in a congressional appropriation bill, I am certain these committees could cut a good bit of waste out of bills such as this.

It seems to me quite definitely that all the talk that has gone before, this afternoon and yesterday, just confirms the fact that we know more or less of nothing; in other words, we do not know

very much about where we are going, we do not know very much about a military or defense program for this country. We have not gotten anywhere in developing a unified service that would promote economy. In fact, in my opinion, this Congress has fallen down on the job tremendously in solving this problem and in taking any truly constructive steps.

As we talk about strategy and things of that kind, it seems most clear to me that we are unable to depart from old ideas and we accept the new fetish of a military deterrent. I am certain that this country is going to have a very rude awakening. In the meantime we are spending and wasting our substance, and we are doing this for nothing.

I am as certain as I am standing here at this moment that for every $3 we spend, if we would do it wisely and do it efficiently, we could do the same job for $2.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, we have about $60 billion of obsolete equipment. Some obsolete equipment is to be expected, but there is no need for the tremendous amount of waste that has gone before. In fact, if my figures are correct, thinking here on my feet, this amount of money would run the State of Vermont from before the time of Christ until today.

Another thing, in all the debate that we have had we develop nothing but propaganda, a war spirit and a spirit of hate. We have no idea of working out a new solution, a new way. With the technological developments of the day we need a new way. These old military methods will not work, yet we do not have the courage to find a new way.

Another point that comes to my mind is that when people want to speak a little bit about a different thing they do not get the time to speak. We do not have here in this Congress the opportunity to debate the issues. I was rather ashamed as I sat around yesterday afternoon to note that there were about 26 Members on the floor of the House when we were discussing a bill which includes more than 50 percent of the total budget of the United States. What interest do we have in the welfare of the American people if only about 26 of us will sit here when such a subject is discussed and when half or more than half of these were members of the committee? What use is there in such a debate? There are many here who will probably laugh when I sit down, and many of them may say that what I got up and talked about does not amount to anything, but I do not think the Members of this Congress are doing their constitutional duty and fulfilling their oath of office when passing a bill in the way it is being passed.

I could go on and go through the whole bill and point out many things that are wrong, but I will not have time. I know I will get the gavel pretty quickly. A friend of mine got it not long before. So I think I will sit down, but I think it is about time this Congress does something constructive about the issue of war and peace, and not keep on voting billions of dollars and throwing about one-third of those dollars down the drain.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

Operation and maintenance

Operation and Maintenance, Army

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, including administration; medical and dental care of personnel entitled thereto by law or regulation (including charges of private facilities for care of military personnel on duty or leave, except elective private treatment), and other measures necessary to protect the health of the Army; care of the dead; chaplains' activities; awards and medals; welfare and recreation; information and educational services for the Armed Forces; recruiting expenses; meals furnished under contract for selective service registrants called for induction and applicants for enlistment while held under observation; subsistence of prisoners at disciplinary barracks, and of civilian employees as authorized by law; expenses of apprehension and delivery of prisoners escaped from disciplinary barracks, including payment of rewards not exceeding $25 in any one case, and expenses of confinement of such prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed $25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in a disciplinary barracks; military courts, boards, and commissions; authorized issues of articles for use of applicants for enlistment and persons in military custody; civilian clothing, not to exceed $40 in cost, to be issued each person upon each release from confinement in an Army or contract prison and to each soldier discharged for unsuitability, inaptitude, or otherwise than honorably, or sentenced by a civil court to confinement in a civil prison, or interned or discharged as an alien enemy; transportation services; communications services, including construction of communication systems; maps and similar data for military purposes; military surveys and engineering planning; contracts for maintenance of reserve tools and facilities for 12 months beginning at any time during the current fiscal year; repair of facilities; utility services for buildings erected at private cost, as authorized by law (10 U.S.C. 4778), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Army regulations to be used for a similar purpose; purchase of ambulances; hire of passenger motor vehicles; tuition and fees incident to training of military personnel at civilian institutions; field exercises and maneuvers, including payments in advance for rentals or options to rent land; expenses for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and other units at educational institutions, as authorized by law; exchange fees, and losses in the accounts of disbursing officers or agents in accordance with law; expenses of inter-American cooperation, as authorized for the Navy by law (10 U.S.C. 7208) for Latin-American cooperation; not to exceed $5,855,000 for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; $3,065,390,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill contains almost $40 billion, and I hesitate a little bit to discuss a matter which could mean a saving of only $10 million or $20 million per year. But, I do have some questions in my mind that I should like to ask of the committee. Before doing so, may I preface the questions with a brief statement? I obtained from the Department of Defense some information with respect to Defense Department passenger travel having to do with travel of military personnel within the confines of the United States. The figures they have submitted to me indicate that, for fiscal 1958, 1,250,000 military personnel traveled by one means of transportation or another in the United States. Of this amount 461,700 traveled by commercial air. Of that amount roughly 71 percent traveled by first class, 3 percent by coach, and 4 percent by charter plane. In passenger miles traveled, 54 percent of the military personnel traveled by airplane, 35 percent by first class, 7 percent by coach, and 11 percent by charter.

Now, it came to my attention a couple of months ago—and I have not checked this out, but I assume it to be true from the information I have obtained—that, for instance, on a jet flight across the Atlantic Ocean where they have two classes of passengers on the same plane, the rear section being the luxury class, the front section the economy class, the cost differential for a round trip is around $425. It is not unusual, so I am told, to find that the luxury-class compartment is occupied chiefly by Government civilian and military personnel while the economy department is occupied by private business people.

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Taxpayers.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Taxpayers, yes; and the same thing is true on flights across the country. A number of companies now have combined types of flight on the same plane, one, the first-class flight, occupied by passengers in the rear part of the plane and the fore part occupied by what they call coach flight passengers. And, it is not unusual to find the first-class compartment occupied by Government civilians and military personnel whereas the taxpayers, as the gentleman indicated, occupy the coach compartment or coach part of the plane. The cost differential on a round trip across the country is about $100.

Now, I have traveled by coach both on combination flights and where the flights are entirely coach, and in my estimation they are all first class.

Now, I would like to ask the committee if it has given consideration to adopting or suggesting a policy to the military whereby we could possibly save from $10 million to $20 million in the military transportation cost in flights in this country alone simply by having the military personnel who are traveling from one assignment to another travel by coach wherever possible. When I say "coach," I am calling attention to the fact that these coach flights are designations only. They are actually first-class flights. Can the committee give me any information on this matter?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in response to the inquiry we have consistently over the last 3 or 4 years, to my knowledge, condemned the various departments for excess of travel, too many changes of stations, not only within the continental limits of the United States but on a worldwide basis.

I cannot say that specifically we have approached the problem that has been mentioned.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. As I understand the law, Government personnel, military or nonmilitary, are permitted to travel first class. Of course, it would be possible to change the laws and the regulations. It is not mandatory, if one wishes to travel second class, that he travel first class. Since they have the privilege of traveling first class, most people in the military and Government agencies do travel first class whereas many citizens otherwise ride the coach flights. Now, the legislative committee could consider changing the law with respect to that subject or we could put a prohibition, perhaps, in this bill, but I doubt that this would be the best procedure.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman. I trust the committee will give consideration to this point, because, as I have said, a coach flight today is a first-class flight so far as comfort and flight time is concerned. In addition to the possible savings of $10 million to $20 million annually on flights within the continental United States there can be substantial savings in transoceanic flights as well.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss the Polaris system and its importance to our overall defense posture of the future.

The fleet ballistic missile, Polaris, occupies a place all of its own in our overall national program of developing long-range rocket powered weapons systems. Its purposes can be stated simply. That purpose is to provide us with a means for retaliating to major aggression massively, immediately, unpreventably from positions unknown to the aggressor, positions which cannot be identified and zeroed-in for destruction by missiles in advance of attack. Its military significance to us or to any potential enemy may prove to be decisive for with missiles ships deployed at sea we will hold in our hands the death warrant of any attacker no matter where, when, or how he might strike.

From a strategic standpoint the ocean areas from which Polaris missiles could reach major targets in the Communist bloc of nations totals some 30 million square miles of international waters. These seas provide a choice of launching positions nearly eight times the area of the United States, and about half again as large as the Sino-Soviet area itself. A fleet of Polaris missile ships deployed throughout this vast hiding place would be almost impossible to locate, especially as they are well concealed deep below the surface. Even a dozen or so such ships could carry enough missiles to wipe out the great bulk of the major Communist military targets within an hour of the order to fire.

The first Polaris weapons system will combine into a unique partnership the two most significant developments in military hardware since aircraft became major elements in warfare. One of these, of course, is the ballistic missile which uses outer space for its trajectory. The other is a ship which can actually live in the ocean depths—the new type of nuclear powered submarine.

A ballistic missile is a huge electronically guided rocket powered "throwing arm," for which to date there is no known defense at present nor in the foreseeable future. Ballistic missiles can destroy the historic barriers of warfare namely oceans, mountains, deserts, distances, and even the weather.

The new type nuclear submarine is a great mechanical fish that can operate deep in the ocean depths longer than its crew can endure. It needs to refuel only about every 2 years. The nuclear submarine and Polaris are our best deterrent to aggressive action against us because we have no defense against ballistic missiles.

The Polaris itself is unable to defend us against ballistic missiles, but our only hope is to prevent an enemy from attacking. With the Polaris he knows that if he does attack he will be clobbered back in return by these hidden but tremendously powerful and illusive weapons.

If an enemy tried to destroy the Polaris system, he would have to shoot or deliver his warheads out over the oceans of the world and not on our homeland.

The Polaris system must become a vital link in our defense. It is scheduled to have its first operational submarine in 1960. It beautifully provides flexible deterrent striking power necessary to complement land-based deterrent weapons.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat again the need and advantages of Polaris. It is undetectable by radar, invulnerable to missile pinpointing, has coverage of all important military targets, has dispersal area of all the oceans.

It removes target from the U.S. soil; it is instantly ready. I am confident our engineers will hurry this program along at maximum speed. The free world needs this great deterrent weapon, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to express my criticism on Army policies which arbitrarily idle and reserve defense production facilities and prevent their use by job-creating private enterprise operations.

In my city of Cleveland, we have a heavy bomber plant built in World War II—which never did receive much use for bomber assembly. This is, however, one of the finest buildings of its type in America, 25 acres under roof, a hangar-type construction. It is ideally suited for aircraft or missile production.

Since 1951 General Motors used this plant to manufacture Army tanks and until recently the M-56 airborne antitank gun carrier. Production terminated last month on the antitank gun carrier, and the Army has declared its intention to shut the plant down and keep control of the structure on a reserve status. At the same time, the Army has released other similar facilities in various parts of the country.

The declared Army policy on this plant reflects a dog-in-the-manger attitude toward the facility. The basic design and structure of the plant is for aircraft or missile assembly and not for weapons production, generally characteristic of Army requirements. Release of the plant for private enterprise use would make it available for research or production which would contribute to the Nation's defense more usefully than an idle, deteriorating plant rapidly proceeding to obsolescence.

It is ridiculous to see this type of plant—one of the finest in America—idled, while new missile-making structures of similar type are popping up at public expense like mushrooms in the night all over southern California and Texas.

Cleveland needs the 5,000 jobs that would be created if this plant were put to proper use.

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

Mr. VANIK. I yield to my distinguished and very able colleague from Ohio, Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. ASHLEY. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I think it is interesting, too, though this may not be exactly the appropriate place to raise this point, that the Army has behaved in a very secretive fashion with respect to the closing down, presumably for economy purposes, of various military installations around the country. Recently the Rossford Ordnance Depot in my district was closed down for what the Secretary of the Army has said will result in a $5 million a year saving. A month ago or longer, I requested the cost figures upon which this decision was based. And do you think I have been able to get one single figure from the Department of the Army? Absolutely not. And it is not only that I have not been able to get these figures. They have been refused me by the Secretary of the Army. And yet the people of Toledo are supposed to swallow this move that will cause an increase in our unemployment from 7.2 to 7.9 percent. Sixteen hundred men and women in the Toledo area are going to be put out of work because of this Army order, and they are being asked simply to take the word of the Secretary of the Army that this is for economy purposes—to take his word while he hides the facts.

The fact of the matter is that all of the information that has come to me from independent audit teams and from high ordnance personnel, which has come voluntarily, has been to the effect that the move to transfer activity from Rossford to Erie Ordnance Depot is for a purpose quite contrary to what has been stated; that economy is not going to be served, that this is a fabulously uneconomic and inefficient move.

I want to call the attention of the House to this matter because we are being asked today to consider a $40 billion military budget item. All I can say is that if this budget was arrived at by the same kind of methods and by the same procedures that I have experienced from the Department of the Army, it is going to be a little hard for me to recommend it or explain it to the people I represent.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know if my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], has read the record the subcommittee established on this point.

Mr. VANIK. I certainly have.

Mr. MINSHALL. But I should like to point out to him that I explored this entire situation with a great deal of thoroughness. I asked the Department of the Army to give me a complete report on this as to why the plant was being buttoned up. After receiving their report, I discussed it with them at some great length.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, during the committee hearings I asked the Department of the Army to give me a complete report on this as to why the plant was being buttoned up. After receiving their report, I discussed it with them at some great length. I explored this subject thoroughly. I am convinced, after having checked with the Army officials, and in view of the report that they gave me, that the buttoning up of this plant was not an economy measure no more than any facet of this defense budget is an economy measure. This defense budget is based primarily on getting the most for our defense dollar and giving the American public the maximum security for their defense dollar. I feel that the Department of the Army in mothballing this plant and having it on a standby basis is doing the proper thing. This is not the place to jeopardize our national defense just to try to make jobs. I am naturally in complete sympathy with any one out of a job but do not think we should make jobs by jeopardizing our national security.

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

Mr. MINSHALL. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. I want to point out that the plant was never designed or constructed for the kind of use to which it has been put by the Army.

Mr. MINSHALL. Does the gentleman know what the plans of the Army are for this plant?

Mr. VANIK. This is a hangar type of plant designed for aircraft and aircraft missile manufacture. I think it should be used for that purpose. If the Army cannot use it, then some type of private enterprise ought to be permitted to make use of it. It is not at all suited to the heavy type of work that the Army has in its public announcements indicated would be the purpose for which it would desire to use this plant.

Mr. MINSHALL. I should like to point out to the gentleman from Ohio that the Army has given me every assurance that this plant will be used in the best interests of the public, and even though it is buttoned up temporarily, in all probability they will be using it in the very near future, but not solely to make jobs.

Mr. VANIK. I certainly hope the gentleman is correct and that the Army will soon make proper use of it. It is my experience that a great many plants are put on a standby basis to be held in reserve and never be used until they become completely obsolete. I hope the Army will not make that mistake in this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, including aircraft and vessels; modification of aircraft; design and alteration of vessels; training and education of members of the Navy; administration; procurement of military personnel; purchase (not to exceed 1,117 for replacement only, including 10 at not to exceed $2,900 each) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $40 per person for civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel discharged for inaptitude, unsuitability, or otherwise than honorably; welfare and recreation; medals, awards, emblems and other insignia; transportation of things (including transportation of household effects of civilian employees); industrial mobilization; medical and dental care; care of the dead; lease of facilities; Latin American cooperation; charter and hire of vessels; relief of vessels in distress; maritime salvage services; military communications facilities on merchant vessels; dissemination of scientific information; administration of patents, trademarks, copyrights; losses in exchange and in accounts of disbursing officers, as authorized by law; annuity premiums and retirement benefits for civilian members of teaching services; tuition, allowances, and fees incident to training of military personnel at civilian institutions; repair of facilities; departmental salaries; utility services for buildings erected at private cost as authorized by law (10 U.S.C. 7580), and buildings on military reservations authorized by Navy regulations to be used for welfare and recreational purposes; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels, and other instructional, entertainment, and welfare expenses for the enlisted men; cryptographic equipment; procurement and production of services, special clothing, supplies, and equipment; procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants; exploration, prospecting, conservation, development, use, and operation of the naval petroleum reserves, as authorized by law; not to exceed $12,325,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 7202 of title 10, United States Code, to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government; and support of the town of Olongapo, as authorized by law; $2,599,320,000, of which $975,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses," Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1960, and $16,885,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation "Operating expenses," Coast Guard, fiscal year 1960, for the operation of ocean stations.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 10, line 10, strike out "$2,599,320,000" and insert "$2,594,820,000."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is one of five amendments that in total would strike $255 million from the budget. You can find the reference on page 18 of the committee report. This has to do with the additional moneys not recommended by the administration for antisubmarine warfare. I regret to say that under the parliamentary situation here I will not be able to discuss all five of these amendments together because, obviously, they cannot be discussed in 5 minutes. But, I join with the gentleman from Vermont who raised a question as to this method of considering a bill of this importance. This is said in no sense as a criticism of this committee. Yesterday, the committee took the entire time for debate. I tried to get time and apparently others did too who were not on the committee, but it is quite obvious that the committee did need the time in order to present this matter to us. As I say, it is not in criticism that I am bringing this out, but there are some of us who do study certain aspects of these appropriation bills and I think there are some of us who can contribute something to them. Certainly, this issue of $255 million which the administration did not request deserves considerable exploration, particularly, I might state, from my own standpoint, inasmuch as this is a matter which deals with antisubmarine warfare, which I have been following very closely ever since spending 3½ years in the Navy during World War II in that activity.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I do not have much time to explain the first of the amendments and I want to get through that first so that the House might possibly understand certain aspects of it.

Mr. SIKES. I was hoping that if we could get the gentleman more time, we might consider all of these amendments en bloc.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is what I would like to do.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may proceed for 10 additional minutes so that he can discuss all five of the amendments.

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

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida. I do regret that we cannot do this now, and I will have to go over this fairly rapidly.

Mr. Chairman, the report of the committee on page 17 that has to do with antisubmarine warfare, I regret to say, does not correctly reflect the testimony

in the committee hearings on this subject. The committee hearings in the volume that has to do with this in part I on policy statements have five references to this, and if anyone is interested, they can be found on pages 35 and 36, page 69, page 546, page 614, and page 757. Now, far from the testimony being that the Soviet fleet is growing, the testimony is that it has been cut back. As a matter of fact, there has been misrepresentation as to what the Soviet submarine fleet really was in the beginning. Incidentally, I have tried to indicate this for some time.

There are two aspects to submarine warfare. Only one has to do with submarines; the other has to do with submarine bases, and I submit to anyone here that throughout all the extent of Soviet Russia you will not find one single, not one single year-around ice-free open sea harbor.

This comparison of the Soviet submarine menace with the German submarine menace of World War II is utter nonsense, because the German submarines did have bases. That is one of the issues involved.

When Secretary McElroy appeared before the committee, he this year points out for the first time this question of the limitation of bases, and maybe that came about as a result of my calling his attention to this serious question.

On page 69 Secretary McElroy states he has not been concerned too much about Soviet submarine capability because he does not visualize the type of war where you might utilize these submarines which presently have to do with a war of a limited type, limited warfare between Soviet Russia and the United States.

But aside from that, the point is that this is something that was placed in the budget not at the request of the administration; and the interesting thing, as I get into it is this: That the committee in its wisdom saw fit to take away an aircraft carrier. Whether that is justified or not I do not know, but having cut out the money for the carriers the committee, I suspect, said: "We ought to give the Navy this quarter of a billion dollars we are cutting out for the carriers, so we will give it to them in an area where there has been no justification, namely, for antisubmarine purposes."

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend from Missouri who has just left the floor. I do not agree with him but I will to the death defend his right to say what he thinks is right.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I certainly thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think this is important. I think we should get into the meat of this matter and I am very much interested, I might state, in the hearings before the committee and the committee's explanation of the testimony that is in the hearings.

I want to refer, for example to page 614, to Admiral Burke's statement, or rather to the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] in his questioning of Admiral Burke.

Mr. GROSS. Which volume of the hearings?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. This is No. 1.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Our calculation of what the Soviet Union would have by way of submarine strength was in error. In other words, they do not have as many as we thought they were going to have.

Admiral BURKE. That is correct, they do not, although what they did was retire their old ships, and we thought they might not.

In a previous statement by Admiral Burke on page 546 he confirms what I have said.

The colloquy runs as follows:

Mr. SIKES. How significant do you consider the apparent cutback in Soviet submarine production?

Cutback, mind you.

I think it is very significant, sir, because they manufacture equipment on a mass production scale.

And he goes on further in that line. But the point is there has been apparently a stoppage of the construction of these submarines. The essential thing is this, Mr. Chairman, and a thing I wish the committee had interrograted the admirals about, and this is concerned with the antisubmarine problem.

The problem of the Soviet submarines is the problem of bases. Those who have listened to the Navy pleading for appropriations remember how they told us that it is not just ships alone that make the Navy, you have got to have bases; and we remember how they came up and justified the need for billions of dollars for naval bases. They can talk in eloquent terms about how they cannot sail ships and operate a Navy without bases when it comes to our own fleet; and they are absolutely right about it. But when it comes to appraising the force of the enemy they forget all about bases, and not anywhere in the testimony here is there any indication that this committee has inquired into that.

One thing Admiral Burke did say was that he thought the Russians would be silly if they built more than 450 submarines; and I say he is certainly right, and I doubt if they ever contemplated building that many.

So that is the basic issue involved here. I interrogated the chairman of the committee yesterday and the ranking minority member along these lines: Where you altered the administration's requests either by cutting off or by increasing the amounts in the light of new information which comes about because of developments after the budget has been frozen months before it is presented, did you take into consideration whether the Department of Defense had approved of these areas of increase or cutbacks. I was interested in the answer that the gentleman from Texas gave me to the effect that that could be ironed out over on the other side of the Capitol in the other body.

I think the way to iron out this increase for antisubmarine activities is not to give the administration what they have not asked for. Do not include this extra quarter of a billion dollars for which there is no justification in these hearings. Eliminate it, and then if it is important let whoever thinks it is important try to put it in on the other side. That is the essence of that.

One final point: This has to do with the tremendous propaganda campaign that is going on and has gone on for many years. I call your attention to Look magazine of May 26, 1959, in which there is a real propaganda article, "The Way We Are Not Ready to Fight," "Our Flanks Are Completely Open to a Giant Soviet Submarine Fleet," "An Inadequate Force of Sub Hunters Is Stretched Thin Across the Atlantic," this article deals with the Soviet submarine threat. It contains inaccurate statements throughout. It is misinformation deliberately given for propaganda purposes. The article quotes several admirals. This was published on May 26, 1959, obviously in order to get the propaganda just in time for us to consider this matter on the floor of the House. This kind of propaganda every Member of the Congress should resent. Let us get to the facts of the thing. The committee has not the facts on the question of the dangers from submarines. According to the testimony of Admiral Burke, we have a very adequate antisubmarine force and we have a good balance in this area.

For that reason I urge the committee to adopt the amendment I have offered and the other amendments which I will offer later.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in testimony before the Committee on Appropriations, Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, made reference to the submarine menace. He pointed out that the threat had become much greater than it formerly had been. He said, "We need to improve our capability to combat submarines." He said, "Since World War II the submarine has progressed faster than the antisubmarine warfare capability to combat them." He made those direct statements in his testimony before the committee. He also reminded us that Russia is operating about 450 submarines at this time. When World War II began the Germans were operating only 48 but the submarine almost proved decisive in that war.

Yet, in spite of that recent history, the gentleman is suggesting that we are doing too much about antisubmarine warfare. Admiral Burke told us that the

older Soviet submarines were being retired. There has been some lag in their production because of some significant reasons. I do not know whether it is on or off the record, but everybody I know of who is knowledgeable on this subject feels that the slow down has been brought about by their desire to construct nuclear-powered submarines.

The gentleman read from one of the six volumes of hearings in regard to antisubmarine warfare, but in volume II, beginning on page 196, we have for many, many pages testimony of the military experts who work very directly with the antisubmarine program, and who are responsible for its success. They came up from Norfolk and elsewhere to testify before us. When we called upon Navy officials to say whether or not additional funds were required in the Navy budget we were told that $500 million worth of additional expenditures were really required if they were to do the job they would like to do for the United States. These additional funds included far more than is being recommended by the committee. In other words, these funds for the additional antisubmarine warfare programs were not in the budget that came to us, but it is not the fault of the Navy they were not because Admiral Burke and the Secretary of the Navy both supported the full program before the Secretary of Defense. The gentleman knows if we have a war of any duration it is important for the United States to maintain control of the seas and 450 submarines constitute the greatest menace that could possibly threaten us on the seas. It seems to me that Congress must be alert about this matter if we want adequate protection for the people and the industrial areas which might be destroyed by the submarines off our coasts. The gentleman should not oppose this action which has the support of the Navy and the need for which has been so thoroughly justified by the Navy.

I hope that the Committee will support the Committee on Appropriations in this matter. In the report the information as to how these funds will be spent is shown on page 18.

Among other things it provides for an additional nuclear submarine, and for an additional destroyer. Here is the place where we are lagging. Here is where our survival may be threatened. To consider for one moment striking this from the bill seems to me unthinkable and I hope the Committee will support the action taken.

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

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

Mr. FLOOD. This was the uanimous action and the enthusiastic action of the full subcommittee, was it not?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing a good deal about submarine bases. I would like to draw attention to the fact, although I do not think it is necessary, because many Members have told me they felt it was very important to put back into this bill the money for the attack aircraft carriers. As you know, the carriers are mobile bases and they are vital to our national defense. If countries where we have airplane bases, airfields, should suddenly decide they do not want us there and put us out, we would be very dangerously weakened. That might happen in a number of instances. And, without these mobile bases, we would be terribly vulnerable. We remember the valuable service the Navy has performed with its great carriers. The performance at Lebanon showed that as an example.

I shall not try to offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman, because I believe we will secure the carriers later. I found many Members tremendously interested in the carriers. This bill was supposed to be a balanced service bill. Thus with the attack aircraft carriers deleted it is not a balanced defense service bill. It would be a horrible thing not to have the carriers. Thanks to each and all of you who have worked so hard on this bill, I know it has been a grueling task and one that tries the souls and hearts of men.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say in regard to the attack aircraft carrier—it is singular—that I thoroughly agree with the distinguished gentlewoman and that I intend to follow her leadership in this matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very grateful. The gentleman is extremely smart and very clever in getting what he wants.

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

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. We are truly a seapower Nation. We are bound to the sea by economics, by politics and by military strategy. We receive and ship materials of vital importance to the entire group of free world nations; we are allied and committed to many maritime nations throughout the world to whom we have pledged our strength and support. The nations of the world with whom we share the common bond of determination to resist Communist aggression would be isolated from us and from each other without the vast network of ocean shipping. Moreover, this isolation would occur at a time in history when consolidation of Western civilization's defensive strength is more critical than ever before. Our world strength, depends in part upon our seapower to hold this network together. But in a vastly larger sense, our world strength depends not only upon our seapower as it projects the Nation's power over the seas of the world, but as it has the mobile capability of projecting this Nation's power from those seas onto any land area of the world where it is needed to stem the tide of Communist aggression and to keep the peace.

Thus our seapower is an important element of our world strength and our seapower depends upon our Navy. Recognizing this, we have wisely built a strong Navy, capable of guarding our shores and our shipping, and of equal importance, capable of striking effectively anywhere in the world where the need should arise. There is no luck or coincidence involved in the fact that our fleets have been ready to move the Nation's power for peace into any area where aggression has threatened. Rather, it has resulted from a unique U.S. comprehension of the concept of seapower, the creation of naval forces capable of implementing that concept, and the skill with which we have done it. We in the Congress have a solemn responsibility to understand what that seapower concept is, its vital role in the Nation's destiny and what balance of naval forces are required to perpetuate it. For if we in the Congress, failing in this understanding, fail thereby to provide the naval forces basic to seapower, we also fail in our obligation to provide for the common defense.

This understanding comes readily if we will but look to the vaunted British navy whose actions for almost three centuries gave rise to generation on generation of proud Britain's declarations that "Britannia Rules the Waves." This, in the literal sense, was true during the emergence and flowering of the British Empire. Britain controlled the sealanes of the world and was thus able to move her land forces where she pleased. Because there was no really effective shore-based resistance she was able to land those forces in many areas of the world and engage in the extensive colonization which created her empire.

But with all due respect to our good friends and allies, it can be said with historial hindsight that never, in all these hundreds of years, did the British ever understand or possess true seapower in the sense that she discovered the concepts, manufactured the hardware, and developed the know-how which would have enabled her effectively and efficiently to project her great national power on to land areas against resistance. This failure was evident during the wars with France, it was evident at Galipoli, and it was evident in the 1957 Suez fiasco.

Britannia did, indeed, for hundreds of years rule the waves, but never did she gain real understanding of their full potentiality for transferring her power to the world's beaches. Thus she never basically utilized and exploited the sea to more than a fraction of the effectiveness she might have. Not, I hasten to add, because of any incompetence. Actually because conditions never really called upon her to do so. The unfortunate result in modern times has been that the Admiralty gave little or no attention to amphibious warfare as a means of projecting British power from sea to land and it relegated the aircraft carrier to a primary role of fleet protection rather than using it for spearhead-

ing powerful striking forces aimed at beachhead objectives.

Fortunately for the United States, a small group exists within our services primarily confronted with the specific problem of projecting this Nation's power from the sea to troubled spots ashore, namely, the U.S. Marine Corps. Fortunately again for this United States, this group is intertwined organizationally with the U.S. Navy. The two groups could, and did plan and work together between the two World Wars. Together, and often with cooperation of the U.S. Army, they expanded the narrow "rule the waves" concept of seapower to a wide and masterful concept of its effective utilization to carry the Nation's full military power anywhere on the oceans of the world and project it from sea to land at times and places of our own choosing. The magnificently successful amphibious campaigns of World War II resulted.

But these amphibious task forces were not merely men trained to hit the beach, or amphibious ships, or attack spearheading aircraft carriers. They were a carefully and precisely balanced combination of all. It must be recognized that without the task force air cover supplied from the carrier, the campaigns would have failed. Without the close air support supplies from these ships to the men on the beach, the campaigns would have failed. Not only in hot war, but in cold war as well, these carriers are a basic element of the Nation's vital seapower. Without aircraft carriers the Lebanon landings would certainly have failed. Without this same type of ship to balance and effectuate the projection of this Nation's power for peace at future trouble spots, we cannot expect the results we have obtained in the past. Without the aircraft carrier this Nation's mastery of seapower is incomplete, its basic power to resist the aggressions of communism is weakened, and thus its ability to deter those aggressions either in cold war or in hot war diminishes.

These are the considerations we should have in mind as we consider the fiscal fate of the Navy's aircraft carrier program and its relation to our strength to defend ourselves in a troubled world.

The arguments we all have heard the Navy use in support of its attack carrier make sense. The Navy has not suggested that the carrier is the sole item of value in our defense, and has not, to my knowledge advocated that the carrier replace any other major defense system. Our Department of Defense has planned a balanced military force, ready to meet either the threat of a nuclear war, or the threat of limited aggression. The Navy within its balanced fleet concept has designed the attack carrier for versatility, capable of accomplishing different kinds of missions. With the attack carrier our fleet can move as it did into Lebanon, as it does in the Formosan area and elsewhere to exert our influence, to limit the spread of fighting, and to serve notice of our intentions to support our national foreign policy. Not only does the carrier have the capability of using discriminate and discrete force, but it carries the big wallop, too. As a self-contained airbase, easily and quickly transported anywhere in the world, free from foreign diplomatic control, the carrier is able to add to the total nuclear punch that we promise in retaliation. I am convinced that no small part of the present nuclear stalemate exists because the Navy is not a preset target, and never will be. An enemy attack simply cannot surprise all of our forces at the same time: he would have to make a decision whether to try for a knock-out blow on our land installations or on our fleet. He could not win both. Our safety is assured to the extent that he continues to know that the United States with the help of a far-ranging fleet can launch such a force.

But the nuclear power of the Navy is not the most significant aspect of our seapower to my mind. I am impressed with the diplomatic way in which the Navy has always been able to show our influence and the speed with which it brings considerable airpower, seapower, and marine-power into focus on local situations.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that if the striking power of our Air Force or of our Army were in question that I would feel equally strongly. We may arrive in time at a point when we can reduce our armed strength—we have not yet arrived there. We need to become aware of all of the capabilities of our major defense weapons. The attack carrier certainly stands out as one of the most important. The new carriers are far superior to the older ones in that they are safer for the pilots, they can handle the modern aircraft so necessary in this jet-age, and they are free from the failures that accompany overage. The testimony before the House subcommittee which emphasized the fact that our ships are approaching the point of being over-age is not surprising. The Navy has, for some years, had the understanding sympathy of the Congress toward this problem. The planned program of replacement of ships, and the modernization of others is necessary to good management. To keep our defense structure strong we must have the most modern aircraft carriers we can afford.

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

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman for a very profound statement on this subject and to say that I fully agree with him.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, the defense health of our Nation must be appraised over a space of time, not just at any one moment. In recent years, we have been subject to nuclearitis, sputnikitis, and, of course, chronic and increasingly severe, budgetitis. A quick check on our present pulse indicates that there are reasons to be somewhat concerned with our military posture. We have the views of the military specialists in attendance as well as those of the general practitioners. With a staff of diagnosticians, professional and amateur, vying for prominence, the resulting recommendations must be looked at very carefully to avoid more drastic treatment than the patient can stand.

My concern at the moment is with the status of our naval power. We hear our Navy friends talk about mobility, flexibility and versatility, and we read these words so often that their real meaning as a frame of reference for making judgments may be lost. These words are not, in my opinion, merely descriptive, for they refer to the basic concepts which underlie our naval planning—the philosophy established by the Congress and accepted by our citizens. This is a philosophy which rests upon our dedication not only to prepare for defense but to be ready to return any attack.

Our geographic position between two oceans requires that we develop and maintain a fleet which can move anywhere in these vast three dimensional battlefields to meet threats under, on, or above the surface of the sea, with the kind of force that is matched to the kind of threat presented. This is what is meant by mobility, flexibility, and versatility.

To be mobile the fleet must be able to move rapidly and it must be able to move with confidence. The fleet must have the speed, armament and air cover that cannot be bluffed. A fleet of ships with limited capability—and such limitations increase with years of service—cannot do the job. The term flexibility is probably one of the most significant in our thinking of military problems today: in this one word the Navy emphasizes that a balanced fleet must be ready to meet different kinds of problems, deal with different kinds of threats, and deliver different kinds of force.

Now what about this flexibility? Is the Navy flexible? Will it continue to be flexible? The growing strength of our submarine force is well known. The highly publicized exploits of our subs and their quiet, steady competence in accomplishing their mission has earned them strong support. There are those who have promoted conflict between the submarine concept and the carrier concept—let us hope that they have become aware of the consequences of an unbalanced fleet—one which, like the unbalanced Russian fleet, could only carry out restricted purposes.

There are those who confuse limited war with limited capability. The capability of our carriers to apply effective force should not be limited regardless of whether we anticipate limited war, or all-out general war. Our carriers should be as modern, as efficient, and as powerful as we can make them. There is no substantiation in history for the "sitting duck" criticism. There is no likelihood that future enemy capabilities to attack will be so superior to our capabilities to defend that such criticism will be valid. Opponents of the attack carrier hypothecate the total destruction of the duck with one nuclear bomb or submarine attack. Such destruction rests upon the assumption that the duck is placidly preening herself. A further assumption underlying some of the criticisms of the attack carrier is that the next war will be a general, all-out, nuclear war. Aside from the fact that our military and political leaders disclaim the imminence or

probability of such general war, common sense assures us that such wholesale destruction can hardly be called an instrument of national policy.

If we accept that we have reached and can maintain a point of mutual deterrence, then the existence of a strong balanced military force capable of dealing with limited wars becomes of primary importance. Each of our Armed Forces must maintain a balanced force, and this balance in the Navy rests to a large extent upon the flexibility of its fleet.

Can the Navy continue to maintain this flexibility? What does it take to insure flexibility to meet limited threats in a limited way as well as to be ready for general war?

First, we must dedicate ourselves to providing the defense we need. We must not be governed solely by the cost in dollars.

Second, we must dedicate ourselves to a concept of a balanced military force, ready to meet any kind of threat, ready to apply appropriate force in support of national policy.

Third, we must be ready to provide for a regular program of procurement of major defense items and to renew and to replace them in accordance with good management procedures.

Fourth, we must resist attempts to unbalance our military force. We cannot plan for our national defense health by following a popularity contest among spectacular developments in modern weaponry. Specifically, we cannot scuttle the regular augmentation of our carrier force, if we are to maintain balanced naval power.

Although I complete 20 years of commissioned service in the Naval Reserve this month, I am not a naval aviator and have not served more than brief training periods on aircraft carriers. Although I have always been proud of my naval service and perhaps sentimental about personal associations within the Navy, I have also been severely critical at times of various attributes of naval policy. I do not subscribe to the blank-check kind of support of the Navy's carrier construction program; the Congress should reexamine all long-range programs each year in the light of changing conditions. I have myself suggested that perhaps less costly carriers might be built as Polaris takes over the "big bang" responsibility of the Navy in an all-out nuclear war. However, I am convinced it is folly to neglect the less than all-out war capability of which the attack carrier task force is our most potent and flexible weapon system. To expect World War II ships, even though modified and modernized, to continue to perform reliably after 20 years of strenuous service is absurd; to expect these carriers to handle efficiently modern aircraft for which they were never designed is foolhardy; to demand naval fulfillment of present and prospective worldwide commitments with obsolete or obsolescent major vessels is to invite costly operational losses in peacetime and disastrous unreliability in time of combat.

These carriers take years to build. The Congress declined to appropriate to build one in the fiscal year 1959, and the committee has deleted the one proposed for the fiscal year 1960. The ability of our Navy to do the job we have assigned it will be in serious jeopardy if we fail to restore funds for orderly replacement of World War II built ships which even today are obsolescent and which will soon be both obsolete and just plain worn out.

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

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to venture the opinion that the committee has made a serious mistake in not supplying in the pending bill the needed funds for construction of an additional attack aircraft carrier which was included in the Navy Department's budget in the amount of $260 million. The attack aircraft carrier is a vital and unique element of our military strength. Its role in coping with international situations has been clearly demonstrated during the Suez, Lebanon and Formosa difficulties.

The Navy is presently operating 14 attack aircraft carriers. Under normal circumstances, four to six of these carriers are deployed overseas in the Mediterranean and the Far Eastern waters of the Pacific. In times of international stress, the carriers deployed to these areas number from 10 to 12. The remaining at such times are engaged in intense training programs, and necessary shipyard overhauls.

Nine of the 14 active attack carriers are of the World War II *Essex* class and must be replaced as their inherent age and infirmity will preclude their utilization by 1966 as attack aircraft carriers. At present they are marginally suitable for the operation of our present high performance aircraft, and will be unable to effectively accommodate the type of aircraft required to keep pace with Russian technology in the field of manned aircraft.

There are now three *Forrestal* class attack aircraft carriers in the fleets, with an additional one scheduled to join the fleet this year. Three more are under construction, including the nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier *Enterprise*. One of these will be completed each year until 1962. As a *Forrestal* carrier joins the fleet, an overage *Essex* World War II class attack aircraft carrier, is retired from the attack carrier force.

To maintain the naval task forces now deployed overseas, the Navy must continue to replace the overage World War II *Essex* class carrier with modern carriers capable of accommodating the high performance aircraft of today and the foreseeable future. The Navy testified before the Appropriations Committee that if all attack carriers were of the *Forrestal* class, the improved safety factor would result in saving the lives of a dozen or more pilots and $70 million each year. Furthermore, the *Forrestal* class carrier carries two times as much jet aircraft fuel, three to four times the number of nuclear and conventional bombs, and can deliver these bombs on the target at three to four times the rate of the *Essex* class.

Originally the Department of the Navy asked President Eisenhower's Bureau of the Budget and his Secretary of Defense for an additional nuclear-powered *Forrestal* class attack carrier. The Administration compromised by allowing funds for a conventional *Forrestal* class attack carrier costing $120 million less than the nuclear-powered carrier. During the course of the hearings of the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, I made efforts to have funds for the carrier included in the bill, and subsequently at the meeting of the full Committee on Appropriations I was prepared to offer an amendment to the pending bill which would have provided them. At about this time all of those who felt that funds for the carrier, either nuclear or conventional, should have been included in the bill agreed that the best strategy would be to forego the offering of an amendment in the full committee and to forego the offering of an amendment here on the House floor with the expectation that the funds will be included in this bill when it is considered by the other body. Relying upon the unanimous judgment of those concerned, I shall not this afternoon offer an amendment to include the carrier funds.

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

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman and others who have spoken on behalf of the carrier.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to concur wholeheartedly with the remarks of the gentleman from New York. During a period of several days last fall, it was my privilege to observe aircraft carrier operations at sea off the coast of Formosa with the 7th Fleet. I can assure you that the modern attack carrier striking force is a vital and necessary arm of our national security. The modern carrier can project the exact degree of force required with precise direction and intensity. It can gain and maintain control of the air in the area of operations, which is so vital in times like these when we are liable to have small, limited wars break out at any troubled spot in the world. It provides close air support for troops ashore. As events in the past have shown over and over again, the attack carrier is an optimum weapon system for deterrence of, or successful prosecution of, limited war.

I think two facts of paramount importance should be mentioned here. First and foremost, in the foreseeable future no system of weapons or armament can replace the aircraft carrier, deployed with its manned planes ready to go. Land-based aircraft must have bases from which to operate in order to project themselves. Missiles cannot replace manned aircraft because they cannot discriminate or select targets or actions required. Once a missile is on its way, it cannot be recalled.

Mr. Chairman, just this past week there occurred on the attack carrier *Essex* a tragic and unnecessary accident that could have been averted, possibly, if these planes had been operating from *Forrestal*-size carriers. In the forenoon of last Thursday 2 men were killed and

18 injured, with 3 burned seriously, when a plane crashed on the carrier deck. In times when high-speed heavy jet aircraft are operated on a day-to-day, night-to-night basis, for the safety of our men in the Navy and the crews that so valiantly serve them, we need larger and more modern aircraft carriers in our Navy.

I sincerely hope the other body, with their deliberate consideration of this item in the budget as proposed, will see fit to approve funds for the construction of a supercarrier.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, since the attack aircraft carrier is the heart of U.S. seapower, I sincerely trust that the House will make provision for a nuclear-powered *Forrestal* type of carrier in this bill. The budget presented by the President requests a carrier and the Navy wants it badly. Of course, both the Budget and the Navy have asked for a conventional type carrier. My impression is that a nuclear-powered vessel would be preferred by them but for budgetary problems.

Admiral Hayward in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee stated that we need a carrier, because if we do not have it in the years to come we shall not be able to meet our commitments. He said that our experience indicates that manned aircraft is here to stay, and that our ability to project our power across the sea is dependent upon the aircraft carrier.

Secretary McElroy stated at the hearings that the decision to request a carrier was made at the highest level of Government after a great deal of consideration not only by the Navy but in other parts of the executive branch. The administration feels this carrier is an integral part of our defense.

Secretary Gates told the committee that it would be a vital error of the United States to delay the construction of a carrier. He said that we are operating nine *Essex* carriers as attack carriers. They are World War II type and cannot handle modern airplanes.

Admiral Burke said that we would not be able to support forces that we might have to commit to limited wars without new carriers. He said that without them we would not be able to project our military power to certain areas of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the new carrier should be nuclear powered. We should not build something that is outmoded at the start. Admiral Rickover has strongly supported the view that new carriers should be nuclear powered. It would, of course, cost $120 million more to build, but it would most certainly be worth it. During the life of the carrier the Navy would probably save that amount of money in supply, and gain several times the value in effectiveness. There would be no refueling costs such as is the case with conventional vessels. The carrier could stay at sea for indefinite periods of time, and by reason of its almost unlimited mobility would be a tremendously effective instrument in any kind of war.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the sums which the bill provides for research and development.

The studies and investigations conducted by the Committee on Science and Astronautics have indicated unmistakably that research and development will play a vital part in the future growth and security of the Nation. Advanced technology lies today at the very heart of our national defense. It also spurs economic growth and activity, which tomorrow will form the foundation of our security as well as our comfort and well-being. We therefore support a strong program of scientific research and development.

Effective research and development, even if adequately funded, needs continuity. In the past, on-again off-again support of research programs has led to waste and delay. We can no longer afford the luxury of erratic support to which we have too often been prone. Lead times are inescapable, and cannot be wholly redeemed even by crash programs or lavish later expenditures. Sound, efficiently managed programs should be continued at adequate levels, and not cut back or interrupted.

In this connection, it behooves us to think twice before we transfer a going program from one agency to another. I am not speaking now of new programs which may be started, for example, in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration rather than the armed services. But a sound program on which the armed services are doing a good job should not be transferred without compelling reasons.

The Appropriations Committee deserves our praise and gratitude for its fine report on this bill. It deserves our thanks for giving substantial support to research and development. If anything, the amounts provided for research and development should be even larger, as in future years they will surely be.

At present, as we all recognize, the spearhead of military technology is missile and space development. While progress must be made on a broad front, and no promising avenue should be left unexplored, research and engineering on military missiles, including their electronic and other associated equipment, demand the highest priority. This, at the moment, is the critical field on which our future and our hopes may well depend. It deserves our full support in all its phases.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the subcommittee and the full committee for its action in reference to research and development generally; research and development covering the Army, the Navy and the Air Force and ARPA, which is a new defense organization covering scientific research and development.

There are funds available to each department of the Department of Defense for this purpose. This represents really the first time, I think, that we have had what you would call a real program of research and development. The program in these different departments runs to something like $3.5 billion or $4 billion. ARPA runs to something like $445 million, and if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] would care to correct that figure, I should appreciate it.

Mr. SIKES. Four hundred and fifty-five million dollars.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It all represents a continuing program. This is the first time, as I say, that we are having a continuing program that will run from year to year.

Frankly, since I have been serving on the Committee on Science and Astronautics I have just begun to fully appreciate the economic value and the security value to the Nation of our program of research and development. I know of nothing that means more to the security of our Nation than for us to keep abreast of developments in scientific research and to see that they are properly and promptly applied to the defense operations of this Nation. In this respect, the committee has been liberal in taking care of the different departments, and I certainly think they are entitled to a word of commendation from us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps including equipment and facilities; procurement of military personnel; training and education of regular and reserve personnel, including tuition and other costs incurred at civilian schools; welfare and recreation; utility services for buildings erected at private cost as authorized by law, and buildings on military reservations authorized by Navy regulations to be used for welfare and recreational purposes; conduct of schoolrooms, service clubs, chapels, and other instructional, entertainment and welfare expenses for the enlisted men; not to exceed $40 per person for civilian clothing, including an overcoat when necessary, for enlisted personnel discharged for inaptitude or unsuitability or otherwise than honorably; procurement and manufacture of military supplies, equipment and clothing; hire of passenger motor vehicles; transportation of things; medals, awards, emblems and other insignia; losses in exchange and in accounts of disbursing officers, as authorized by law; and departmental salaries; $171,350,000.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, may I compliment the members of this committee on the painstaking way in which they have done an arduous job, in bringing this bill to the House. I agree that there are probably problems presented in the minds, particularly of some of the new Members, concerning our procedure in handling the debate. But we seem to move along. What I have to say at this point may not apply to the committee's handling of this specific matter with the Air Force. It may apply to the Legislative Committee, but methinks it must be said at this time.

The pressing, legitimate, and unmet needs of our defense system today go well beyond what our revenues can presently support, what the administration has sought, or what the Congress is likely to

approve. We are constantly in the position of responding to requests in accordance with degrees of urgency, leaving many acknowledged gaps and deficiencies unfilled. Even so, as we are constantly reminded, the support of our present Military Establishment is a heavy burden upon the civilian economy.

This being the case, we should be doubly alert today against any use of defense funds for purposes that are unnecessary and uneconomical, that do not contribute in a positive way to the state of our defenses, and that are clearly and directly detrimental to the civilian economy from which those funds are drawn. When, for example, a branch of the Armed Forces proposes to create a military labor force for the express purpose of taking over work that is now being loyally and skillfully performed by private firms and civilian workers more efficiently and at lower cost, it is our duty as Members of Congress to blow the whistle and call a halt.

Specifically, the objections of Congress ought to be expressed in the strongest possible terms against the announced plans of the Air Force to supplant civilian contractors and civilian employees with enlisted personnel in the operation and maintenance of all SAGE plants that have been and will be established throughout the country. These plants are now being operated by skilled and experienced workmen who were led to believe that these jobs offered some degree of security and stability of employment. They were never told, nor was it the understanding when they were engaged, that these were short-term jobs and that after the plant had been placed in smooth working order, they would be dumped on the unemployment rolls in a small town with no other demand for their services, or for those more fortunate—kept on just long enough to help break in inexperienced Air Force enlisted men on their old jobs.

It should hardly be necessary to point out how much more difficult this Air Force plan will make it for contractors who will still be called upon to build and to undertake the initial operation of future SAGE plants to recruit the kind of reliable, skilled, and experienced men they will need to carry out their responsibility. It is equally obvious that the increase in civilian unemployment resulting from this loss of private employment opportunities will be harmful to the economy, both locally and nationally, and to relations between civilians and the military in the communities where these plants are located.

A survey conducted by the Air Force itself has found that the number of years of experience that civilians presently employed at these plants have for their jobs is exceedingly high. Constant turnover as men are transferred and enlistments expire, on the other hand, has consistently handicapped and made more expensive past efforts to train enlisted men for skilled occupations of this character or to give them any real interest or stake in such jobs.

From the standpoint of operating economy, any comparison of costs will expose the Air Force proposal as an example of sheer, senseless, large-scale extravagance. At Grandview, Mo., the American Hydrotherm Co. operates a SAGE plant, by contract with the Air Force, with 48 employees at a cost to the Government of about $264,000 per year. No case has been or can be made that this operation is not being conducted or maintained in keeping with the requirements of the program.

Effective July 1, 1959, the following system will go into effect:

American Hydrotherm will retain, for the time being, a contract covering 22 employees. Seven civil service employees will be used and 60 enlisted personnel have already been asssigned. The annual cost of maintaining the enlisted personnel alone has been estimated at $637,740. The total cost for all 89 of the contemplated personnel will be about $771,940 per year. The difference in cost over the present system is $507,940 a year.

Ultimately the contract with American Hydrotherm, according to present Air Force plans, will be completely canceled, so that this cost will be reduced by about $80,000, but the net cost will still remain more than $425,000 a year higher than under the present system. When it is realized that some 30 of these SAGE plants will eventually be established in different parts of the country, it can be seen that the result of applying the Air Force policy will be an added cost to the American taxpayer of $15,000,000—spent in disregard of the most effective use of military manpower in a manner which needlessly deprives skilled and loyal American workmen of their livelihoods.

The one argument advanced by the Air Force is an old one, constantly invoked by the military whenever it has sought to extend its boundaries into civilian territory, to multiply its duty stations, and to enlarge its reservoir of potential assignments for personnel. It maintains that the iron discipline of military law, with absolute control over the lives of personnel, is necessary to assure continuous operations and to avoid the possibility that a work stoppage might occur during an emergency.

I believe that this argument is a totally unjustified slur upon the loyalty, responsibility and patriotism of American workers. If this attitude of the military is correct—that the only way to assure performance of duty when the safety of the Nation and of every family is threatened is a gun in the back—then we are in a very bad way, and we had all better be inducted into the Armed Forces right away. If there is no workable alternative to a possible breakdown of vital operations but militarization then we had better begin either to find one or to consent to a far more sweeping extension of the authority of the military over civilian life than any we have tolerated before in a free nation.

The character and complexity of modern weapons and modern warfare is such that, unless we conscript most of the population, there is no alternative but to rely upon civilian experience, civilian cooperation, and civilian devotion to duty in many vital industries, sciences, and skills that are just as essential as a SAGE project to the support of the defense effort. We are doing so now in the production and testing of missiles and in the operation of missile bases, in the operation of atomic installations, and in a host of other areas of direct and vital importance to our national safety. It would not only be foolish and costly in the extreme, but impossible, to incorporate and to keep in the ranks of the military every job, skill or technical function that bears upon our military security.

So far as the continuous operation of SAGE installations as a part of the defense network is concerned, it should be enough, so long as civilian operation is otherwise satisfactory and economical, to be fully assured that the parties involved are completely aware of the responsibilities they bear and have developed reliable methods and procedures for the resolution of differences without work stoppages.

In this connection, I am advised that in all the period that SAGE plants have been in operation, not 1 minute of time has been lost by reason of strikes, work stoppages, slowdowns, or labor disputes of any kind, and that the labor agreements between the contractors and trade unions representing employees in these plants contain the most ironclad no-strike provisions to be found in the country. Methods and criteria for bargaining and reaching settlements on wages and other terms of employment, in the absence of the ultimate strike weapon, have been developed and employed successfully in areas such as the TVA and on atomic energy projects, and can certainly be applied with success in SAGE situations. I understand that the unions whose members are employed in SAGE facilities have expressed their complete willingness to cooperate with any steps or procedures necessary to assure that operations do not suffer from work stoppages or shortages of skilled manpower.

Cooperation of this kind has proved of very great value to the Nation in the past. It should not be spurned now, in favor of costly and unnecessary military regimentation.

I have very clearly in mind the present administration's many promises and strong declarations over the years, as to the need to get the Federal Government out of business and to turn over to private industry all of those functions which it could perform more efficiently. This is certainly one of those functions, and certainly no intrusion of Government into private enterprise is more dangerous or destructive of American values than an encroachment of the Military Establishment. Has the Commander in Chief no influence with the Air Force or were those promises for the birds? I now suggest that the Congress redeem them, if the President will not.

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

Mr. SHELLEY. I yield.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the position taken by the gentleman from California because it has come to my attention that

in the SAGE operations around Duluth about 30 experienced operating engineers have been given notice that their services will be terminated and that Air Force employees will take over, which I protest against.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman for this contribution.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the problem that has just been discussed by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY]. I think it is something that is worthy of the attention of the Congress. I hope they will read the testimony given by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] and the statement which I am making in the RECORD.

When I heard of the proposal of the Air Force to replace civilians with enlisted personnel in the operation of SAGE plants I sent an inquiry to the Air Force in an effort to ascertain the facts. Like many other Members who did the same, I received a reply through the Office of the Air Force Legislative Liaison.

In this reply I was informed:

In the past it has been our practice to initially maintain and operate utility systems at SAGE installations by contract until such time as Government personnel could be properly trained to perform this service.

I had some difficulty with this sentence because it seemed to imply that the replacement of civilians with military personnel at these installations was an old established procedure that had been going on for some time with the knowledge of all concerned. Yet, if my information is correct, contract operation has been the standard operating procedure up to now, and the takeover by military personnel is something new that had not previously been done. Furthermore, if it was the intention of the Air Force all along to throw out the contractor and the civilian work force, and to put enlisted men in their jobs, knowledge of this intention was, it seems, pretty much the private property of the Air Force itself.

Apparently the contractors were not made aware of it when they took the jobs. At least, so I am informed, in organizing the work force they needed to man these installations, skilled workmen were, in many cases, persuaded to quit good stable jobs they held with private utilities and elsewhere and to give up years of seniority and other employment rights in order to meet the need for experienced men to operate the SAGE plants. They were offered steady jobs, not floaters' havens.

Now the Air Force proposes to dump them unceremoniously for the sake of more billets for the military. They gave up their former jobs and pioneered the SAGE projects just to pave the way for the troops. I doubt very much that any skilled experienced craftsman, holding the kind of job that would qualify him to help put a SAGE plant in good order, would care to go to work for a SAGE contractor if he were told what lay at the end of the road.

The Air Force's manner of doing business in this situation seems, on the face of it, to represent the rankest kind of highhanded injustice—aside from the cost element, which is damning in itself.

The Air Force reply went on to say:

The Air Defense Command is currently conducting a study to determine the method of operation to be used for the SAGE sites. This study will cover all factors involved in these operations, including a comparison of the costs of contract operation versus Government operation.

Any final decision in this matter which may result in a change in the present plans to operate these installations with Government personnel will be made only after this study has been completed and the results thoroughly evaluated.

In other words, after making the decision to replace civilian contractors and employees with enlisted personnel, effective July 1 of this year, the Air Force is going to make a long and careful study, extending into the indefinite future, to determine whether that decision was a wise one. Would it be too much for the Congress to ask that this study be undertaken before a radical change in the method of operating these facilities is made, rather than after? Without further belaboring the obvious absurdity of the Air Force's approach to this matter, let me simply express the devout hope that this is not the way that all military decisions are now being made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

For necessary expenses in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games, 1960, as authorized by section 1 of the Act of April 3, 1958 (Public Law 85-365), $400,000.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAIRD: On page 19, line 5, after "$400,000" insert "provided that funds in this paragraph shall not be available for support of any international game or events in which participation is denied any of the free countries of the world."

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, and reserve the point of order.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to prohibit the use of the $400,000 which this bill makes available for Army support personnel to carry on the winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley if any free nation of the world is prohibited from taking part in these winter Olympic games.

The International Olympics Committee recently decided to expel the athletes of the Republic of China from participation in Olympic activities. It seems to me this decision of the International Olympics Committee is purely an act of political discrimination. It does not seem to me that the U.S. taxpayers' dollars should be used for support of the winter Olympic games if representatives of the Republic of China, by the action of the International Olympics Committee, are barred from participation in these games.

This amendment is fair and just. It is necessary for the International Olympics Committee to give further consideration to their action in barring representatives of Nationalist China from taking part in the Olympic activities.

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

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BECKER. Is a point of order going to be made against the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order has been reserved.

Mr. BECKER. If a point of order is to be made against the amendment I wish it could be disposed of at the present time, for if it is sustained I have an amendment I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has informed the Chair that he will withdraw his point of order.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to heartily endorse the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I have an amendment at the desk which would do the same thing by striking out those lines on page 19.

I think it is about time that we in the Congress of the United States expressed our feelings not only to the people of our Nation but the people of the world and let them know that we support our allies and our friends now and at all times.

Mr. Chairman, I was indeed very pleased to read in the newspapers that since the Olympics Committee made the decision barring Chinese nationalists from participation that our own State Department has made a public statement condemning the action of the International Olympics Committee. I believe this is quite a step in the right direction, and I am pleased that our State Department has made known our feelings on behalf of the U.S. Government. We, the taxpayers of the United States, do not intend that our money and our name, our country and our land be used to purge a friend, and a very good friend of the United States, Nationalist China.

Why, at this particular time, the Olympics Committee should see fit, on the demand of Soviet Russia, Red Russia, to purge a sporting outfit, an outfit to be sent to the Olympic games, to purge a friendly nation, is difficult to understand.

Let me take you back to the forming of the United Nations and remind you that it was Red Russia that forced the governments of the world participating in that United Nations formative assembly to bow before her demands for the elimination of opening each session of the U.N. with prayers calling upon divine wisdom to guide the United Nations in their actions. That very surrender cost us a great deal of prestige in the eyes of the world.

I believe this is the time for the Congress to say we will not appropriate $1 for this purpose under this purge at this time.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, certainly.

Mr. MAHON. I cannot speak for the full committee, but I believe that we are in agreement that this amendment is probably acceptable, and there is no serious objection that I know of to the amendment.

Mr. BECKER. My respect continually increases for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. FORD. On behalf of the minority members of the subcommittee we likewise agree that this amendment is acceptable.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the attitude of my colleagues on my side of the aisle.

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

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I raised the question originally as to whether these funds would go for support of the Olympics in which the Nationalist Chinese were barred. I have been assured they would not be barred from participation, and, therefore, I do not offer the amendment I had at the desk which would have eliminated the funds.

I support the gentleman's desire that we express in appropriate words our feelings. We all remember the slogan "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute." We certainly do not want to put ourselves now in the position of appropriating $38 billions for defense and $400,000 or some other amount for tribute.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. DORN of New York. In all fairness I think the attention of the House should be called to a telegram I have just received from Robert L. King, executive director, organizing committee, Eighth Olympic winter games. It reads as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 3, 1959.*
Hon. FRANCIS E. DORN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Recent action of International Olympic Committee does not make Red China member of that body. They cannot and will not participate in VIII Olympic winter games. The organizing committee invited Nationalist China, and they accepted prior to I.O.C. action. The organizing committee will stand behind this invitation and accept entries of Nationalist China competitors at Squaw Valley. Therefore, this I.O.C. action has no actual effect whatsoever on our conduct of the Squaw Valley games.

ROBERT L. KING,
Executive Director, Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games.

I join in support of this amendment because it is in keeping with the resolution I introduced heretofore that it would be the sense of this body that if Taiwan, that is, the Republic of China, Nationalist China, were excluded from participation in the Olympic games that the United States would withdraw from the Olympic games.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

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

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee and one who shares some concern in this matter, I want to join with my colleagues in support of the pending amendment. I am confident that it can be said that the action we are taking in adopting this amendment will meet with the wholehearted approval of the State Department of the United States. I understand that the State Department is very much incensed with the action taken by the International Olympics Committee, and I believe this move certainly will have an important place in correcting this discrimination and this injustice.

I hope the Committee will accept the amendment.

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

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in the support of this amendment. I would like to recall to the gentleman from New York an occasion in this very Chamber when our former colleague from New York, Mr. Reed, made a great speech in which he said that the Olympic game participants used to go through conflicting armies without challenge. There was absolute freedom from politics.

I hope the pending amendment will be agreed to.

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

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. I assume that America has a representative on the International Olympic Games Committee. Is that true?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I believe that to be so.

Mr. POFF. Can the gentleman supply us with the name of the American representative on that Committee?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I cannot offhand. I think a gentleman by the name of Brundage is serving on this Committee.

Mr. POFF. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the American representative on this Committee also voted to exclude Nationalist China?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am not familiar with the procedure that is followed in the International Olympic Committee.

The Department of State did make clear that this action, whatever the method employed by the Committee, was regarded as a clear act of political discrimination.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. To answer the gentleman from Virginia, it is my understanding that the vote was 33 to 19 and at the time there was the very disgraceful situation of the United States delegate voting with the Soviet Union.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in support of this amendment. I also want to pay sincere tribute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER], and all those who have brought this disgraceful affair to our attention. They have rendered a real service to their fellow Americans. Acquiescence in the action of the International Olympics Committee would be interpreted in many quarters as a retreat from America's consistent policy in opposition to diplomatic recognition of Red China and as a repudiation of Nationalist China. Rather, the Congress, by adopting this amendment, will repudiate the vote of the American representative on the International Olympics Committee which was in no wise representative of America's foreign policy.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD with regard to the Olympic games controversy.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some questions. It seems to me that we are not acting on the basis of good information here. If someone knows what actually happened there, I will be glad to yield. Can the gentleman from New York answer? I understand that what this Committee did was to decide it was a misnomer to call the government of Chiang Kai-shek China, and that if the government of Chiang Kai-shek wants to come back purporting to represent Formosa that would be all right. It seems to be a matter of nomenclature. What was the issue?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The question was brought up at the meeting by the Soviet Union. As the gentleman knows, Communist China is not a member of the International Committee. So the Soviet Union speaking for Communist China proposed to the assembled international delegation, which was incomplete, there were at least 22 members not present at the time, in effect that Chiang's China be thrown out; and if Chiang's China is not thrown out, we and all of our satellites will not participate. And they carried on with a further threat and said, "We will establish our own Olympic games."

Mr. PORTER. Would the gentleman confirm that if Chiang's China wants to come back, using a more accurate but still erroneous name, the Government of Formosa, then they would be allowed to be admitted?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The gentleman from Oregon is discussing this matter on a question of semantics. The question was that it was the Republic of China that was being thrown out, and the Republic of China stood on its rights, recognized by the United States and, as far as I know, everyone else, but the Communist Chinese insisted that they should be called the Republic of China and participate as the Republic of China.

Mr. PORTER. But the point is that apparently it is just a matter of nomen-

clature who has a right to call itself China.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. No; the gentleman from Oregon and I disagree. I do not think that it is a question of nomenclature. It is a question of real high moral principles.

Mr. PORTER. I am not against high moral principles, of course.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I am sure the gentleman is not.

Mr. PORTER. What are you doing?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. All we are doing is saying that no free nation shall be barred from participating in the Olympics.

Mr. PORTER. That is, any free nation?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Is it your understanding that a free nation was barred by the action of the Olympic Committee?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Absolutely correct, by the action of the Olympic Committee.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 19, strike out all of lines 1 through 5.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in the argument over the amendment just offered, I think we are losing sight of the fact that this is nearly another half a million dollars in Federal funds to be appropriated to the winter Olympic games in Squaw Valley, Calif. I would like to ask either the chairman of the subcommittee or the ranking minority member of the subcommittee how much money is here being appropriated or has been appropriated to the winter Olympic games in California?

Mr. FORD. The appropriation totals $400,000. There was a request for an additional $500,000, as I recall, based on additional costs that have materialized in recent months. This had to be authorized. I understand that authorization bill has been approved by the House but has not as yet been approved in its final form by the Congress as a whole. Because that additional authorization is not law, we did not approve the request for the additional $500,000.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, let me call the gentleman's attention to the hearings on page 986:

Mr. LAIRD. We are also building a pavilion out there with Federal tax dollars.

Mr. KING. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. What is the total cost of that?

Mr. KING. $3,500,000. The total Federal contribution to the Olympic games will wind up $3,500,000 plus the $900,000 of military support for a total of $4,400,000. That will be the final total.

Now, is that correct? Does this $400,000 put the total up to $4,400,000, or what is the story?

Mr. FORD. There were funds made available originally for construction. That is the more sizable amount. The $400,000 in the bill here is for what we call military support for the winter games. They did request an additional $500,000 for that purpose, but that is not authorized by law.

Mr. GROSS. Does this $400,000 put it up to $4,400,000? I am not clear on that point.

Mr. FORD. It puts it up to $3,900,000.

Mr. GROSS. Then there is how much more to come?

Mr. FORD. There is an additional authorization of $500,000 more.

Mr. GROSS. On top of the $400,000 in this bill; is that correct?

Mr. FORD. No.

Mr. GROSS. So there is another $900,000, including this?

Mr. FORD. There would be $900,000 in military support plus the $3.5 million for construction, and if all is approved it would be a total of $4.4 million for both construction and military support.

Mr. GROSS. And that is not the end of it, because Mr. King testified before the gentleman's committee and said: "I may have to come back for more," did he not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say that I do not think there will be any more requests because of the fact that California has put $7½ million into the project as against the Government's $4.4 million.

Mr. GROSS. That is what Mr. King said when he came before the committee before that. He said, "I won't be back, this is it." But then he said here before the committee:

In answer to your statement, I believe I made the statement to Mr. SHEPPARD'S query that so far as I knew, this was all that was going to be asked, and I even think that I embarrassed myself at this point by stating at that time that if there was to be any additional request, somebody else would have to come back—

Then he goes on to say, in effect: "Here I am again, looking for another handout from the Federal Government." Here we have all the taxpayers, including those in Iowa, underwriting a big part of the cost of the Winter Olympic Games out in Squaw Valley, Calif.

I am not for this appropriation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is not the first time the Federal Government has participated in an appropriation for a purpose of this character as I understand it. Furthermore, I would like to suggest, as a matter of timing, that if they do come back for more, that would have to be in a supplemental, not a regular appropriation and we could stop it then if it should be stopped.

Mr. GROSS. It does not make a bit of difference whether it comes in a supplemental or in a deficiency or in a regular appropriation. It still comes out of the taxpayers' pockets, and I am opposed to this proposed $400,000 appropriation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make two comments. The first is that while I share the interest of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] from the standpoint of economy, my concern in this particular issue today relates to the financing of the Olympic activities in which the Nationalist Chinese would be barred by the Communist blackmail activity and the surrender to blackmail that occurred just this last weekend. It is for that reason I have adhered strictly to that issue.

Now that the gentleman from Oregon has seen fit to suggest that the action that was taken was proper, I should like to observe simply this, that if this Congress accedes to that intolerable position, we will have receded completely from the position which this House has taken repeatedly in opposing any proposals for the recognition of or the seating in the United Nations of Red China.

I want to commend the State Department for its emphatic protest against this action by the Olympics committee. I want to point out that in 1957 the United States, I think with some questionable wisdom, acceded to the request of the Chinese Communists to participate in the Olympics. But the Communists are not satisfied with that. Their interest is political and ideological, and the only thing that will satisfy them is to drive the free Chinese, the representatives of a friendly power, recognized by this Government, out of the Olympics. And there is nothing that the gentleman from Oregon can say that can alter that fact.

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

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman has made a very fine statement, and I think we all subscribe to it. I would like to point to the fact that there was some confusion about the contents of the amendment when it was first offered. Many of us had not had the opportunity to see it, but I would like to point further to the fact that when the amendment was explained and understood, its adoption was unanimous, and I think that shows clearly the strong feeling of the House in the matter.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I have been in no way critical of any statements made in connection with this or the position of the committee whatsoever beyond the one fact of the attempt of the gentleman from Oregon to defend the action that was taken under Communist blackmail.

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

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PORTER. Tomorrow afternoon, when there will be more time and I will not be holding up so many Members, I intend to make a speech about China, and I hope the gentleman will be present.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I shall make it a point to be present, I assure the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

Procurement

Procurement of Equipment and Missiles, Army

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, ammunition, equipment, vehicles, vessels, and aircraft for the Army and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; purchase of not to exceed one thousand three hundred and fifty-nine passenger motor vehicles for replacement only (including twenty at not to exceed $2,900 each); expenses which in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army are necessary in providing facilities for production of equipment and supplies for national defense purposes, including construction, and the furnishing of Government-owned facilities and equipment at privately owned plants; and ammunition for military salutes at institutions to which issue of weapons for salutes is authorized; $1,232,300,000, to remain available until expended.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is the intent of the committee to undertake to finish the bill tonight and have a rollcall vote on the final passage. As I understand the situation, if the consideration of the bill went over until tomorrow, a rollcall vote on tomorrow would have to be postponed until next week. So I hope that we can move along as rapidly as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, and modernization of aircraft, missiles, and equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, without regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such lands, and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; procurement and installation of equipment in public or private plants; and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; $1,969,394,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 20, line 16, strike out "$1,969,394,000" and insert "$1,930,394,000."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is the second of the five amendments which relate to the extra money amounting to $255 million, which was put in the budget for antisubmarine purposes and not requested by the administration. I am not going to offer the other amendments inasmuch as the House has shown its desire in this matter unless by some chance in these brief 5 minutes, I might still persuade the House that this thing is a very serious matter and needs correction. I regret to say that the chairman would not yield to me when he was quoting certain parts of the hearings. I simply wanted him to give me the citations because I still make the statement that the report of the committee on page 17 is not in accordance with the hearings at all. It actually misrepresents the case.

Under the privilege of extending my remarks I want to answer a point made by the chairman immediately following my remarks. He now refers to part 6 of the hearings and the testimony of Admiral Hayward appearing on page 299. I trust the House will read that testimony, particularly the information the Admiral supplied for the record. Here it is.

During the last year many well qualified industrial concerns have made a large number of interesting proposals to do all types of work in all phases of antisubmarine warfare research and development.

Because of stringent funding limitations, only a small percentage of these proposals have been followed up with a contract. Only those proposals which the Navy felt were sure to produce an increase in ASW effectiveness were funded. This means that many new ideas which were of a high risk nature have been left unfunded for lack of funds. It is entirely possible that one of these new ideas could hold the secret to a real successful improvement in antisubmarine warfare. The $100 million additional requirement for ASW R.D.T. & E. contains an appreciable sum which will be used to explore new or novel ideas with the hope of increasing our capability to detect, classify, and kill the enemy submarine.

I think this clearly shows that the judgment by Admiral Hayward's superiors in cutting back on these funds was entirely in reason. Why did the committee disregard the considered judgment of the Navy heads and the Department of Defense?

It actually misstates the case. I regret to say I believe the distinguished chairman has not reviewed the testimony in regard to this matter. I want to refer to page 216 of volume 2 of the following testimony. Admiral Weakley was appearing before the committee and the chairman was interrogating him on this matter of research and development money that was needed:

Admiral WEAKLEY. We went after a figure in antisubmerine warfare research and development of $246,330,000. This is for antisubmarine warfare R.D.T. & E.

The figure that is now in your budget is $174,692,000 for antisubmarine warfare, R.D.T. & E.

Mr. MAHON. That is research, development, test, and evaluation?

Admiral WEAKLEY. That is the new budget line which has taken the place of the old R. & D. budget line.

Mr. MAHON. You felt that would be fully adequate?

Admiral WEAKLEY. We felt it was adequate and about what we could fund.

That is what the testimony was.

Also, I want to call attention to a very interesting exchange on page 214 where the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], began interrogating the witness, mind you, a member of our committee that is supposed to find out the justification for these items.

I may say that I intend to take the floor at a later time under a special order and point out the inaccuracies of this committee's report. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] on page 214, starting this out, says:

Admiral, I was shocked to see that there is not a more dramatic program for antisubmarine warfare. Maybe this is as good as we can have.

Therefore I say it is very obvious that the chairman of the committee is the one who wanted to put more money in, not the witness, who testified that this sum was adequate.

One other point from the hearings dealing with the subject matter of whether or not there is a growing submarine threat. I refer to page 222 of the hearings:

Mr. MAHON. We have been told that the Soviet Union has drastically reduced its rate of production of submarines. What do you make of that?

However, the point I am getting at is the limitation of bases from which submarines might operate. I challenge anyone to point out a single question the committee directed to any witness as to what submarine bases Soviet Russia might have. We all know, or should know, that bases are a limiting factor in submarine warfare.

I again point to this article in Look magazine which quotes these same admirals who, of course, are pumping for their funds. It is a pure propaganda sheet, and this committee instead of protecting the House and bringing us factual information almost repeats in its report the propaganda which is carried in this magazine. And the report is at variance with what limited information there is in the hearings.

The administration has not asked for this money. This money has been put in, I maintain, because the committee having deleted the aircraft carrier fund felt that to make up for it they should give the Navy more money to use in research and development, a quarter of a billion dollars which had not been requested and which the record will show, if we really had a record, was not needed. Certainly this record does not justify putting a quarter of a billion dollars into this item.

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

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it is not practical to undertake to run through the various volumes of the hearings and seek out testimony at this time. It is not possible for members of the committee to remember what testimony was printed and made a part of the record and what was not printed. About one-third of the testimony is not in the record but is locked in the vaults downstairs and is available, because we have taken the secret testimony in order that we may have it available when we mark up the bill.

I have not had an opportunity to review all this testimony during this discussion, but I do have page 299 before me, volume 6. The witness testifying is Admiral Hayward. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] was acting chairman of the committee at this time.

I call attention to the following statement by Admiral Hayward:

Admiral HAYWARD. As you may remember, last year Congress gave us $48 million additional for ASW research and development. However, I felt personally that we did not have sufficient money in the research and development phases, and we need an additional $100 million for 1960.

He said they need $100 million additional for 1960 for research and development in the field of antisubmarine warfare. We gave them, as shown in the report, $45 million in addition to the estimates for antisubmarine warfare research and development.

The people who worked on this bill and listened to the testimony will remember that when the vote came on the amendment to provide more funds for programs of antisubmarine warfare, the motion I believe was unanimously approved. The gentleman from Michigan may be able to state whether or not it was unanimous. I do not know.

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

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

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Chairman, if the committee will observe page 537, "Part I, Policy Statements," it will see that Admiral Burke indicated that he needed about $500 million in three categories: First, new ships; second, aircraft; and, third, research. He divided those into three generic classifications further into, first, antisubmarine warships—1 guided missile destroyer (DDG), 1 attack submarine (SSN), 1 guided missile frigate (DLG); second, aircraft, 12 all-weather fighters (FAH-1), 24 early warning aircraft (WF-2), 18 carrier ASW aircraft (S2F3), 20 ASW helicopters (HSS); third, ASW research and development; fourth, modernization and maintenance and operation funds; and, fifth, Polaris—1 Polaris submarine (SSBN).

This testimony came when the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] was in charge of the committee. I had asked the admiral earlier what he would do if the subcommittee gave him the money for a new nuclear carrier, and he said that in the light of the fact that his fleet was superannuated to the tune of 82 percent, being ships of World War II vintage, he could not in good conscience spend the money on a new nuclear carrier, but he would break it up in the previously itemized fashion which would cost $507 million. The testimony is replete that Russia has 450 operational submarines. If the gentleman from Missouri is going to research the point of the need for antisubmarine warfare funds he will do a wonderful service, to the whole House and to the country, but it was the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee that the submarine threat did exist, and I submit the money is necessary in light of all the facts disclosed by both the secret record and the record that is printed.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

It will be recalled that Congress accelerated the Polaris program, which is to be one of the brightest hopes for deterring war in the arsenal of this country. Congress will remember that the Constitution says it is up to the Congress, and Congress is authorized, to raise military forces and support them. Why should not Congress try to direct, insofar as it reasonably can, an effort to solve a problem that has to do with the very survival of the country?

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

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I disapprove the elimination of funds for the carrier, and as an alternative I support this effort for an increase in our antisubmarine warfare capability. I believe this amendment, which includes $255 million spread out in three or four appropriations was unanimous in the subcommittee.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT OF ORDNANCE AND AMMUNITION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the production and procurement of Navy ordnance and ammunition, including missiles (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, without regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; and procurement of plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public or private plants; $627,369,000, to remain available until expended.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question or two, and the first one I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee is whether or not he made the statement a moment ago that if a vote was not had on this bill tonight it would have to go over until next week?

Mr. MAHON. I conferred with the leadership and was told they would be glad if we could finish this bill this evening, that a vote on tomorrow would be passed over until next week.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me why?

Mr. MAHON. I am not able to give that information.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot understand why we cannot vote on this bill on tomorrow.

Mr. MAHON. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], that I have said we hoped to finish this bill by 6 o'clock and have a roll call. I stated that probably a roll call which might be ordered tomorrow in the event we do not finish tonight would be passed over to next week.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts I wonder what big event is going on tomorrow that would preclude the House from voting on this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course we are anxious to dispose of this bill today. The question of what might happen tomorrow or the day after has nothing to do with the hope of disposing of the bill today.

Mr. GROSS. Then we could have a vote on this bill tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. If it goes over, but I doubt it very much. What might happen tomorrow or on Friday has nothing to do with the desire to get rid of the bill today.

Mr. GROSS. I still do not know what world-shaking event would preclude a vote tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are not going to be here all night. We are pretty close to the end now. There are important matters coming up and we would like to dispose of this bill today, because if the bill is not disposed of today the program I had intended for tomorrow will not come up. Now, if we could get this bill out of the way, I could bring a bill up tomorrow that I have in mind.

Mr. GROSS. Well, will there be a vote on that bill tomorrow, may I ask the gentleman? I am not trying to usurp the functions of the leadership on the minority side. I am just trying to get some information.

Mr. McCORMACK. Am I using the gentleman's time?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but I have a motion that I can use if I have to. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want any statement I make about tomorrow or the next day to be imputed by the gentleman today to have an application to the bill pending.

Mr. GROSS. Whatever that means I do not know.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, with that understanding, I might say that the leadership on both sides—because of circumstances that they think are justifiable and, if the occasion should arise, with the permission of the House—have agreed that if any rollcall should come up tomorrow or Friday, that it go over until next Tuesday.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am afraid I will have to object to any unanimous consent request for that purpose.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, knowing the fairness of the gentleman, I do not want him to commit himself now but wait until that situation arises.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Now, I wonder if there is any money in this bill to construct any ordnance depots, in view of the fact that Army is supposed to be abandoning one of the finest, if not the finest, ordnance depot in the United States, the San Jacinto depot in Texas.

Mr. MAHON. There is no money in this bill to build ordnance depots. Such a program would be carried in another bill.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman will give some attention to that, because I am very much interested in the San Jacinto ordnance proposition.

I notice in the bill $54,380,000 for what is called extraordinary expenses, and most of that money is spent on the accounting of the Secretary of Defense or the Secretaries of the various branches of the armed services. I can understand that some money is necessary for that

purpose, but I am wondering if this subcommittee is really riding herd on these people to find how this money is being spent. I do not suppose the average, common, garden variety Member of Congress can find out, but I hope the committee will ride herd on these items under the title of extraordinary expenses.

Mr. MAHON. The vast majority of this money is spent for highly classified purposes, and we would do a great disservice to the country with any statement made with respect to those expenditures, but we are doing our best to ride herd on these people and safeguard public funds.

The Clerk read as follows:

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft, and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land without regard to section 9774 of title 10, United States Code, for the foregoing purposes, and such land, and interests therein may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; reserve plant and equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, including rents and transportation of things; $4,165,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year there may be merged with this appropriation such amounts of the unobligated balances of appropriations previously granted for "Aircraft, missiles, and related procurement," and "Procurement other than aircraft and missiles," as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be necessary for the accomplishment of the programs for which this appropriation is made.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLEY: On page 22, line 23, delete "$4,165,700,000" and substitute "$4,175,700,000."

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is at bottom an appeal to you members of the Committee of the Whole. It is an appeal that I make as an elected Representative of many thousands of unemployed persons in the Sixth District of Maryland and the many more thousands who are dependent upon these unemployed persons. As I pointed out yesterday in my remarks to the Committee, appearing on pages 9608 and 9609 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, these unemployed persons are highly skilled, many of them professional employees and many semiskilled employees. They are employees layed off by the Fairchild Co. in Hagerstown, Md., within the past 17 months. In my investigation to determine the basic reasons for this great economic setback to the proud, progressive and truly outstanding American community of Hagerstown in Washington County, I have found these facts to be true:

The great and growing surge of unemployment in Hagerstown has been caused by the layoffs by the Fairchild Aircraft Co. It is the same Fairchild Co. of Air Force flying boxcar, the C-119, fame, and the builder of the C-123. But these proven craft no longer are being built. The Air Force last December canceled a $50 million contract for the Goose decoy guided missile which would have been produced by Fairchild. In addition, the J-83 engine for the Goose missile was canceled. These cancellations have cost Fairchild not only considerable current income production and profit, but amount to approximately $200 millon loss in future business. But my complaint is not with these inevitable developments in the swift technological change that is characteristic of the missile age. My complaint centers upon the nonglamorous, more prosaic part of the aircraft spectrum. It has to do with support aircraft. More particularly is has to do with the current need and future demand for the F-27 twin prop jet transport produced by Fairchild.

Last August, in 1958, the Air Force officials requested approval of procurement of the F-27 from the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. Because of the lateness of the hour of the request, the F-27 was not included in last year's budget. In January of 1959, before the House Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, of which the distinguished gentleman from Texas is chairman, the request was made for approval of the F-27 for limited air attaché or embassy use. This request was turned down by the subcommittee. In my subsequent conversations with the members of the subcommittee, by letter and by personal visit, I pointed out the many broader and greater needs for the F-27 by the Air Force. I will itemize these needs a little later. Suffice it to say that the Air Force has seen this aircraft and has approved the aircraft and has demanded the aircraft.

I can inform the Members of the Committee without any fear of contradiction, that Gen. Curtis LeMay has requested this aircraft, that Gen. Thomas White, Chief of the Air Force, has requested this aircraft, that the Air Force weapons board has approved the F-27 and has requested through channels requisitions of the aircraft. Moreover, an Air Force committee, studying the future needs of support aircraft to replace the C-47, the old DC-3, has recommended the purchase of 150 of the F-27 over a period of time. Yet, in the face of this expert appraisal and recommendation of the top Air Force Defense official, the civilian spokesman for the Department did not come before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and request the F-27 for the 1960 fiscal year.

Let me remind you that last December the Air Force cancelled the Goose missile. The Air Force has terminated production of the C-123. Fairchild Company as a result of these actions has had to lay off close to 3,000 of its employees within the last 17 months. The company lost considerable money in 1958, and will lose increasing amounts in 1959. In fact, unless there is a military requisition effective within a few months to come, the whole F-27 production program of Fairchild will come to an end.

For this reason, I have presented this amendment to the Committee of the Whole House. Since the top spokesman for the Air Force, for no reason, to my mind, failed to request this necessary aircraft vehicle, I, as the elected Representative of the many thousands of unemployed persons and the last person who can register an appeal with you members of the Committee of the Whole House, you who are the last refuge for my constituents, make this appeal for support of my amendment. For in our governmental system, it has been necessary for me to wait until this very moment to have the authority and opportunity to make a request of the Committee of the Whole House for appropriations for these needed aircraft vehicles.

By approving my amendment these will be the immediate effects of the action taken by the Committee of the Whole House:

First. A proven aircraft producer, namely Fairchild, of Hagerstown, Md., will be saved from imminent economic disaster, and I am not overstating the case.

Second. A proven aircraft, namely the F-27, the logical economical replacement for the old DC-3's will be provided the Air Force.

Third. Employment conditions will immediately improve in Hagerstown and in Washington County for the Fairchild Company can recall many hundreds if not thousands of those now in the bread lines in Hagerstown and the policy of the Congress to aid a surplus labor area will be implemented.

Fourth. A source of spare parts for the F-27's presently in operation by feeder aircraft throughout the country will be continued in operation.

My amendment will make it possible for the Air Force to order 10 F-27's during fiscal 1960. The additional funds requested will be earmarked for the procurement of this particular aircraft.

Fairchild Co. needs this military order to maintain its F-27 production line in operation. Likewise, the Air Force needs this F-27 to replace the DC-3. These are demonstrable needs but because of bureaucratic bungling the needs have not been presented, until these last few moments. I have felt that it is my constitutional duty to present the needs to the members of the Committee of the Whole House. And in between the needs of the company to produce and the need for the Air Force to acquire the F-27, are the 3,000 unemployed persons anxiously waiting to get back to the production line. By this Committee's approval of my amendment the first and most important step back to the production line for these thousands of unemployed will have been taken. My amendment is not asking for a grant. My amendment is not asking for a loan. My amendment is merely asking the members of the Committee of the Whole House to provide for a genuine, economically sound quid pro quo. The Air Force will get needed proven support aircraft—the company will get desperately needed requisitions to continue production of the F-27. But more importantly, and over-

riding every other consideration, thousands of unemployed persons with their many more thousand dependents, will once again have the chance to exercise their high skills and earn a living.

By approving my amendment, the members of the Committee of the Whole House, the last refuge for thousands of my constituents, will have once again and forcefully condemned bureaucratic bungling. The members of the Committee of the Whole House, in the practical circumstances I have presented to you today, by approving my amendment, will have given meat, substance, and marrow to the oft declared policy of providing contracts for labor surplus areas.

I respectfully request the members of the Whole House to approve my amendment and I wish to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and all members of that subcommittee for their courtesy and consideration that they have shown me in this very important and crucial matter to thousands of my unemployed constituents.

MILITARY USES OF THE F-27

First. The F-27 is a natural replacement for the DC-3—C-47—which the Air Force uses as a general work horse all over the world. The DC-3's are anywhere from 12 to 18 years old. They are getting expensive to maintain; the spare parts problem grows more acute with time; and they are wholly unsuited to a member of Air Force missions today.

Second. The Air Force could use the F-27 in the photographic and charting service in the low and medium altitudes. The F-27 is the best airplane in the world for this use because of its high wing configuration. The commanding general of the charting service at Orlando, Fla., has requested the F-27 in the most glowing terms.

Third. There is the Medical Air Evacuation Mission, particularly in Europe, South and Central America. Because the Air Force is responsible for the medical care of not only its own personnel, but State Department personnel and oversea Government agency employees, some 1,200 people are transported each month by the Medical Air Evacuation Service, ranging from Burma to Iceland. These people are carried from bases or places of employment to military hospitals, and so forth. The capacity of the F-27 for either ambulatory or litter patients or both, greatly exceeds that of the C-47—DC-3. With its jet engines and vibrationless performance it can do the medical mission better than any airplane presently flying.

Fourth. There is a navigational training mission. The F-27 is particularly suited for the work carried on at the Air Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo. Because of its superior high altitude and hot temperature performance, the F-27 is ideally suited for student navigational training work. There are navigational training jobs at a number of airbases in the United States where present aircraft should be replaced by a more modern aircraft.

Fifth. The Caribbean Air Command based in Panama has a daily flight requirement of supplying high priority equipment, mail, and personnel to some 20 military missions maintained by our Government in Latin, Central, and South America. This work is now being accomplished by old DC-3's. The DC-3's are also being used to furnish high priority cargo and personnel service to a number of remote radar facilities.

Sixth. The Air Attaché Mission, particularly for countries close to or behind the Iron Curtain, is now carried on by old DC-3's.

In general, because of its greater range, larger payload, and additional speed, an A-27 has two and one-half times the productivity or usefulness of the C-47. It costs 56 cents a ton-mile to operate a C-47 today. It costs 22 cents a ton-mile to operate the F-27. Thus the F-27 does two and one-half times more work than the C-47 at only 39 percent of the ton-mile cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compliment the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] on the work he does constantly for his constituents.

Perhaps, because the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] has inherited some of the Midwestern aggressiveness and sincerity of his parents, he serves his people in Maryland better.

I can say that in this case, however, he serves the country, too.

I only want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I support my distinguished friend from Maryland in his significant amendment.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks and to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the unanimous consent requests of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I should like to say that I agree with what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF] said about our colleague from Maryland, JOHN FOLEY, that he is sincerely trying to do a good job for his people.

Certainly, he is here today making an earnest plea for several thousand unemployed people in his district as well as their families.

Mr. Chairman, there are some points that I would like to emphasize following what my colleague has told you about this situation.

First, a proven aircraft producer, namely Fairchild of Hagerstown, Md., will be saved from imminent economic disaster, and I am not overstating the case.

Secondly, a proven aircraft, namely the F-27, a logical economical replacement for the old DC-3, will be provided the Air Force.

The gentleman pointed out several other facts in support of his amendment, but I suggest the strongest point that he has to make is the saving of one of our pioneer aircraft producers from possible disaster. The gentleman is making a plea and so am I for several thousand workers, and also for the modernization of our Air Force, and to do away with a lot of the obsolete DC-3's that are now being operated all around the world, with many of them that have been held over since World War II and replacing them with modern jet airplanes that will be capable of doing a much better job and at much less cost, in other words, at about 39 percent of the cost of operating the old DC-3's. The Air Force itself has made a plea for this. I do not know why the Air Force did not come before the committee, but as the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] pointed out, General LeMay and General White, I believe were in favor of the F-27. The F-27 has proven its worth and its capabilities. I am certain it would help to modernize our Air Force and replace a lot of planes which are now obsolete.

The F-27 has also proven its worth in air medical evacuation. Some of the officers who are in charge of this have said that they would like very much to have this plane.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the Air Force requested funds for certain cargo planes which were eliminated by the committee, and which represent a reduction of $50 million. Certain other administrative type of planes were also eliminated from the budget. The plane in question is one manufactured by Fairchild at Hagerstown. It was not presented to us as a budgetary item at all for 1960. It was discussed somewhat with regard to the program for fiscal year 1959. I have the greatest sympathy and the greatest interest in the people involved here, but, Mr. Chairman, there have been many cancellations of programs throughout the Nation and many people have lost their jobs. Of course, such a thing is always regrettable, but the object of our defense program is to provide the best possible defense for the country with the maximum utilization of the funds available. If we use these funds primarily to aid communities with unemployment problems, we will get ourselves very far afield from our main objectives. I want to say in behalf of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY] that he has done a diligent and a good job in presenting this very serious problem to the Committee and to the Congress. I do not blame him for offering the amendment. I wish I could support it, but it would be contrary to the principles that this Congress must follow in

making defense appropriations. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I must recommend that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOLEY) there were—ayes 25, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor, ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land without regard to section 9774 of title 10, United States Code, for the foregoing purposes, and such land, and interests therein may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; reserve plant and equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, including rents and transportation of things; $2,448,300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That during the current fiscal year there may be merged with this appropriation such amounts of unobligated balances of appropriations previously granted for "Aircraft, missiles, and related procurement, Air Force", and "Procurement other than aircraft and missiles, Air Force", as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be necessary for the accomplishment of the programs for which this appropriation is made.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MINSHALL: On page 23, line 21, strike out "$2,448,300,000" and insert "$2,248,300,000."

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day during general debate, I discussed at some length my argument against Bomarc. I also took the liberty of addressing a letter to the Members of Congress last night which I assume many of you saw on your desks this morning, in which I outlined, at least, some of my arguments against Bomarc.

I should like to state very briefly, just what my amendment does. This amendment does but one thing: By reducing the appropriation by some $200 million it will take out the funds that are appropriated for the Bomarc program only.

I am leaving in the bill what you might call rope with which they can hang themselves, $84.6 millions for test and evaluation.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Defense Department concept of defense in depth. As you all know, around our cities and around our important areas in this country we have Nike-Hercules. That covers an area of about 80 miles surrounding those particular installations. Beyond that we would have Bomarc B, which is designed to reach out another 400 miles. Then we have the manned interceptors that would also cover this range and farther out beyond that.

If we could spend that money today and be assured of attaining the concept of defense in depth, including the Bomarc, I would be 100 percent in favor of it and would not be offering this amendment. But fact is, of course, that no funds voted today would do any such thing.

For 9 long years the Air Force has been tinkering around with the Bomarc program, and to date they have spent a total of $1,900 million for a program that has yet to be proven.

Bomarc B, which is the only thing we are talking about here today, has still to be fully tested; and according to the Air Force's own estimate will not be operational for at least another 2 years and will only have a minimum capability until 1964. Who in this House is going to say that the only threat against our country in 1964 would be manned aircraft? Manned aircraft is the only weapon against which Bomarc is effective, not the ICBM upon which the Russians are basing their entire offensive threat according to our best intelligence estimates. Bomarc is useless against the ICBM.

In summarizing my remarks today in general debate I said that Bomarc is a $2 billion failure. Call it, if you will, a $2 billion boondoggle. They have not produced as yet a single operational weapon, yet they want to carry on this program which if continued will cost another $3 billion or $4 billion. And this, of course, does not include $7½ billion for SAGE, the semiautomatic ground environment electric computer system upon which the Bomarc system is entirely dependent.

Bomarc B was developed from Bomarc A. Bomarc A has been completely abandoned except for five squadrons which are going to be put in position next year. Bomarc B shows some change in the propulsion and guidance systems, and an increase in power. Bomarc B, as I have just said, is useless against the ICBM; which will be our threat in the next few years. After 9 long years and nearly $2 billion we are still not receiving 1 cent's worth of defense, not 1 cent's worth of protection from the Bomarc system, yet this program if carried out will cost $3 to $4 billion more not including SAGE.

The most important thing in my opinion is the fact that the Bomarc will be obsolescent before it is operational, and it will be at least 2 years before Bomarc will become operational even if Bomarc is on schedule.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have a very great appreciation for the gentleman from Ohio and the work he has done on our committee. He has been a valuable member of the committee. He has been diligent in his work, and I compliment him very sincerely.

I do not support his amendment; in fact, I recommend very strongly that his amendment be defeated. I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that we are now talking about the defense of America. We are talking about the defense of the cities and towns of this Nation and the people who live in them, the millions of people who would be exposed to attack by Russian bombers. They are the people for whom protection must be provided by the Congress in this bill. That is why I do not want to take a chance on $200 million or any other sum which might deny the people the protection that you and I want them to have.

In addition I am talking about the protection of our military bases, the bases from which retaliatory efforts must spring if we are attacked.

Mr. Chairman, we in the Congress cannot really decide on the wisdom or lack of wisdom of this step. It is something that must be determined by those who have the technical knowledge, the advanced scientific knowhow which will permit them to decide properly on such an important step.

I call your attention to the fact that not a single scientist, not a single top ranking official from the fields of research and development testified that this program should be discontinued. I call your attention to the fact that the Secretary of Defense himself stated very positively that this program should be carried forward, that there is need for this weapon and a place for it.

I realize that the Nike program is a very good weapon, and I am proud that our committee made no cut in the Nike program, but that program does not possess the range which Bomarc offers. Bomarc, according to reliable data, will reach out into an area 400 miles from our own borders and to a height of 85,000 to 90,000 feet in the atmosphere.

Mr. Chairman, we simply have no other weapon available now or foreseeable which in the years immediately ahead will do the job for which Bomarc B is intended. Bomarc A is not under discussion, nor is it affected by this amendment.

I call your attention to the fact Bomarc A becomes operational in September 1959, this year. I call your attention to the fact that Bomarc B will become operational in March 1961, and that one installation a month will become functional beginning on that date. Bomarc B does have the capability to shoot down supersonic aircraft, it does carry an atomic warhead, it does have the potentiality to knock down entire formations of hostile aircraft.

There is not a miserable record of failure in connection with either Bomarc A or Bomarc B. More than 50 percent of the tests that have been conducted were successful, and for any new weapon a record of 50 percent is a very good one.

Until 1970 there is no evidence that manned aircraft will cease to be operational. We must maintain the best defenses we can against manned aircraft while they remain a threat to America's security. This has been a slow weapon to come into focus and into production. I recognize that it has been disappointingly slow, but this is a complex weapon. Frequently we have found that once a breakthrough is achieved, progress is thenceforth rapid. This was true of Thor, Atlas, and other weapons—all of them were disappointingly slow at one time.

If we do not spend this $200 million we lose ability to procure this missile during the coming fiscal year and thereby take the risk of setting back the defenses of our cities and bases a full year. That is what we are being asked to do here.

We saved a billion dollars in this bill by cutting down on the number of manned interceptors we would have to buy if we did not buy the Bomarc B. Bomarc B is not an addition to our defenses, it is a replacement.

We may never have a need for this weapon. I hope we do not. But I want to be sure we do not fail to have all reasonable protection available for our people if it should be needed.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL]. I rise in support of the position taken by the Committee on Appropriations. The reason is this: I believe there is an aircraft threat by the Soviet Union, a manned aircraft threat, that exists today and one that will exist at least until the late 1960's. This can be said for this reason, that the Furnas Committee report states—and if you have a chance to look at the people on the Furnas Committee, I think you will be impressed—that they are confident that intelligence estimates available to the panel have led to the conclusion that there will be a manned bomber threat at least until 1970. And, as long as we have that manned bomber threat, we have to face it with a mix of air defense weapons.

This graph shows in outline our plan for our air defense program. That area in brown will be defended by manned aircraft. At the present time they are F-101's and F-106's. We have some research and development money in this budget for a new manned aircraft, the F-108, that would have a longer range, greater speed, and greater altitude. But, that is only in research and development at the present time. This area which is shown in red is the range that will be covered by Bomarc A but more specifically by Bomarc B. This is a range out to approximately 400 miles.

These dots on the graph are the proposed sites for Bomarc A and Bomarc B. Those on the east coast, five of them, are Bomarc A sites. The first will be operational in September of 1959. The remainder will be coming along on a schedule of one each 3 or 4 months thereafter. The 16 Bomarc B sites will go into operation, the first one, in March 1961. They will become operational at the rate of one each month thereafter. They will all be operational by 1964 at a time when we still have a very substantial manned aircraft threat.

Now, if you knock out this $200 million for Bomarc B, you might as well wipe out all of the area defended by the red except that on the east coast which will be defended by Bomarc A. If you approve this amendment to take $200 million out of the bill, you can wipe off all of the protection you will get from Bomarc B, and Bomarc B is the only weapon which gives you this vitally important protection or will give it to you starting in 1961.

I disapprove of the action taken by the Senate Committee on Armed Services where they have made a deep slash in the Nike programs. I believe in the Nike program. The Nike sites will protect our major population areas. I hope that the Congress will take remedial action to straighten out the situation caused by this action taken by the Senate subcommittee. Our action, if we approve this amendment, will be as wrong as the action taken by the Senate committee.

This amendment is the meat ax approach. I do not think any of us in this body are competent to decide on a very technical matter such as this. We have a responsibility to provide adequate funds for a good air defense program, and if we leave this money in the budget, a total of $284 million for Bomarc, then the Secretary of Defense can make an intelligent decision as to which weapons, and in what mix, should be in our defense of depth. The Secretary of Defense has indicated in a communication dated May 11, 1959, "I have indicated above, and as I have indicated in my testimony, our concept of defense in depth leaves a place for both types of missile systems."

This was a letter addressed to the chairman of the Senate Military Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is defeated.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in regard to this controversy over the Bomarc and the question of our defense missiles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, yesterday on the floor of the House, I was amazed when one of my distinguished colleagues, who is an avowed supporter of the Air Force Bomarc program, said that the Bomarc B target seeker will be used on the Army's Hawk missile, which is a low-to-medium altitude field-type missile.

The reason for my amazement was that I know the Bomarc B has no perfected target seeker at this time. Numerous approaches have been made to the problem, but as yet there have been no proven successes. The Bomarc B target seeker which my distinguished colleague has apparently been led to believe is successful is undoubtedly one which is under development by Westinghouse. The technical principle involved in this device is entirely different from the one which is used in the Hawk.

Now, let me digress for a moment and emphasize that the Hawk missile used by the Army, and whose target seeker was first developed in 1952 by Raytheon, is a highly effective, operational system this day, and has been in operation for a considerable period of time. Whereas, the Bomarc B seeker is in the same state of development now as was the early model of the Hawk seeker in 1952. That was 7 years ago.

Yet we hear that the Air Force Bomarc B seeker is indeed the best device possible for the use of the Army's Hawk. That suggestion, that the Bomarc B seeker be used in the highly efficient Hawk is just about as silly as the idea of a football coach at a junior high school offering one of his bench-warming eighth grade touchball players to the coach of the Cleveland Browns pro football team for use as the mainstay of that rugged group of men. It is just plain ridiculous.

I read one of the many voluminous press releases, which are ground out with regularity, that the Bomarc B was test-fired on May 27. We were told here on the floor of the House yesterday that this test firing was, and I quote, "entirely successful." I know that this test was far from successful—unless success means that it got off the launcher and then plunked down to earth again not far away.

I am tired of the Air Force making these highly ridiculous claims through their press agents, and their continuing efforts first to degrade and then later to capture the fine developments which the Army and the Navy have achieved in the missiles field.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, the floor of the House is hardly the place to make a technical decision so vital to the internal defense of our Nation.

Economy may be a desirable thing; we may welcome a balanced budget, but the greenbacks saved in this manner will not be useful in warding off an enemy air attack on our homeland—they will not shoot down a single plane.

I support the position of the committee in this matter. I feel we would be very unwise to make a technical decision here this afternoon as to the relative merits of the Nike-Zeus and the Bomarc missile. In my own layman's judgment I believe we would be wise to follow good military advice and until far more is known about this matter we should give adequate support to both of these air defense programs.

Both programs have much to recommend them. Until all the answers are available I feel it is the better part of wisdom, in the interest of the preservation of millions of American lives, to defeat the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment.

Much has been said pro and con regarding the general conclusions of the Furnas report. I should like to quote from the summary of that report:

> The panel considers the Bomarc IM-99B an important element of continental air defense against the air-breathing threat. Because we are now facing this threat, it is of paramount importance that our defensive posture be improved as rapidly as possible. Hence, it is recommended that a limited, though vigorously expedited IM-99B program be pursued at this time. Deployment should be limited to locations on the perimeter of the area to be defended, as outlined in section 6 of this report. Deployment at sites in the interior is not recommended.

That, Mr. Chairman, comes from an able panel who knew what they were talking about.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL] stated that at the proper time he intends to introduce an amendment to strike out $200 million which is earmarked for the Bomarc missile.

I have some interest in this matter, Mr. Chairman, because the Boeing Co. which makes the Bomarc is located in a neighboring congressional district of mine and I am somewhat familiar with the controversy that has existed as between the Bomarc and the Nike-Hercules. Basically, of course, this is a conflict as between the military services. It is a fight between the Air Force and the Army, each of which desires to fill a certain mission in our overall defense picture.

As to the Nike-Hercules, I believe it is an excellent defensive missile. I have visited the Nike sites in my district and have been briefed on the capability of this particular weapon. I say nothing of a derogatory nature about it.

Of course, I was disappointed when the committee struck out certain funds requested by the Defense Department and recommended by the President for the Bomarc B. I would have liked to see the $447 million that was in the budget included in the bill. However, when the committee reduced this to $284 million I considered that it was doing what it thought proper and I was prepared to support the committee.

Now I have heard many statements about the lack of capability of the Bomarc. However, let me refer to the testimony of our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], on this subject. He pointed out that Bomarc A last December intercepted a jet fighter traveling at 500 miles per hour at a range of 145 miles at an altitude of approximately 30,000 feet. I do not think that the record of tests from Bomarc A is anything except a good one. Furthermore, I believe the Bomarc B with its increased range of 400 miles and the increased capacity as to altitude certainly deserves support on this merit.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the committee in all respects and in particular hope that any attempt to reduce the appropriation for the Bomarc B will be defeated.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, in a minute and a half I am not going to be able to say very much. I think I shall confine my remarks to commenting on the fantastic propaganda campaign which has been carried on against the Bomarc missile. I know that most of the members of this committee are not aware of the incredible lengths to which the adherents of the Nike defense system have gone in their attempt to discredit the Bomarc. I think some of the methods used have been quite questionable; extremely questionable.

Of course, this is Army inspired. The Nike is an Army weapon, and if the Nike should be stricken out, the Army will be out of the missile business. So I can understand it.

Let me say that I am not one who proposes that the Nike should be eliminated. I think we need both of these weapons.

Mr. Chairman, this morning the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] was at his histrionic best.

Mr. Chairman, of course, I wish to record my vehement objection to this amendment. Rather than cut any more funds from the Bomarc program, I believe that this Committee has an obligation to restore those already deleted by the Appropriations Committee and to take a serious look at this whole Nike-Hercules-Bomarc controversy.

Never in all of my experience as a Congressman have I witnessed such a volume of claims and counterclaims as that surrounding the vital subject of the defense of the United States. And this, ladies and gentlemen, is the basic issue—what is the best defense system for the United States?

In order to answer that question, let us start by looking at the threat. The basic threat that exists today is Soviet bombers and known air-to-surface missiles. In addition, we know that the Russians are developing nuclear bombers and high-energy fuel bombers with supersonic speeds. This, then, is the airborne threat that Russia has today or will have in the coming years. We also know that Russia is busily engaged in developing and implementing production of a ballistic threat, or the intercontinental ballistic missile. Eventually, as the ICBM is improved in accuracy, range, and the technology required to make it a reliable weapon, it will replace the airborne threat. However, for today and a number of years to come, the airborne threat is still the most accurate and cheapest way to deliver a nuclear bomb.

Now, the Nike-Hercules and the Bomarc are aimed at taking care of this airborne threat. They are not intended to tackle the ICBM's. So let us now examine just how these two weapons will accomplish their jobs. First of all, I am sure you will agree that we have to keep any nuclear explosion sufficiently far away so that its effects will not cause marked destruction of either property or life, either by action of the enemy or by our own action in destroying the carrier of such nuclear weapon. In order to do this, we have to effect the kill of the oncoming weapon warhead by destroying it before it reaches the target zone. The problem is further complicated by the fact that new weapons of the air-to-surface missile type are being developed which can be launched from bombers a number of hundreds of miles away. This means that in order to be sure that we get and kill the attack before it can hurt us we should kill the carrier before it releases its missile. This is the concept of any defense weapon. If it does not do this job, it is not protecting the target area.

To understand this better, let us take a look at two targets—one a city and the other a SAC base. Both are protected by Nike-Hercules, Hawk, and Bomarcs. The Bomarc uses the eyes of existing radars in early warning airplanes, picket ships, Texas towers and land-based radars. All of these provide the early detection that enables Bomarc to carry the battle as far out as possible. In contrast, the Nike-Hercules and Hawk depend on radars adjacent to their particular sites and therefore cannot take full advantage of the early warning airplanes, picket ships, and Texas tower type of radars. This brings up the first difference between the Nike-Hercules and the Bomarc. The Bomarc, tying in with SAGE, uses farflung existing radar systems for early detection and control. The Nike-Hercules and Hawk depend upon individual radars, which, because they are located next to a battery, are very limited in line-of-sight, plus the fact that they can control only the weapon of that particular battery, and do not have the depth of early warning and control gained by an entire integrated radar network.

Secondly, we have the difference in range. Roughly, the range of the Nike-Hercules is 86 nautical miles and the altitude approximately 100,000 feet. The Hawk, which is designed to compensate for the lack of low-altitude capability on the part of the Nike-Hercules, has a maximum range of approximately 21 miles at its top altitude of 50,000 feet and approximately 12 miles at sea level. These two systems must go together to provide point defense from sea level to high altitude.

On the other hand, the high-altitude range of the Bomarc is more than 400 nautical miles, while its low-altitude capability is approximately 300 miles. This means that from the center point a Bomarc missile could go 400 miles at high altitudes in any direction and at low altitude approximately 300 miles in any direction. It gives protection from sea level to high altitude without adding any other missile.

Thirdly, we have the difference in manpower. To operate a Nike-Hercules battalion takes approximately 460 men. To operate a Hawk battalion requires approximately 400 men. To man a Bomarc base requires approximately 140 men.

Fourthly, we have the difference in cost. The average cost of a Nike battalion, based upon the number of battalions required to protect 62 targets in the United States, is $67.5 million per battalion. The Hawk, based on the same ground rules, costs approximately $70 million. The Bomarc costs approximately $82.5 million for this same coverage. While the cost of the Bomarc is individually higher than either the Nike-Hercules or the Hawk, you must remember that the Nike-Hercules and the Hawk have to be combined to give you the same protection as the Bomarc. Therefore, the total figure for coverage by the Nike-Hercules and the Hawk is close to $135 million, while the Bomarc will give you this same coverage for $82.5 million.

In summary, I believe that the Bomarc weapon system will provide the best and cheapest air defense. We need a defense system to meet the manned-bomber threat which exists through 1970. The way to meet this threat effectively is to have a remote battle, one that keeps the destruction of the enemy and the blast effects of our own missiles away from our shores. It is also desirable to store air-defense-missile warheads away from our populated areas by remote deployment. And, finally, the Bomarc system provides the most economical way to achieve effective air defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

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

Mr. Chairman, like most Members of Congress, I am not a military expert. Therefore, on many items in this bill I must rely on the advice of members of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee which year after year gives consideration to military matters.

I must oppose the amendment to strike from this bill the sum of $200 million for Bomarc missiles. The Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and a majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee recommend funds for continued construction of Bomarc missiles.

If there is any question with respect to the effectiveness of the Bomarc we should resolve that question at this time in favor of the defense of our Nation. Let us not gamble with the security of our Nation by eliminating a missile which the Defense Department says we need.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I think that the interservice competition is largely back of this amendment. I feel that I am not competent to pass on the merits of the two missiles. I am going to support the committee. I think it is very unfortunate that we on this floor should be in the position of having to try to settle a highly technical matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time not to argue or discuss the merits of this issue but to ask questions of either the chairman of the subcommittee or the ranking minority member. Has any member of the subcommittee observed a successful firing of the Bomarc?

Mr. MAHON. The Bomarc has been tested for a number of years. It goes operational in units in September. I personally have not been present at any of the firings, but some of the other members perhaps have.

Mr. FORD. I have not seen a firing myself, but the record indicates that out of 54 firings against targets they have had 37 successful launchings, I think.

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

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MINSHALL. I would like to say that the Bomarc B, which is the only weapon we are considering here today, has never been fully tested. They fired it on May 27, the night before the subcommittee met, and then grossly exaggerated what it did.

Mr. FLYNT. That was going to be substantially my next question. Have there been any successful firings of any significance of the Bomarc prior to the 27th of May?

Mr. FORD. I can say this, that that test was the first Bomarc B launching.

Mr. SIKES. There has to be a first of everything.

Mr. FORD. This was on a schedule that was set 12 months ago.

Mr. SIKES. There have been many successful firings of the Bomarc A. There has to be a first for everything, and this is the first of the Bomarc B.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question, which is not clear to me. Just what is the $200 million that your amendment seeks to take out to be used for?

Mr. MINSHALL. The $200 million, may I say to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, would be used solely for procurement.

Mr. BOW. That is for procurement of a missile that has not had but one unsuccessful test; is that correct?

Mr. MINSHALL. It was tested once and that was a very qualified success. I cannot repeat it here because the results are classified, but I can say the report which was published in the public press was highly exaggerated, and I saw the official results.

Mr. BOW. I understand the gentleman's amendment leaves the $84 million in for the Bomarc B for further development; is that correct?

Mr. MINSHALL. Yes; for further testing and evaluation. It will in no way affect the testing and evaluation of this weapon. We are leaving that money in there, but we do not think we should spend $200 million more for procurement and send more good money after bad.

Mr. BOW. To what extend will this delay the missile program?

Mr. MINSHALL. In my opinion and in the opinion of many military experts, it will not delay the Bomarc program one iota.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. It will delay the procurement of the Bomarc B for 1 full year thereby setting back the defenses of our cities and towns and bases 1 full year.

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman believe that the Bomarc B will be successful or will we be providing money for a missile that has not yet been proven to be successful and which may not be successful.

Mr. SIKES. I have every reason to believe it should be successful. If it is not successful, the money does not have to be spent, but it would be held.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen of the committee are very fine and sincere men; thus I regret I must make the following statement.

I rise in defense of the amendment to exclude the moneys for the Bomarc program. Mr. Chairman, the Bomarc program is completely obsolete, and it appears that the proponents of this Bomarc program are thinking in terms of spending approximately $12 billion by 1962 to make a weapon operational which was obsolete at its inception. According to the best estimates which I have been able to gather, it will take $7½ billion additional funds—I said billion, Mr. Chairman—to finish the research and development program on the SAGE system, the central control system for Bomarc, and it will take more than $3 billion additional in research and development funds in the Bomarc program.

It is my contention, Mr. Chairman, that this $12 billion—if we must spend it—could very well be put into advanced research on defense weapons against the ICBM which travels above Mach 5. This is, and has been, a tragic waste of taxpayer's money.

What are some of the secrets of this weapon heretofore not generally made public?

From my research, I have discovered that there has been only one engagement by a Bomarc weapon against a supersonic target, and that one was unsuccessful. The Bomarc B is on the planning boards only. The Bomarc program was started in 1949 against a projected target 1955 style, so that today in 1959 we are talking about spending about $12 billion, Mr. Chairman, for a weapon which was planned to meet its peak of efficiency in 1955, and 4 years later is still not operational. The 400-mile range is free flying, not on target. An engineer's dream. Not 400 miles and intercept.

What are the weaknesses of this weapons system? The first point that we have to make immediately is its limited altitude range, the ultimate range of which is slightly in excess of 60,000 feet. By the best estimates 40,000 feet is the maximum effective range, and again it is not operational today. This is only projected thinking. The ramjet engine which it has obviously indicates that it has to have air to breathe, and this is the reason for its limited altitude. Compare this to the rocket engine of the Hercules complex which has a maximum altitude of somewhere around 150,000 or more feet.

Further, it is a slow-speed weapon which is indicated by the fact that it has not made a supersonic kill as yet. About 2.7 Mach.

Another weakness of this system it appears to me is the recognition of the guidance and centralized control system needed for the Bomarc. It becomes completely inoperable if the SAGE system is knocked out. This can be a very

dangerous thing to have a country depending upon this weapon for defense, even if we project ourselves to the time when it will be operational if we must rely on a guidance and computing system which can be made useless so easily.

Contrast the Nike-Herc system with Missile Master Guidance System which has its own operational centralized control system. Each battalion in the Nike-Herc system has its own target-acquiring control and target-tracking control. This is completely the opposite to the SAGE system which has a centralized control for the entire system in the Bomarc program.

The proponents of the Bomarc system seem to sell it on the strength of its great range, but I would like to ask, with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, "What good is range, if when it gets there it can't hit the target?" It is like sending a boy to a dry well for a drink of water—only in this case, the defense of our country is what is at stake.

And, as it stands, the SAGE system tests have shown that it cannot support the Bomarc at extreme range. It does not have enough definitive warning at this great distance, and again we are talking about a theoretical maximum distance of 400 miles, and we are still talking about a ramjet engine which limits its speed and its altitude.

Now, what about the cost of maintaining a Bomarc B squadron? According to the best estimates the Bomarc B squadron with 60 missiles will cost about $2 million. For contrast purposes only, the Nike-Herc battalions of 84 missiles each will cost about $70,000. Or, in other words, we can have 30 Nike-Herc battalions for the same cost as 1 Bomarc squadron. Common sense dictates my thinking as to which I would prefer to have.

In other words we can put out 2,400 Nike-Hercs for the price of 60 Bomarcs. Let us scatter these out wider. A proven system operational today.

Not the Bomarc which the great DAN FLOOD so eloquently said, "Hasn't even shot down a starling." One of the gentlemen suggested yesterday that the Bomarc B was using the same seeker in its nose as the Hawk. I believe the Hawk is using a ratheon seeker. Westinghouse is building the Bomarc seeker and hopes to test it this fall. It terrifies me when I think what will happen when we rely on the too automatic dream world created by the supporters of Boeing Aircraft Corp. and the Bomarc program. Remember, obsolete today, but not in sight until 1964.

I sincerely hope the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio is agreed to.

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

Mr. WOLF. I must yield to my colleague since he has been so very kind to me, but, as the gentleman knows, our time is very, very limited.

Mr. SIKES. The SAGE program is not intended primarily for Bomarc. It uses the SAGE program thereby avoiding the expense of a separate guidance program for Bomarc. The SAGE program is part of the warning network and interceptor control system of the Nation and is not intended primarily for Bomarc. It is considered a necessary facility whether or not we have the Bomarc program.

Mr. WOLF. May I ask the gentleman from Florida in return what would the SAGE program do if it is proven that the Bomarc is worthless? What would its service be then?

Mr. SIKES. It would do exactly what it is intended to do, regardless of whether Bomarc continues in the defense system. SAGE is part of the warning network of the Nation and has an important function in the guidance of our aircraft.

Mr. WOLF. Is it as expensive a program without the Bomarc involved?

Mr. SIKES. It would be at a comparatively lower operating cost but there would be no major difference in the installation costs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I must rise to take vigorous issue with this radical and dangerous proposal to strike out the procurement funds for the Bomarc missile.

First, this action would dramatically undercut the U.S. defense posture at a critical time, just at this very time Secretary McElroy and Secretary Herter are both in Europe and our negotiations with the Communists over Berlin must be backed by a display of our military determination.

The Bomarc missile has been studied and restudied by military committees, and the development and procurement of the missile has been consistently recommended. The Weapons System Evaluation Group, currently headed by an admiral, recommended that the Bomarc be stepped up. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and Secretary McElroy have also supported the green light on Bomarc development.

Thus to strike out procurement funds now would be premature. Furthermore, I understand Secretary McElroy has promised Congress within about a week and a half a complete overall air defense plan.

Second, it should be made clear that the Bomarc is not a duplication of the Nike system, but is, to the contrary, a distinct complement to the Nike system, with abilities that the Nike system does not have. Let me explain. The Nike includes three series; the Ajax, which replaces antiaircraft defenses for point defense; the Hercules, which is also for point defense and has a range of approximately 75–85 miles. This, of course, is a last-ditch effort, and far too close for comfort. We must have weapons which will down enemy aircraft long before they get within 75 miles of a city.

The Nike-Zeus is designed to destroy intercontinental ballistic missiles. It will be good for long ranges and go very high. On the other hand the Bomarc is designed for air-breathing vehicles. The A which has a liquid fuel booster and then cruises with ramjet power has a range of 200 miles. The B which has a solid fuel booster and then cruises with ramjet engine has a range of 400 miles. While cruising these can be maneuvered, which the Nike missile cannot. The B therefore will be able to destroy enemy aircraft at a much greater distance from the target than the Nike, Ajax, or Hercules could do, and the Nike-Zeus would not be suitable at all for antiaircraft.

Some of my colleagues who favor striking the Bomarc procurement funds apparently believe that there is no need for us to defend ourselves against aircraft because of the coming missile age. However, this is fallacious for two reasons. The first is that the groups which have access to all of the American intelligence about the Russian military potential and plans, such as the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Weapons System Evaluation Group, know best the nature of the threat to the United States and they strongly endorse the Bomarc missile as a necessary part of our defense structure. The second is because we would be inviting Soviet air attack by planes if we do not prepare a defense against aircraft.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. I yield.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one more point, if I can. I thank the gentleman from Montana for yielding to me. Some of the discussion here today has referred to the cost of these two programs. You can set up a battalion of Nike-Hercs which is 84 missiles for $70,000 approximately and a squadron of Bomarcs when they are operational, which they are not today, of 60 for about $2 million. Now you can have 2,400 missiles, Nike-Herc missiles, for the price of 60 Bomarcs. Suppose you were to scatter these out over this area. You are going to cover more with these 2,400 Nike-Herc missiles. You cannot take it out in the Atlantic but you have the Polaris out there that we are providing money for. I think these are some of the things that should be thought about here very carefully. As I say, we are not talking about $200 million here about the Bomarc but $12 billion. It is a boondoggle and has been a boondoggle from the start. In 1949 when they started this program for a missile which was supposed to be operational against a target date of 1955 and it is not today in 1959 operational. Again I remind you that it will be 1964 before it will be fully operational and on site and I fear then we will be worrying about an ICBM which will travel at 2 times the speed of the Bomarc. This, of course, will eliminate the Bomarc as a defensive weapon against the ICBM.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Defense asked the Congress to put both feet of the Department of Defense to the fire as regards this country's air defense system. In my opinion the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense started to put the feet of the Defense Department to the fire but they only went half way. I would like to read to you from page 16 of this committee report, which supports my position. It states:

> The committee would be willing to appropriate the full budget estimate and more if it had full confidence in the proposed Bo-

marc missile—if it had the assurance that the system would actually work. The contractor for this missile has already received over a period of years commitments in excess of $1,100 million. Before further commitments and expenditures pile up, a new hard look should be given to the proposed Bomarc and the whole air defense problem.

In this particular case our subcommittee was unanimous in providing all of the money necessary for research and testing; but certainly by giving half the money requested to set up a production line I think we are taking one foot of the Defense Department away from the fire. The Minshall amendment makes the Department of Defense face up to this air defense problem and come to the Congress before this bill is enacted into law with a firm decision.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close the debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the figures in regard to the Bomarc program will be found in the discussion yesterday in the House. This issue was discussed for several hours. The committee report which begins on page 14 under the heading "Air Defense" covers the situation. The gentleman from Wisconsin has quoted from this section of the report.

We did strike out $162.7 million of budgeted funds for the Bomarc missile in order to compel a decision.

Secretary McElroy has sent word to the Congress that a decision will be forthcoming with respect to air defense within the next 10 days.

It seems to me that under the circumstances the committee action is as good a compromise, as to how this matter should be handled, as could be obtained.

This is not a new missile. The Bomarc B is a follow-on to Bomarc A. This missile has been in production in one form or another, or under research and development, for about 8 years, and the major and the important technological questions have already been solved.

We are trying to telescope time in the Bomarc program in order to give us some degree of air defense. We did that last year with the Polaris missile; we are doing it in this bill with the Atlas and other missiles. It is simply a matter of trying to gain time from the beginning of research to the production of an operational missile.

I hope the Committee will vote down the Minshall amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired, all time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MINSHALL) there were—ayes 51, noes 178.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS, MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The appropriation to the Department of Defense for "Construction of ships, Military Sea Transportation Service," shall not be available for obligation after June 30, 1959.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANTANGELO: On page 25, after line 17, add new section, as follows:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 301. None of the funds contained in this Title may be used to enter into a contract with any person, organization, company or concern which provides compensation to a retired or inactive military or naval general officer who has been an active member of the military forces of the United States within 5 years of the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is subject to a point of order. I have not seen a copy of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman making a point of order? If so, will he state it?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I will reserve a point of order.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to eliminate influence by retired military officers above the rank of colonel and to reduce the cost of our defense program. It will permit those who grant procurement contracts to let them without offending their former bosses or colleagues.

It has become rather general practice for high-ranking military officers to accept important positions in defense industry after their retirement from active military service. We have approved the budget request of 715 million for retired pay of military personnel. Retired officers receive substantial retirement benefits. In some cases such officials take positions with companies which have large contracts for the furnishing of war materiel to the Defense Department.

There can be little doubt that this is a very unhealthy situation and should be changed immediately. It can have a very definite effect on contracting policies and procedures within the Defense Department. It can result in unnecessary expenditures and waste.

Persons within the Department who may be looking forward to possible employment within a certain organization after retirement can display partiality and favoritism without ever realizing it. Further, prominent military figures in retirement can have a great influence over their former subordinates who are still in the Department. Contact at social and professional gatherings between active and retired officers can provide a perfectly natural setting for influence and favoritism.

Past history before the Renegotiation Board indicates that defense contractors have made excessive profits. Last year, procurement contractors voluntarily or involuntary disgorged $112 million. During the past 10 years since the creation of the Renegotiation Board our Government has recovered or recouped over a billion and a half in excess profits. From the nature of things, excess profits are concommitants to negotiated contracts and letter contracts, they follow when bids are noncompetitive. In our haste to be efficient, we have become shamefully prodigal.

Of the President's $77-billion budget for 1960, $45,805 million goes to national security programs. Of the $45,805 million, $13,938 million is allocated to procurement, the purchase of aircraft, missiles, ships, and other military equipment. A great bulk of this $13,978 goes to contractors producing planes or missiles. About 10 companies received the bulk of negotiated contracts. Page 68 of hearings which deal with procurement discloses what defense contractors received in 1958:

ADVERTISED VERSUS NEGOTIATED PROCUREMENT

(Extent of single source procurement, fiscal year 1958)

The total value of Air Force single source procurement on negotiated contracts during fiscal year 1958 was $9,221,542,000 (AF-N27 report). This was made up of $4,668,134,000 of amendatory actions pursuant to the terms of existing negotiated contracts and $4,553,408,000 of new procurements negotiated with a single source. Of the total of the single source procurement, $6,672,791,430 or 72.3 percent was effected with 10 contractors. Those 10 contractors are our major source of aircraft, missiles, installed systems, and ground radar. The 10 contractors and the value of the procurement placed with each is as follows:

Boeing: Bomarc, B-52, KC-135, Minuteman	$2,209,793,957
Douglas: C-133, Thor, Genie	386,735,577
General Dynamics: B-58, X-15, F-106, Atlas	1,268,395,457
General Electric: ASG-14 fire control, J-79 and J-58 engines, guidance systems, nose cones, FPS-6 ground radar	654,795,742
Hughes: ASQ-25, MG-13, MA-1 fire control systems, Falcon	385,381,034
Lockheed: F-104, C-130, system 417L, reconnaissance missile	557,982,372
Martin: Titan, Mace	166,916,863
McDonnell: F-101	260,574,882
North American: B-70, F-100, F-108, propulsion units for Thor, Atlas, Jupiter, guidance systems, Hound Dog	501,607,864
Republic: F-105	280,607,682
Total	6,672,791,430

What has been the development of these defense contractors?

Let us take three companies. Boeing from 1952 to 1958 was able to increase its capital investment on the basis of profits made almost entirely from Government contracts from $34 million to $145 million. In 1958, Boeing made $29 million profits after taxes. Who are their public relations men, who are the retired officers on their payroll?

Douglas Aircraft in 1953 had a private capital investment of $53 million. In 1957, Douglas had a private capital investment of $111 million and made a profit of $30,665,000 after taxes. Who are their public relations men—who are the retired military or naval personnel on their payroll?

Lockheed in 1953 had a private capital investment of $57 million. Today it has a private capital investment of $129 million. In 1958, after taxes, they made

a profit of $18,556,000. Who are their public relations men, who are the retired military or naval officers on their payroll?

The committee report on page 42 clearly indicates that policy decisions by the Joint Chiefs of Staff are not taken and infers that their indecision is influenced by industrial contractors. The committee report demonstrates their concern about the influence of retired personnel on procurement of contracts by defense contractors. Why this indecision which is so costly? I do not hazard a reason but I can surmise.

Why do these industrial contractors engage or hire retired military or naval officers at inordinate salaries? Is it because of their technical knowledge or is it because of their relationship with their former colleagues or former subordinates who are at the levers of control? This amendment seeks to minimize that influence by denying funds to a defense contractor who engages a retired general officer within 5 years from date of retirement solely for purposes of capturing contracts.

Further, it seems that most of these contracts are going to companies who have their plants out West. Eastern contractors are losing their work and the loss of contracts is depressing areas in the East, in New York and Maryland. This amendment will give all companies an equal chance without interference by retired officer personnel.

My proposal is similar to legislation which makes it illegal for an Internal Revenue agent to handle private tax cases during a period of 3 years after leaving that organization.

I urge the passage of this amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order. I agree that there are abuses indicated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO]. I think those abuses should be corrected. But, I think at this point, this is the wrong way to do it, and for that reason I make the point of order. In my opinion, this amendment or this limitation places additional burdens on the executive branch of the Government which are not now required by law, and therefore it is legislation on an appropriation bill; therefore subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SANTANGELO. Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is not legislation upon an appropriation bill. This is a limitation of expenditures and restrictions as to the way they shall spend these funds, and it is in no wise legislation. I submit it does not violate the parliamentary rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order on the basis presented by the gentleman from Michigan that this would impose additional duties upon the Department of Defense.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] offered an amendment in the nature of an addition to the pending bill by adding a new section, the language of which was reported with the amendment: None of the funds contained in this title may be used to enter into a contract with any person, organization, company, or concern which provides compensation to a retired or inactive military or naval general officer who has been an active member of the military forces of the United States within 5 years of the date of enactment of this act, to which amendment the gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

It is obvious that the intent of this amendment is to impose a limitation on the expenditure of the funds here appropriated, and while the point might be made that imposing limitations will impose additional burdens, it is nevertheless the opinion of the Chair clearly a limitation on expenditures, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 6 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It is with some reluctance that I oppose this amendment offered by my friend and colleague from New York, because I believe there are certain cases to which he has referred in which this has been a serious problem. But, I think there are two points that ought to be borne in mind by the House. In the first place, we are denying to our defense industries, if this amendment goes into effect, the services and assistance of the very people who have had the most experience in the fields of weapons and related matters to which the Government looks to such contractors. If this amendment were to go through in this extreme form, we would actually be jeopardizing our own national defense. We would be throwing out the baby with the bath. Secondly, this House not too long ago adopted the so-called "hump" bill for the Navy, and we are expected soon to be presented with a similar piece of legislation for the Air Force, under which valuable officers in the higher ranks will be forced to retire before their time with a lesser return in retirement pay. If this amendment were to be adopted, therefore, we would be foreclosing to these loyal officers, many with families still to educate, the chance of entering certain fields of gainful employment after their forced retirement, particularly those fields where they are best qualified and best able to serve. How can we force loyal officers to retire, and then deny them a chance to find a living in those very civilian fields which are most likely to be open to them?

Mr. Chairman, this, I think, would work a serious injustice to these officers and would impair our national defense. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I shall ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a portion of page 42 of the report on this bill in which the Department of Defense is called upon to supply the names of military personnel working for defense contractors:

> The committee is seriously concerned over problems which arise as a result of the acceptance by retired senior officers of employment in responsible executive positions with defense contractors. The problem has been discussed within the committee over a period of years. Hearings before the House Armed Services Committee in previous years have been consulted. The committee is advised that further hearings before the House Armed Services Committee are scheduled for the near future. As a prelude to further analysis of this problem, the Office of the Secretary of Defense is requested to supply the committee, prior to the 1961 appropriation hearings, with a list of retired officers of or above the rank of colonel, or the equivalent, employed by persons or firms having contracts with the Department of Defense or any of its agencies.
>
> The Office of the Secretary should also be prepared to discuss its lack of a Defense-wide policy in this matter, as well as its interpretation of the force and effect of section 281 of title 18, United States Code.

Representatives of this committee have been in touch with members of the Committee on Armed Services, particularly the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], who is about to start a series of hearings on this issue looking toward necessary legislation in this field. This matter was explored by the Committee on Armed Services of the House a few years ago. Hundreds of pages of testimony were taken.

This issue is not as plain, simple, or uncomplicated as it may appear on the surface. It seems to me that this is quite drastic action to be taking here on this appropriation bill without the benefit of adequate testimony.

I realize that this amendment has considerable appeal, and I realize that my able friend from New York is seeking to do a good service. But I am sure he would not want to take steps that he might later find to be undesirable and injurious to the cause of national defense. So I hope that this amendment will be voted down, and I sincerely hope that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] and those associated with him on the committee will be able to come up with legislation dealing with this very delicate and difficult problem.

There is an area here for something to be done. I believe that the interest which has been shown in this matter and the action here on the floor today will tend to bring into focus the issue and help to bring about some sort of decision on the issue.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL. Recently I had the opportunity to talk with a colonel who is considered to be one of the outstand-

ing nuclear men in our Armed Forces. He was telling me about a great personal problem that he had. He had been educated at West Point at the expense of the Government, then sent to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and then to California Institute of Technology. He is indeed a great expert in his field.

He told me that he had over 20 years in service and was entitled to retirement at the present time. He said, "I have a family of four youngsters all going to high school at the present time, about ready to go to college. I have the opportunity to retire and to go to work for one of the larger companies at a salary twice what I am now receiving. To whom do I owe the obligation? Do I owe it to the country who gave me my education, who sent me to MIT and to Cal. Tech., and for whom I have worked through the years? Or do I owe the obligation to my family, to take my pension and go out into newer fields where I can double my salary?"

I think there is a tremendous amount of merit in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. It is high time, some provision was made to prevent the industries doing business with the Government from pirating the brains of our Armed Forces.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, but I cannot yield further. I want the Members of the House to vote their own convictions on this difficult matter. My question is, Is this too hasty and is this too severe under all the circumstances without any hearings or further consideration?

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

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 130, noes 131.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SANTANGELO and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 125, noes 147.

So the amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time so that I might ask the chairman of this Appropriations Subcommittee for an answer to the following question: I am reading from a letter that was transmitted from Chief of Transportation of the Army to the commanding officer of Military Sea Transport. Military Sea Transport has the responsibility of transporting our troops and supplies to troops. This letter states:

> Air transportation as the primary mode of transportation to and from overseas for Army passenger movements in peacetime is under active consideration.
>
> For discontinuance, it is planned, commencing with the month of October 1959, to decrease surface movement by approximately 10 percent and increase air movements by this amount. Similar transfers will be made in succeeding months and all surface movements phased to the irreducible minimum.

I want to ask the chairman of this committee: Have funds been put into this bill to transport the Army personnel, and the dependents of the Army, by air in lieu of available transportation by MST and private modes of transportation on the high seas?

Mr. MAHON. I will yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], one of the senior members of the committee, for his comment in regard to the problem.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, this is the question: If this is the intent I think the Merchant Marine Committee should be told about it, because it is our responsibility to keep a certain amount of ships available for the national defense in the case of an emergency, and I am wondering whether you plan a program to move the entire Army in a case of emergency by air. If you do, that is one thing; but if you are going to cut out this peacetime movement, then how in the world do you expect private industry and MST to be available at the time of emergency when you need them for great movements of national defense forces?

Mr. SIKES. May I say to the gentleman that there is money in the bill, of course, as the gentleman realizes, for the transportation of personnel as we have carried it heretofore. We have not attempted to specify to the services what mode of transportation they should use; we have left it generally to the services to attempt to find the most economical mode of transportation.

The gentleman may have noted on page 25 of the bill that $1 billion is appropriated to the Department of Defense for the construction of ships for military sea transportation, sea transport service. He probably is interested in that item also.

Mr. BONNER. I am going to ask about that later, but I think this question should be answered either by somebody on this committee if you have taken charge of the Army in its movements and its regulation, or at least it should be answered by the Armed Services Committee.

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

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. FORD. In the testimony it shows that the MATS operation for fiscal 1960 planned to spend exactly the same amount for passenger ton miles in fiscal 1960 that they are spending in fiscal 1959; and they also indicate the same for commercial aircraft. In other words, there is not going to be any build-up in fiscal 1960 either on commercial aircraft or on MATS over what they are doing in fiscal 1959.

Mr. BONNER. I am glad that the gentleman has made this contribution. However, may I say that this letter is signed by Maj. Gen. F. S. Besson, Jr., Chief of Transportation for the Army. He says he is going to keep all transportation to a minimum conventional sea service and put it all in the air. That is the reason I asked the question.

I would like to say there is nothing whatever in the report about this section of military sea transport and I thought that had some connection with this.

Mr. Chairman, the letter I referred to above is as follows:

> APRIL 27, 1959.
>
> To: Commander, Military Sea Transportation Service, Washington, D.C.
>
> Subject: Department of Army policy on use of air transportation for passengers.
>
> 1. Air transportation as the primary mode of transportation to and from overseas for Army passenger movements in peacetime is under active consideration. Under this plan, all military personnel and their dependents will be furnished air transportation except in cases where air transportation is not suitable or available, or is medically contraindicated or when dependents refuse to travel by air.
>
> 2. It is planned, commencing with the month of October 1959, to decrease surface movements by approximately 10 percent and increase air movements by this amount. Similar transfers will be made in succeeding months and all surface movements phased to the irreducible minimum by July 1, 1960. Revised estimates of requirements reflecting these adjustments will be furnished in the near future.
>
> 3. In order to plan for the orderly transition from a surface and air to a maximum air passenger movement program, a meeting will be held in the Office, Chief of Transportation, room G-824, building T-7, at 1330 hours May 1, 1959.
>
> 4. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss the various implications adoption of this plan will have on your operations.
>
> 5. It is requested that the names of representatives of your organization who will attend this meeting be furnished Lieutenant Colonel Harding, extension 56060, as soon as possible.
>
> F. S. BESSON, Jr.,
> *Major General, United States Army,*
> *Chief of Transportation.*

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word so that the gentleman from North Carolina may continue his line of questioning. Does the gentleman want to ask me something about the section on the construction of ships?

Mr. BONNER. Yes.

Mr. SIKES. There is nothing in the report about it.

Mr. BONNER. No; there is nothing in the report.

Mr. SIKES. I will be glad to explain the action of the committee. The gentleman is discussing an item which appears on page 25 of the bill, which says:

> The appropriation to the Department of Defense for "Construction of ships, Military Sea Transportation Service," shall not be available for obligation after June 30, 1959.

May I say that this item was in an appropriation. The gentleman is an expert in this matter, and the program provided for the construction of commercial ships and high-speed tankers which could not be satisfied from existing sources. As indicated by the Department of Defense, no further program of this type is contemplated and the remaining money would, therefore, revert to the Treasury. That may possibly have some connection with the matter the gentleman brought up insofar as this committee is concerned. While there is no reference made in the report, this committee is concerned with items of expense for transportation and would be seriously concerned with the adoption by the Department of Defense of any

mobile transportation more costly than is now being used. I am glad the gentleman calls this to the attention of the committee, and I am sure the committee will inquire if the result would produce higher costs.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

For transfer by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense available for research, development, test, and evaluation, or procurement or production related thereto, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred, $150,000,000, and in addition not to exceed $150,000,000 to be used upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such funds can be wisely, profitably, and practically used in the interest of national defense and to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation during the current fiscal year as the Secretary of Defense may designate: *Provided*, That any appropriations transferred shall not exceed 7 per centum of the appropriation from which transferred.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the committee for its statement on page 48 in regard to the disposition of surplus property. The point I want to drive home is the amount of surplus involved. The testimony indicated that $26.7 billion worth of material is presently awaiting disposition. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], myself, and others, have been very much interested in this problem of procurement, and this is a demonstration at the other end of the line of the surplus that is generated. I have tried to point out in the past 2 or 3 years that we are generating surplus at the rate of about $7 billion or $8 billion a year that we dispose of, getting about 8 cents on the dollar. So, if anyone thinks there is not considerable room for improvement in our procurement practices, just think of this $26.7 billion of property that is ready to be disposed of at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the remainder of the bill?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 392, nays 3, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—393

Abbitt	Cederberg	Green, Pa.
Abernethy	Celler	Griffin
Addonizio	Chelf	Griffiths
Albert	Chiperfield	Gross
Alexander	Church	Gubser
Alford	Clark	Hagen
Alger	Coffin	Haley
Allen	Cohelan	Hall
Andersen, Minn.	Collier	Halleck
	Colmer	Halpern
Anderson, Mont.	Conte	Hardy
	Cook	Hargis
Andrews	Cooley	Harris
Anfuso	Corbett	Healey
Arends	Cramer	Hébert
Ashley	Cunningham	Hechler
Ashmore	Curtin	Henderson
Aspinall	Curtis, Mass.	Herlong
Auchincloss	Curtis, Mo.	Hess
Avery	Daddario	Hiestand
Ayres	Dague	Hoeven
Bailey	Daniels	Hoffman, Ill.
Baker	Davis, Ga.	Hoffman, Mich.
Baldwin	Davis, Tenn.	Hogan
Barden	Dawson	Holifield
Baring	Delaney	Holland
Barr	Dent	Holt
Barrett	Derounian	Holtzman
Barry	Derwinski	Horan
Bass, N.H.	Dingell	Hosmer
Bass, Tenn.	Dixon	Huddleston
Bates	Dollinger	Hull
Becker	Donohue	Ikard
Beckworth	Dooley	Irwin
Belcher	Dorn, N.Y.	Jarman
Bennett, Fla.	Dorn, S.C.	Jennings
Bennett, Mich.	Dowdy	Jensen
Bentley	Downing	Johansen
Berry	Doyle	Johnson, Calif.
Betts	Dulski	Johnson, Md.
Blatnik	Dwyer	Johnson, Wis.
Blitch	Elliott	Jonas
Boland	Everett	Jones, Ala.
Bolton	Fallon	Jones, Mo.
Bonner	Farbstein	Judd
Bosch	Fascell	Karsten
Bow	Feighan	Karth
Boykin	Fenton	Kasem
Boyle	Fino	Kastenmeier
Brademas	Fisher	Kearns
Bray	Flood	Kee
Breeding	Flynn	Keith
Brewster	Flynt	Kelly
Brock	Fogarty	Keogh
Brooks, La.	Foley	Kilburn
Brooks, Tex.	Forand	Kilday
Broomfield	Ford	Kilgore
Brown, Ga.	Fountain	King, Calif.
Brown, Mo.	Frazier	King, Utah
Brown, Ohio	Frelinghuysen	Kirwan
Broyhill	Friedel	Kitchin
Budge	Fulton	Kowalski
Burdick	Gallagher	Lafore
Burke, Ky.	Garmatz	Laird
Burke, Mass.	Gary	Landrum
Burleson	Gathings	Lane
Bush	Gavin	Langen
Byrne, Pa.	George	Lankford
Byrnes, Wis.	Giaimo	Latta
Cahill	Glenn	Lennon
Cannon	Goodell	Lesinski
Carnahan	Granahan	Levering
Carter	Grant	Libonati
Casey	Gray	Lindsay
Lipscomb	Osmers	Siler
Loser	Ostertag	Simpson, Ill.
McCormack	Passman	Sisk
McCulloch	Patman	Slack
McDonough	Pelly	Smith, Calif.
McDowell	Perkins	Smith, Iowa
McGinley	Pfost	Smith, Kans.
McGovern	Philbin	Smith, Miss.
McIntire	Pilcher	Smith, Va.
McMillan	Pirnie	Spence
McSween	Poage	Springer
Macdonald	Poff	Staggers
Machrowicz	Porter	Steed
Mack, Ill.	Preston	Stratton
Mack, Wash.	Price	Stubblefield
Madden	Prokop	Sullivan
Magnuson	Pucinski	Taber
Mahon	Quie	Taylor
Mailliard	Quigley	Teague, Calif.
Marshall	Rabaut	Teague, Tex.
Martin	Rains	Teller
Matthews	Randall	Thomas
Meader	Ray	Thompson, Tex.
Merrow	Reece, Tenn.	Thomson, Wyo.
Metcalf	Rees, Kans.	Thornberry
Michel	Reuss	Toll
Miller, Clem	Rhodes, Ariz.	Tollefson
Miller, George P.	Rhodes, Pa.	Trimble
	Riehlman	Tuck
Miller, N.Y.	Riley	Udall
Milliken	Rivers, Alaska	Ullman
Mills	Rivers, S.C.	Utt
Minshall	Roberts	Vanik
Mitchell	Robison	Van Pelt
Moeller	Rodino	Van Zandt
Monagan	Rogers, Colo.	Vinson
Montoya	Rogers, Fla.	Wainwright
Moore	Rogers, Mass.	Walter
Moorhead	Rogers, Tex.	Wampler
Morgan	Rooney	Watts
Morris, N. Mex.	Roosevelt	Weaver
Morris, Okla.	Rostenkowski	Weis
Moss	Roush	Westland
Moulder	Rutherford	Whitener
Mumma	St. George	Whitten
Murphy	Santangelo	Widnall
Murray	Saund	Wier
Natcher	Saylor	Willis
Nelsen	Schenck	Wilson
Nix	Scherer	Winstead
Norblad	Schwengel	Wolf
Norrell	Scott	Wright
O'Brien, Ill.	Selden	Yates
O'Brien, N.Y.	Shelley	Young
O'Hara, Ill.	Sheppard	Younger
O'Hara, Mich.	Shipley	Zablocki
O'Neill	Short	Zelenko
Oliver	Sikes	

NAYS—3

Harmon	Johnson, Colo.	Meyer

NOT VOTING—39

Adair	Durham	May
Baumhart	Edmondson	Morrison
Boggs	Evins	Multer
Bolling	Forrester	O'Konski
Bowles	Green, Oreg.	Pillion
Buckley	Harrison	Powell
Canfield	Hays	Simpson, Pa.
Chamberlain	Hemphill	Thompson, La.
Chenoweth	Jackson	Thompson, N.J.
Coad	Kluczynski	Wallhauser
Denton	Knox	Wharton
Devine	McFall	Williams
Diggs	Mason	Withrow

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Wallhauser.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Withrow.

Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Coad with Mr. Baumhart.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Wharton.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Forrester with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Knox.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Harrison with Mr. Pillion.

Mr. Denton with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Powell with Mrs. May.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks and include pertinent excerpts; and I ask that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

WEST VIRGINIA IS GETTING SHORT CHANGED

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, the House has just passed a bill carrying billions of dollars for the national defense and security of our country.

It was with some misgivings that I voted for this bill, realizing as I do that West Virginia will be far down near the bottom of the list in military installations, personnel, and expenditures resulting from this appropriation.

There have been some Members of the House who have chided me in a friendly way about my campaign to reduce this outrageous discrimination against West Virginia. Some of my colleagues have kidded me by saying I was interested in some kind of pork barrel for West Virginia. All I can say is that we are reaching the bottom of another kind of barrel in many communities of my State.

We are not asking for pork-barrel handouts; all we are asking for in West Virginia is an even break when it comes to locating defense installations and defense contracts.

But what has happened in the five States bordering West Virginia? Ohio, with 4 times the population of West Virginia, has over 30 times as many active-duty military personnel, 40 times as many civilian employees of the Department of Defense, and 16 times as many active military installations.

Pennsylvania, which is 5 times as large in population as West Virginia, has over 25 times as many active-duty military personnel, 60 times as many civilian employees in the Department of Defense, and 30 times as many active major military installations.

Virginia, with 50 percent more population than West Virginia, has 140 times as many active-duty military personnel, 70 times as many civilian employees in the Department of Defense, and 37 times as many active major military installations.

The same facts in relative degrees hold true for the other two bordering States of Maryland and Kentucky.

I listened today, Mr. Speaker, to the debates on this military appropriation bill. I heard some of my colleagues state that in their view the national defense was an issue which should be approached from a national standpoint, and that it was inimical to the interests of our national security to consider the claims of States and areas.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is all very fine doctrine in the abstract. But I also submit that when there are flagrant discriminations against a single State, as in the case of West Virginia, it is high time for someone to blow the whistle and put a stop to this discrimination. For the strength of our national defense, Mr. Speaker, is tied in with the strength of the Nation. If one area or State in the Nation is neglected, overlooked, underprivileged, and deprived of virtually everything which other States and areas receive, the whole Nation will eventually and inevitably suffer.

West Virginians are a proud people, Mr. Speaker. We can take it. We are used to standing on our own feet. Our State motto is "Montani Semper Liberi"—"Mountaineers Are Always Free". But you cannot push us around this way much longer and expect the Nation's defense to grow stronger.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he can advise us what the program will be for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow we will consider the water pollution bill.

On Friday, we will take up the public works appropriation bill, and I would like to meet Friday at 11 o'clock.

Any rollcall on tomorrow or Friday with the exception of a rollcall on a rule will go over until Tuesday of next week. That will apply also to Monday of next week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet on Friday at 11 o'clock.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is why I made the request now while my friend was present, so he could ask about it if he wished to.

Mr. GROSS. I ask why we should meet at 11 o'clock Friday.

Mr. McCORMACK. The public works bill I expect will be debated considerably and we want to dispose of it that day.

Suppose we let my request go until tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

MICROFILMING OF THE JAMES MADISON PAPERS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 281) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to transmit to the Papers of James Madison, a research project sponsored by the University of Chicago and the University of Virginia, at Chicago, Ill., microfilm or photostatic copies of certain James Madison documents in the files of the House of Representatives, as described in the 46th page list deposited with the Clerk, the cost of such photostatic copies to be paid by the Papers of James Madison.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask how long this loan is for?

Mr. YATES. It is not a loan. This is a research project undertaken by the Universities of Chicago and Virginia. This resolution is necessary to authorize the Clerk to permit the universities to take microfilms of these papers within his possession for delivery to the universities at the expense of the universities. The papers will still be in the Clerk's possession. This merely permits them to be microfilmed.

Mr. FULTON. My only thought was that if it were a loan the period of the loan should be specified; there should be a time limit.

Mr. YATES. It is not a loan.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the resolution offered by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will greatly facilitate the undertaking of the University of Chicago and the University of Virginia, sponsors of the project, in collecting and publishing the papers of James Madison, the fourth President of the United States. It is a project that properly has stirred wide interest not only among scholars but in all circles where information of the undertaking has become known.

James Madison, who kept the minutes of the Constitutional Convention, who served as a Congressman from Virginia 1789–97, was Secretary of State, 1801–09, and President of the United States, 1809–17, is one of the great figures in American history. The publication of all his writings and utterances on the many complexing issues of the years of conception and early development of our Republic, including the period of the War of 1812, will be an important contribution to scholarship and our understanding of our national history.

The editors of the Papers of James Madison are Dr. William T. Hutchinson, of the University of Chicago, and Dr. William M. E. Rachal, of the University of Virginia. On May 27, 1959, Dr. Hutchinson wrote me:

There is, I believe, a standing rule of the House, requiring it to give clearance to anyone who wishes to make copies of its records in the National Archives. With the consent of Mr. Roberts, the Clerk of the House, and the cooperation of Dr. Wayne C. Grover, Archivist of the United States, Mr. Robert Scribner of our editorial staff searched through the records of the House from 1789 to 1817 for items by or to Madison. Because of his outstanding prominence during those

years, as a Congressman from Virginia 1789–97, Secretary of State, 1801–09, and President, 1809–17, the resulting list was a long one.

We sent a copy of this list to Mr. Roberts requesting that we be favored with permission to photocopy the papers with a view to editing and publishing them in a comprehensive edition (probably about 22 volumes) of the Papers of James Madison, to be published by the University of Chicago Press. Clearly this edition will be far from "comprehensive" if it omits Madison's many writings in the House records. We are informed by Dr. Grover that Mr. Roberts to clear so many papers for microfilming will require permission by the passage of a special resolution by the House.

I trust that you will agree that we are responsible scholars, solely interested in providing as complete an edition as possible of the writings of one of America's ablest political thinkers and statesmen.

My colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and I are most appreciative of the fine cooperation of the distinguished majority leader and the promptness with which he has acted in order to avoid any delay in the compilation of the papers of James Madison. Our appreciation for their parts in a fine cooperative effort in a matter of historic significance is expressed to the Honorable OMAR BURLESON, chairman of the Committee on House Administration, to Mr. Roberts and Dr. Grover.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in my remarks during debate on the national defense appropriation bill I may be permitted to include a letter from Maj. Gen. F. S. Besson, Chief of Transportation, U.S. Army, to the Chief of the Military Sea Transport Service, advising that the Army contemplated using airplanes in lieu of ocean vessels for transportation of military personnel and their dependents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION IN MOSCOW

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 31, the U.S. Information Agency announced that 49 paintings and works of sculpture had been selected for showing at the American National Exhibition in Moscow this summer. The art collection has already been crated and was scheduled to be shipped to the Soviet Union on the steamship *Finnsailer*, which I understand is now on the high seas.

The 6-week American National Exhibition at which these works will be shown will be opened in Moscow's Sokolniki Park on July 25 by Vice President NIXON. It is billed by the USIA as containing "cultural, scientific, and technological exhibits designed to further Soviet understanding of life in America."

The USIA press announcement concerning the art collection lists the names of the 67 artists whose works will be displayed at the exhibition. In the 3 or 4 days which have transpired since the press announcement was distributed by USIA, I have requested the staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities to furnish me with information in the committee files on the artists whose work has been shipped to Moscow. I wish to emphasize that the information which I shall now reveal is not the result of any field investigation or even of an exhaustive check of all possible sources of information, but is the result of a routine check of committee files made on 67 people in the course of a few days' time.

This routine check, may I state, is a service which the Committee on Un-American Activities regularly renders to any executive agency of the Government which requests it.

Of the 67 artists whose works have been chosen for exhibition in Moscow, 34—a fraction more than 50 percent—have records of affiliation with Communist fronts and causes. Of these 34 there are 12 whose records appear to be relatively inconsequential because they involve connections with only one or two Communist fronts or causes, and include no affiliation for a period of 10 years or more.

This leaves 22, or one-third of the 67 artists, with significant records of affiliation with the Communist movement in this country. The routine check against the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities indicates that these 22 artists have a minimum of 465 connections with Communist fronts and causes.

One of these artists, Max Weber, has been publicly identified as a Communist Party member. The affiliations of some of the others, however, are so extensive and of such a nature that they raise serious questions as to where their loyalty actually lies.

Three of them have been connected with Communist Party schools.

Six of them have publicly urged participation in the Communist Party's May Day parades.

Five of them have publicly recommended the election of known Communists to public office.

Three of them have contributed articles to, or openly supported, the Communist Daily Worker or its west coast counterpart, The People's World.

Eight of these artists have been members of the Communist John Reed Clubs.

Two of them have had their paintings offered as prizes for Daily Worker subscriptions.

Four of them defended Stalin's bloody Moscow purge trials of the late 1930's.

Four have contributed their art work to the Communist magazine The Liberator.

Two have similarly served Fight, the publication of the Communist front, the American League Against War and Fascism and, later, of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

Three have done the same for Soviet Russia Today, another Communist magazine.

Two of them have been owners of the Communist publication, the Masses.

Sixteen have contributed their art work to the Communist magazine New Masses.

Thirteen have similarly served its successors, Masses and Mainstream.

Three have contributed art material to the Communist publication Jewish Life.

Twenty-six of these 67 artists have contributed their paintings to art exhibitions staged by Communist fronts: 12 to the China Aid Council, 5 to the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, 1 to People's Drama—a Communist Party theatrical agency—and 8 to the Communist-line weekly newspaper, The National Guardian.

Eleven of these artists signed the call to the American Artists Congress of 1936, one of the major art fronts set up by the Communist Party in this country.

Three of these artists have publicly defended V. J. Jerome, Communist Party cultural commissar, for delivering his speech, "Grasp the Weapon of Culture," at the 1950 convention of the U.S. Communist Party. This speech was one of the overt acts on which Jerome was subsequently indicted—and convicted—for conspiring to overthrow the Government of these United States by force and violence.

Just a short time ago two of these artists signed a public statement calling on the United States to completely reverse its foreign policy, particularly in regard to Formosa and Labanon. This statement was, in effect, a call for United States surrender to Moscow.

Now, I should like to tell you a few things about some of these artists as individuals. First, let us consider the case of Jack Levine, who, the routine check made by our committee indicates, has been affiliated with at least 21 Communist fronts and causes. Levine's work, "Welcome Home," is being sent to Moscow to portray and impress the people of the Soviet Union with American culture.

A recent issue of the Communist Worker described this painting as a picture of a stuffed-shirt American general. Jack Levine himself has described this painting in the following words:

> And no matter how commanding and impressive a general, he will be chewing. His wife, however smart and fashionably turned out, will be chewing. Everybody in the general's party will be chewing, as a gesture of kinship with the lower orders of mankind. What is more absurd than an august gathering abstractedly chewing their cuds * * * my thesis, that armies are a continuation of class snobbery.

So that there will be no doubt about Levine and the style and purpose of his art, I quote from a review of an exhibit of his works which was published in the

Communist newspaper, The Worker, on April 10, 1955:

Jack Levine is an artist of social satire and social caricature. He paints dead souls in living bodies with devastating power and insight. He paints the men and women who would stifle humanity, starve mankind, brutalize the world for their own parasitic, selfish, greedy ends. He divests these people of their outer garments of wealth, position, and respectability and exposes the sham that covers the leering evil, the greed, the corrosion of upper-class immorality and self-indulgence.

One cannot look at these canvases without experiencing the impact of their terrific power. The painting, The Trial, has deep political significance today as witchhunts and hysteria have made a mockery of courtroom justice.

* * * * *

Throughout the exhibition it is more clear what Jack Levine hates. He says himself, "Those I love I simply leave out. A painter should do what he does best."

It is obvious from Levine's own words that he hates the U.S. general he has portrayed in "Welcome Home."

The Worker review of Levine's exhibit also stated:

One of the functions which art is expected to perform is to intensify man's emotions and sharpen his insights. Jack Levine has done this in a merciless exposure of corroding evil dressed in riches and respectability. He has created unforgettable faces expressive of corruption that grows and decays, of hypocritical souls wielding power today.

This statement makes it clear that not only does Levine hate American generals but that, in his artwork, he follows the dictates of the world Communist conspiracy. Addressing the 21st congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on January 27 of this year, Nikita Khrushchev made the following statement:

It is the duty of * * * painters to raise still higher the content and artistic level of their work, to continue as energetic assistants of the party and the state in the Communist education of the working people.

Writing in the Communist New Masses magazine in 1946—the magazine to which 16 of these artists have contributed—U.S. Communist Party Chairman William Z. Foster, said:

There must be a clear understanding that art is a weapon in the class struggle. Not only is art a weapon, but a very potent one as well. Moreover, rising revolutionary social classes instinctively realize the importance of art as a social weapon and have always forged their own art and used it to challenge that of the existing ruling class.

It is clear from these statements that neither Khrushchev nor Foster has any complaints as far as the work of Jack Levine is concerned. He uses his art as a weapon to arouse hatred of our free society and people considered representative of it.

His picture of the gum-chewing, "stuffed shirt" American general will help the Kremlin convince its enslaved people that its vicious propaganda about American military leaders is true, and is supported even by the American people.

Another artist whose work the USIA has chosen to exhibit in Moscow is Ben Shahn, who has been affiliated with over two dozen Communist fronts and causes. Shahn has been repeatedly described in the Communist press as a "people's artist." Shahn is one of the artists in this group who recently signed a statement calling on the United States to reverse our policy of resisting Communist aggression.

A Daily Worker review of his paintings a number of years ago contained the following statement:

Shahn has always considered art as a medium for the communication of ideas and his ideas have always been progressive. (When used in the Communist press, "progressive" means Communist or pro-Communist). He is one of our finest artists and one of our best social painters.

The Communist newspaper's use of the word "our" in referring to Shahn is significant.

The People's World, west coast Communist Party newspaper, in April of 1955, described some of Shahn's paintings in a Los Angeles exhibit as follows:

His brilliant caustic social paintings * * * an acid portrait of a policeman, a sympathetic drawing of a miner * * * drawn by an artist who takes sides and expresses his viewpoint in a powerful style.

The same Communist newspaper in a 1948 review of an exhibition of Shahn's works made the following comment:

It is interesting to note, also, that posters such as "We Want Peace, Register, Vote," "For All These Rights We've Just Begun To Fight," and others are fine, qualitative examples of the work to the artist. * * * Here, simply and definitely, is an artist of the people.

During the 1948 election campaign Shahn put his talents to the use of the Communist-controlled Progressive Party by painting a campaign poster which mocked President Truman and his Republican opponent, former Governor Dewey of New York.

Still another artist chosen for the Moscow exhibit is Max Weber, the one who has been identified as a Communist Party member by Louis Budenz, former managing editor of the Daily Worker and member of the Communist Party national committee.

Weber has been connected with some 70 Communist fronts and causes. The Communist magazine Masses and Mainstream, issue of April 1949, contained an article on Weber praising him as follows:

Weber grew up an artist in the atmosphere of quest and revolt * * * Weber sought an answer to the anarchy of capitalist society in the controlled order of formal manipulation.

Through the depression years of the thirties, Weber took an active and leading part in the struggles of artists. And at this time his work * * * reflects the social scene through the inclusion of new thematic material in such paintings as "At the Mill," "The Builder," and "Refugees."

His passionate social awareness makes him constantly affirm his alliance with those who have begun to break through.

In passing, Mr. Speaker, permit me to quote certain appraisals made by art critics of the work of Max Weber. These appraisals are taken from a publication copyrighted by the Whitney Museum of American Art in 1949:

Their ugliness is appalling.

No one is going to believe that nature alone ever made anybody as bad an artist as all this. Such grotesquerie could only be acquired by long and perverse practice.

Here are travesties of the human form, here are forms that have no justification in nature, but that seem for all the world like the emanation of someone not in his right mind, such as one might expect from the inmate of a lunatic asylum. * * * It is difficult to write of these atrocities with moderation, for they are positively an insult to ordinary intelligence.

A brutal, vulgar and unnecessary display of art license.

Philip Evergood, another artist whose work will be displayed in the exhibit, has been connected with over 75 Communist fronts and causes, has contributed articles to the Communist Daily Worker and has been a staff writer for the west coast Communist Party newspaper, the People's World.

Evergood is one of the many artists in this group who sponsored or took an active part in the notorious Communist initiated Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace held in New York City in March 1949, and frequently referred to as the Waldorf conference.

Evergood was a panel speaker at this conference. His subject was "The Artist as Interpreter of His Age." Addressing the numerous Communists and fellow travelers who took part in this gathering, he said:

The tools of the artist may vary, his philosophy may change, but the substance of his art, if it is to live, is always the reflection of his time. Today the artist is living in the most complex of societies. How can today's artist cope with and express the chaotic state of the world in which he lives? The artist must enter the struggle for peace like the people who are for peace and the continued growth of their kind, because to quote Paul Robeson, "The people are engaged in a mighty creative battle for progress."

The worm-rotted shells whose stench of putrefaction permeates our contemporary mental atmosphere will disintegrate and disappear like the nightmare they are.

Entering the struggle for peace himself, Evergood did a charcoal drawing of a "Dove of Peace" for an art exhibition staged in 1951 by the New York branch of the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, the Communist Party's cultural front. It was at this time that Moscow's Stockholm peace appeal was being circulated throughout this country and the Communist artist Picasso's peace dove had become the symbol of the Kremlin's hypocritical peace drive.

The art exhibition the USIA is sending to Moscow is supposed to portray—and help the enslaved people of the Soviet Union appreciate—the art and culture of the United States. The theory behind the exhibit is that it is an exhibition of the art of freemen. It appears that we are sending the so-called art of men who have prostituted whatever talents they possess to the foulest conspiracy in the history of man. I ask you, "can anyone claim—and the USIA claim—that these men really represent American culture?"

It is repulsive to me that a U.S. Government agency should glorify so-called artists who stand for nothing that this country represents and for everything it is opposed to, men who stand for, promote, and defend Communist slavery, mass murder, and destruction of freedom; men who, by their actions and statements over the course of many years, have proclaimed themselves the enemies of the United States.

I also wish to state my objection to what is implied by the backgrounds of the artists the USIA has selected to represent this country in Moscow; namely, that of all the painters and sculptors in the United States, one-third of them are either Communists, conscious and deliberate fellow travelers, or dupes of the Communist conspiracy.

I am cognizant, Mr. Speaker, of the "liberal" line proclaiming the intrinsic esthetic value of "art for art's sake," irrespective of the background or design of the artist and that somehow by displaying in Moscow, at U.S. taxpayer's expense, the art work of American Communists and Communist-fronters, Khrushchev and his gang of international outlaws will cease being Communists dedicated to world revolution. In my judgment, this is plain poppycock.

How long is it going to be, Mr. Speaker, before it is recognized that the Communist conspiracy is at total war with the free world? It is a war of intrigue, subversion and force. It is above all, a war in which the Communist conspiracy is irrevocably dedicated. If our method of fighting communism is to display in Moscow art works of American Communists and Communist fronters our cause is lost.

I cannot believe that the overwhelming majority of the patriotic American citizens will stomach this nonsense.

ANTILYNCHING LEGISLATION

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, about 5 weeks ago, on April 25 a man was taken from a jail cell in the dead of night and murdered without trial. This did not happen in Communist Russia, nor among the head-hunters of Borneo. It happened here, in the United States, the most powerful bastion of human dignity and of the rule of law. The perpetrators of this crime have not been apprehended, and there is strong evidence to suggest that they will go unpunished. The Federal Government is powerless to prosecute, and the government of Mississippi is moving with little determination and even less diligence toward a perfunctory grand jury inquiry. Yet the crime at issue is heinous, and its effect reaches far beyond the unperturbed county of Pearl River, Miss.

The 15 or 20 masked criminals who took the life of Mack Charles Parker are guilty of more than murder. They have spat in the face of decency and morality, and they have ridden roughshod over the standards that are essential to the survival of freedom and democracy in this country. In spirit, they are the direct descendants of all the hate-poisoned murderers of history, from Jenghiz Khan's barbaric hordes to Hitler's evil hoodlums. By their crime, the killers of Parker have flown in the face of every basic tenet of the American creed.

This is a very serious matter. It is a source of deep shame to every thinking American, and it seriously undermines our international stance as leading champions of freedom and democracy. Yet, the authorities in Mississippi seem to think that the case requires no more than the cavalier treatment that has traditionally been accorded such crimes in that State. Governor Coleman has announced that the case will be presented to the grand jury in Pearl River County during the next regular session in November. In other words, there will be no action until more than half a year after the date of the murder. The likelihood of effective action at that late date is infinitesimal. The Federal Government, meanwhile, is excluded from the case because no Federal law was violated.

For some time past, the Congress has been urged to pass antilynching legislation. Many bills to that effect have been drawn, but so far they have always failed on enactment in the face of southern assurances that lynching was on the wane and that the States had the matter well under control. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the time has come to brush such assurances aside and to pass a bill containing an antilynching clause. One unpunished lynching in 10 years—nay, in a century—is one too many. For the sake of our national conscience and our national interest, we cannot afford to tolerate such unspeakable barbarism in our Nation.

Let us enact such a law now, before another Mack Charles Parker case shocks the Nation and the world.

GONE-EMPLOYMENT IS THE REAL MENACE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SLACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, we have had heartening news recently about national economic trends, and I know that all of us are happy to see a marked upturn from the 1958 recession levels. Throughout this session many of us have been very seriously concerned with the problem of unemployment, and we have given evidence of that concern by the introduction of a variety of measures aimed at both stimulating employment and easing the plight of the unemployed. The improvement in business activity during recent weeks has reduced the total number of unemployed, and I am sure that all of us are thankful for that. However, it has not had any effect on long-term chronic unemployment, which is the most stubborn opponent to full prosperity for our country.

I have no desire to minimize our improved economic picture, but I feel it is my duty to rise and bring to your attention a very real need which faces us today.

The Secretary of Labor issued a study recently which analyzed the employment situation in terms of total unemployment and of the gains in the number of employed during the spring of 1959. Almost all of the criteria of measurement were on the plus side. In this report, however, there is a most significant statement which, to my mind offers a major challenge to the wisdom and ingenuity of this Congress.

Secretary Mitchell's report stated that there had been a decline in the number of unemployed during the past year to a total of 3,600,000, a figure which constitutes 5.3 percent of the total labor force. He acknowledged, however, that there were "1.4 million persons unemployed for 15 weeks or longer, and of these, 700,000 had been without jobs for more than 26 weeks." These 700,000 men and women are the long-term chronic unemployed who represent a particular problem which is developing along with the growth of our national economy—a problem for which we must find a solution.

If you study the area of location of these 700,000 workers who have been unemployed for more than 26 weeks, a year or more, or even 2 years, they are the workers whose present circumstances are responsible for the existence of what we have been discussing in this session as depressed areas.

There have been four changes in our economy since the end of World War II, during which there have been increases and declines in the general economy. After each dip the economy has recovered, but each recovery has left behind an addition to the total number of men and women whose means of livelihood has disappeared under the impact of technological advance. Most of the attention directed toward this development has been focused on mining and a few other industries in which the impact has been felt most heavily. Yet the trend is such, and the indications on the horizon are such, that we must recognize the inevitability of the growth of pools of chronic unemployment in all areas and industries over a period of years.

Obviously, we must continuously strive for top operational efficiency in our business industry. Not to do this would mean that we would one day rank as the No. 2 industrial power in the world. We all know what that would mean. It would simply mean that we would lose our leadership among the free nations of the world, and soon thereafter we would lose our very national existence. We must, therefore, learn to live and grow with the growth of automation and mechanization developments and techniques. It seems to me that whenever there is a downturn in the business cycle, there is a tendency to give some thought to this matter. When business revives to a degree, we tell ourselves that the unemployed, or at least those who want to work, will all find jobs without any further thought being given to the situation.

I note the beginnings of such thinking again both among business spokesmen and among some of my colleagues. I say to you that this is a very dangerous position to take. I say it not in criticism so much as in the belief that most of us have never analyzed the true scope of the problem in the light of our national requirements, and I believe we have failed to do so because the problem has never been labeled, identified, and segregated from its surrounding background. We must put the problem under the microscope and study it. We must also give it a specific identification, and talk of it specifically when we discuss the chronically unemployed.

The men and women who are without jobs for periods of time ranging up to 26 or 30 weeks, and who receive some assistance through unemployment compensation and similar benefits while unemployed, are simply unemployed employables. Their situation is temporary; even if they are out of work for as much as 6 months, they are still unemployed employables because their jobs will again be open to them as soon as a temporary economic setback is reversed by an upward business trend. We have considered many measures to deal with unemployment of this kind; some of these measures are more effective than others, but on the whole our efforts in recent years have combined to produce a fairly effective array of protection devices for workers in that position. The great majority of these unemployed employables who were without work as a result of the 1958 recession are now being called back to work. Most of the States are again able to report that their unemployed totals are declining to prerecession levels. It is not of these workers that I would speak with you today.

I wish to call your special and particular attention to the circumstances in which the 700,000 previously mentioned chronically unemployed find themselves. They will not be called back to work. They cannot do so because the jobs to which they previously owed a source of livelihood no longer exist at all. The jobs are gone. They are gone forever. They have vanished under the pressure of technological advance. We must learn to segregate this body of the unemployed from the larger group that comprises the majority of all national unemployment. As a device to assist you in identifying this group of workers I offer for your approval a new word to be added to the language—a word which shall be used to describe the condition in which these men and women find themselves.

That word is "gone-employment."

When we talk about the chronically unemployed displaced by mechanization or new automation methods or techniques we are talking about gone-employment. It is gone forever, and these persons can never hope to obtain employment again in the capacities in which they previously earned a livelihood.

I know that many of my colleagues, almost a hundred in fact, have been disturbed during recent years over the growth of persistent pools of unemployment in their districts. I have watched the progress of legislation in the session by means of which efforts have been made to better the situation. One of the most far-reaching such efforts was embodied in the area redevelopment bill which passed the Senate and was referred for action by this House. Both the last Congress and this one have made approaches to the problem through depressed areas or area redevelopment legislation. Today, however, in the light of the more favorable news about employment generally, there appears to be far less enthusiasm for efforts to deal with the problems of the chronically unemployed through this or similar legislation.

What I wish to call to your attention with greatest emphasis, however, is the fact that whatever measures are enacted by this Congress for immediate relief of the unemployed in depressed areas will not strike at the core of the problem. Even if we should place on the books an area redevelopment measure, and should stimulate public works programs and housing and airport construction, and the development of flood control and similar engineering projects, and should add to the prevailing unemployment compensation benefits and appropriate money to broaden and increase the agricultural surplus commodities program we would still be working in the dark.

By this time I believe most of us realize that the long-term chronically unemployed—the gone-employed—are the victims of technological advance. We have seen the growing effects of mechanization and automation develop in many industries and in many parts of the country. What we need to approach the problem intelligently is a roadmap or guide to our planning and spending.

In other words, while we approach the problem at the national level and encourage activity at the State and community level, we must also institute measures to support our activities by obtaining definitive findings at the theoretical level. We are dealing here with an economic disease and it must be handled like a campaign against any other disease. I am reminded of the national effort to conquer poliomyelitis. For many years we contributed dimes and dollars to fight poliomyelitis. The money was spent to buy crutches and braces for the children who were suffering from the effects of this disease. Millions of dollars were spent over a period of years to this purpose, and it was a good purpose, but we knew at the time that it was not getting at the root of the trouble. Meanwhile, there were those with special knowledge who approached the problem in the laboratories, at the theoretical level, and in due course they produced a vaccine which dramatically reduced the ravages of polio.

In the same manner a background of theoretical experiment and scientific inquiry is badly needed if we are to ever hope to lay down an effective method of dealing with gone-employment.

It is fruitless to believe that we can in any manner halt or mitigate the effects of technological advance in industry. In fact, the international competition today requires that our national policy contemplate the encouragement of continuously growing efficiency among our productive forces. In the same manner that we could not expect polio to simply die out, we cannot expect the undesirable effects of mechanization and automation to disappear either.

I am proposing, then, that we deliberately search for a theoretical basis for correctives. We know the problem will be with us for a generation or more; how serious it will be depends upon how wisely we plan to meet it now. We can spend money for any number of possible solutions, but we will never know whether or not we are spending the money wisely, and whether or not we may expect a favorable final result.

To obtain a basis upon which future Congresses may take action in this area of need, I propose the authorization of a study of long-term chronic unemployment, such study to be made by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. My suggestions are contained in a House joint resolution which I am introducing today. The resolution calls for an exhaustive inquiry into the recent economic history of areas and communities so affected, and into the trends of their industrial growth and decline, in an effort to segregate and identify as a basis for corrective action whatever factors may be applied as yardsticks of measurement in dealing with the economic decline of areas and communities in the future.

The study would be confined to those areas generally considered to be depressed areas within the meaning of the terms of the various area redevelopment measures under consideration. It would be pursued over a period of 3 years with a progress report to be filed at the end of the first and second years and a final report with recommendations to be filed in June 1962. I might say at this time that there have been suggestions for studies of unemployment recently and that this House has been reluctant to take action because of the political implications of such short-term studies and the fact that we are again approaching a presidential election year. This resolution is written in such a manner as to avoid all partisanship and all political implications for the forthcoming 1960 election. Its adoption will reflect credit on both parties and will signify to the people whose livelihood has been destroyed by technology that this Congress is aware of their problems and is undertaking to assign the best qualified economists in the United States to the search for a solution.

If we do not move in this area at once, we will soon be lulled to sleep by the increasingly pleasant statistics regarding gross national product and personal income. In recent weeks I have heard comments from fellow Members who represent districts in New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Kentucky, and several other States voicing distress over the tendency to sweep the chronic unemployment problem under the rug simply because the general national economic outlook is improving. I believe the only way we can obtain a commitment to a

solution of this problem is to authorize a specific study of this nature and thereby demonstrate that we have a strong interest in the subject, even though certain specific measures before the Congress designed to deal with various particular aspects of the problem may finally fail of passage.

A few days ago the White House Conference on Refugees suggested that we open our gates to hundreds of thousands of refugees from overseas, and a State Department official suggested that we boost American aid to foreign refugees to about $65 million per year. Many public statements were made to the effect that we have a responsibility to do something about the rehabilitation and resettlement of some 2,500,000 refugees in Europe and the Near East. I remind you also that it is proposed to appropriate $700 million for the Development Loan Fund to rehabilitate and develop certain oversea areas.

This resolution would call for an expenditure of only $150,000 per year for 3 years, and it is designed to save us money in the long run. If the amount—$150,000—appears high, you might remember that this constitutes only one-fiftieth of 1 percent of the amount of money we proposed to spend to correct similar problems overseas. I realize that we have been advised by some self-appointed experts to the effect that it is not necessary to study the problem; it is only necessary to appropriate and spend money. I disagree with this position. I do agree that short-range, politically motivated inquiries are without value.

The trend toward growing gone-employment in those areas and industries first affected by the rapid technological advance has been growing and increasing ever since the end of World War II, and we will not obtain the answers during the course of a 60-day or 90-day inquiry. We may not obtain all of the answers for a decade or more. But we must start at once before the problem gets completely out of control. I remind you that under the terms of the National Defense Education Act we are supplying funds to intensify the development of engineers and technicians, so that their talents may be sharpened to the utmost and added to the working tools of our economy. In other words, we are subsidizing an increase in the rapidity of the cycle of technological advance. I believe this is necessary and desirable. But we must also prepare our economy to ward off the ill effects which we know will develop coincident with increased technology.

I do not propose this study as a substitute for any of the measures now pending before the Congress which would apply short-term relief to the depressed areas of today. The people in those areas must have immediate and practical relief. But, while we take steps to aid them today, we must support a strong inquiry into the origins of the situation in which they find themselves, so that their sons and daughters may look forward in full confidence that the despair of their unemployed fathers will not fall to their own lot.

I realize that there are many among my colleagues whose districts do not face this situation, and whose people are today enjoying the full economic and social benefits of an expanding economy in a prosperous Nation. To them I say that you above all should join in support of this resolution because your people will have the most to lose. Do not think for a minute that any city or State or industry is immune to the economic and social ravages that can be created by the rapid installation of automatic machinery and automation techniques. Give a moment's pause to this statistic, and think of its implications: Between 1947 and 1957, when industrial production was rising 40 percent, the number of production workers in industry increased only 1 percent.

We must be informed about this trend, so we may legislate wisely and inform our constituents, and to that end I ask support for this resolution.

HOW TO BECOME A MAJOR GENERAL

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, these remarks could have been made under a point of personal privilege, but I do not want to take the time of the House, or any more of my own time, to dispose of this matter.

I spent most of World War II as a second lieutenant. Now I am a major in the Air Force Reserve. That is the only military rank I hold. I am not a major general in the revolutionary army of national liberation of Santo Domingo. I never have been and I never will be.

Many Members of Congress and journalists received copies of a legal sized multigraphed, single-spaced newsletter called "Special Memorandum From: Universal Research and Consultants, Inc." who are identified on the letterhead as being consulting geopoliticians, foreign negotiations, operations research.

The May 26, 1959, issue contained four paragraphs about me. Here is the first paragraph:

> The Dominican Republic Herald recently confirmed an announcement made early in May by Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER that he had been appointed a major general in the revolutionary army of national liberation of Santo Domingo. Such an announcement by an American Congressman is indeed a shocking one. The revolutionary army of national liberation is no honorary society or chowder and marching club but an active revolutionary force dedicated to a physical invasion of the Dominican Republic and the overthrow of its Government. For a Congressman of the United States to publicly announce his acceptance of a commission in a revolutionary army is by no means compatible with his duties to his constituents in Oregon, nor is it compatible with the interests of the Nation.

This item was the first notice I had of any such appointment. I never announced any such thing or anything remotely similar. This is made from whole cloth. And as for one of Trujillo's newspapers confirming any such item, well, it is not likely they would favor me or care about the truth.

My administrative assistant, Jack Billings, spoke with the editor of the newsletter and was told he read the item in the Dominican Republic Herald for whom, incidentally, I understand the editor writes a column.

My action has been to refer the newsletter to attorneys to advise me as to the grounds therein for a libel suit. I don't mind being cussed and vilified but outright misrepresentation as gross as this tends to annoy me. Moreover I know that some of my colleagues have seen it and it may be that one or more of them will believe that it is true.

To set the record as straight as I can I am inserting these remarks. Of course I am against Trujillo and against any other tyrant, whether he rules Formosa, mainland China, the Soviet Union, Spain, or any other country. I rejoice when a tyrant's power is challenged and overthrown, but I never have alined myself with any particular revolutionary group. I feel a kinship and a sympathy for persons who fight tyranny. I will continue to urge my Government to give the formal handclasp to dictators and the warm embrace to democratic leaders. I will continue to stand up for the principles of freedom and human rights on which this Nation was established.

But I will not be a major general or even a private or a marshal in any particular revolutionary army of another nation. Of course, no one has asked me to be, no doubt with good reason. It is generous of Trujillo to bestow such rank on me and certainly broadly tolerant of Special Memorandum to accept the word of Trujillo's newspaper.

Special Memorandum has come on rough days. Not long ago it was paid by Batista and by Pérez Jiménez to be a foreign agent for their illustrious cutthroat governments, and also by some purportedly anti-Communist league with a high-sounding name. Now these clients are gone, but perhaps the editor seeks to sign up Rafael Trujillo before it is too late for both himself and Trujillo.

Many strange animals roam the corridors and infest the cocktail parties of this Capital City of the United States. The strangest and slimiest snakes of all, in my opinion, are those creatures who take blood money from tyrants to do their prostitute journalism and other chores in this citadel of democracy and the free world.

THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION'S PLAN FOR PEACE: REGIONAL AND WORLD CONFERENCES OF LAWYERS

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on May 18 the American Bar Association completed the study it undertook at the request of the International Cooperation Administration. The study's recommendations are of key importance in the long, hard and frequently frustrating fight to establish the rule of law in the world.

Yet, I understand, ICA may refuse to allocate the funds, even in the amount promised in a letter from former ICA Director James Smith. It may be that an attempt to amend the Mutual Security Act should be made when it reaches the House floor so as to earmark the necessary funds.

The report affirms that "it is feasible to conduct a series of conferences, culminating in a world conference, of lawyers from the United States and other nations, to consider and recommend specific measures for the achievement of world peace through law."

The regional conferences would be held possibly in Rio de Janeiro, New Delhi, Accra, and Vienna, the world conference possibly in Stockholm. Each regional conference would run for 5 days, and the world conference for 3 weeks.

GENERAL OBJECTIVES

The report states:

The general objectives of each of the conferences would be to further the basic goal of world peace through the rule of law and to make international law and international courts a more powerful force in international relations, thereby reducing international tensions.

The details may be found in the report, the complete text of which I am appending to these remarks.

The men who prepared this report, with the help of many other lawyers, are idealists, yes, in a sense but not starry eyed. They know that the only route to survival is the rule of law. The American Bar Association committee's chairman, a former president of the American Bar Association, is Charles S. Rhyne of Washington, D.C., whose work for the rule of law in the world has been widely, justly and highly praised.

His committee members are outstanding lawyers from all over the United States, including among others such distinguished lawyers as Dean Erwin N. Griswold, of Harvard Law School; Arthur H. Dean, of New York; and former American Bar Association president, Robert G. Storey, Sr., of Austin, Tex.

When law replaces weapons,

The report concludes—

in the control of the fate of humanity, the mission of lawyers will have been completed. In a world ruled by law man can walk in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

REPORT TO THE INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

The American Bar Association has completed the study which it undertook at the request of the International Cooperation Administration and has reached the conclusion that it is feasible to conduct a series of conferences, culminating in a world conference, of lawyers from the United States and other nations, to consider and recommend specific measures for the achievement of world peace through law.

OUTLINE OF PLAN

According to the plan submitted herewith, lawyers from the four continents (the Americas being considered as a single continent) would meet first in international regional conferences at cities to be decided upon, possibly Rio de Janeiro, New Delhi, Accra, and Vienna, and eventually in a world conference at a city to be decided upon, possibly Stockholm.

Each of the international regional conferences would run for 5 days, and the world conference for 3 weeks.

The general objectives of each of the conferences would be to further the basic goal of world peace through the rule of law and to make international law and international courts a more powerful force in international relations, thereby reducing international tensions.

The agenda for the conferences would be determined by committees, provided for in the plan, upon consideration of topics which would include:

(1) Means of increasing use of the International Court of Justice, including:

(a) Exercise of the Court's existing authority to sit outside The Hague and to form chambers of three or more judges for hearing and final decision of particular cases or classes of cases;

(b) Achievement of acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court by all nations without crippling reservations;

(c) Inclusion in future international agreements of a provision that disputes over their interpretation will be subject to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court;

(d) Improvement in the practice, procedure, and administration of the Court.

(2) Establishment of regional courts of international law, outside the judicial system of the United Nations, by bilateral and multilateral treaties.

(3) Extension of the jurisdiction of international courts, by amendment of the statute of the International Court of Justice and by bilateral and multilateral treaties, to disputes between governments and individuals and between private parties, either generally or with specific reference to disputes growing out of contracts between governments and individuals or out of international business transactions.

(4) Extension and improvement of institutions and procedures for arbitration of disputes between governments and disputes growing out of concession contracts and international business transactions between governments and individuals and between private parties.

(5) Extension and improvement of institutions and procedures for international cooperation in promoting the economic advancement of all nations, including the improvement of the legal framework for such advancement and the removal of the legal uncertainties and fears which now block such advancement.

(6) Consideration of means to strengthen the United Nations both by Charter changes and by increased use of existing United Nations machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes under the rule of law.

(7) Establishment or improvement of agencies and procedures for clarification of uncertainties of existing international law and for adaptation of existing rules of international law to changing conditions with a view to furthering the growth of a body of international law acceptable to all nations by drawing upon all legal systems of the world.

(8) Consideration of methods for compilation, reporting, and analysis of legal decisions and other developments in the international field.

It is believed that a series of conferences prepared for and conducted in the manner suggested in the accompanying plan would result in the marshaling of the resources of the legal profession of all the participating nations for the achievement of world peace through law and for the education of the world opinion which is essential to that end.

EVOLUTION OF THE PLAN

The accompanying plan was prepared, under the direction of the board of governors of the association, by a special committee on world peace through law. The names of the members of that committee appear at the end of this report. As stated in an interim report of February 23, 1959, to the house of delegates, a copy of which is submitted herewith, the committee decided at its first meeting, 6 days after the signing of the contract with the International Cooperation Administration, to seek the cooperation of lawyers, professors of international law, and associations of lawyers in this country and abroad and the cooperation of legal organizations such as the International Bar Association, the Inter-American Bar Association, and the International Law Association, to study the efforts of the United Nations and other official agencies in the field of world law; to arrange a number of regional conferences of leading lawyers in the United States for discussion of tentative ideas, suggestions, plans, and proposals; and to employ a staff to assist the committee in its work. It decided also that its staff should give special attention at the beginning of its work to the compilation and analysis of ideas and information as to how the proposed conference might advance the use of the rule fo law in world affairs, promote the use of the judicial concept in the settlement of disputes between nations, extend international judicial institutions to disputes of individuals growing out of international transactions, and increase the sense of responsibility and the influence of members of the legal profession in the field of international relations.

Presidents of 1,400 State and local bar associations in the United States and 182 professors of international law were requested to send the committee comments, suggestions, and ideas as to what a world conference on the rule of law should do and can do.

Similar letters, accompanied by a partial list of topics which had been suggested for discussion at the proposed conference, were sent to 1,300 members of the section of international and comparative law, 2,400 members of the American Society of International Law, and the presidents of 74 bar associations in foreign countries.

The responses to the above-mentioned letters were almost uniformly favorable to the idea of the proposed conference. Many of them contained extremely helpful suggestions as to the questions to be discussed and as to the practical arrangements required for successful conduct of the conference. These communications provided substantial evidence that lawyers assembled from many nations may be able to achieve concrete advancement of carefully stated programs for the establishment of international relations on the basis of respect for law and the observance of its orderly procedures.

Equally encouraging indications were received from specially qualified persons whose views were sought in private conversations and at conventions and conferences of lawyers in the United States and abroad.

On March 28 and 29, 1959, the first of five regional conferences in the United States was held at Boston, Mass., for the purpose of consultation on what lawyers assembled from many nations could do toward the achievement and maintenance of world peace. Similar conferences were held at Charlotte, N.C., on April 10 and 11; Chicago, Ill., on April 17 and 18; San Francisco, Calif., on April 24 and 25; and Dallas, Tex., on April 28 and 29. The participants in each of these conferences included the presidents of State bar associations in the several regions

(comprising from 7 to 11 States) and four or more leading lawyers of each State invited by these presidents or by the committee. The participants in each of the conferences were provided, in advance of the conference, with working papers, prepared by the committee's staff, with the assistance of experts in the fields of international law, which contained the background information required for intelligent discussion of the questions raised in the conferences. Copies of the working papers prepared for these conferences are submitted herewith.

The potentialities of the program under study by the committee were recognized by one of the most eminent clergymen in the United States, Cardinal Cushing, in the following statement at the beginning of the Boston conference:

"The work on which you have ventured may well be the most significant of our time. For it can set the pattern for the future of the world, and it may indeed decide whether or not this civilization of ours will survive at all."

Equally enthusiastic comments were made by lawyers participating in this and subsequent conferences.

The consensus of the participants in the five regional conferences, with specific reference to the feasibility of conferences of lawyers on a continental or global scale, may be fairly summarized as follows:

1. A world conference of lawyers should be held. To make it a true world conference, lawyers from behind the Iron Curtain should be invited.

2. The groundwork for the world conference should be laid by international regional conferences in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Europe.

3. The conferences will serve a very useful purpose whether or not Iron Curtain lawyers and their governments are willing or able to seek to extend the rule of law. It is important meanwhile for the other countries of the world to gain experience in the settlement of international disputes by judicial means and to build up a record of accomplishment in the settlement of such disputes among themselves.

4. The world conference and the international regional conferences which precede it should concentrate chiefly on the improvement of existing international institutions and the creation of the new international institutions that will be required if the rule of law is to achieve internationally the degree of order and stability that it has achieved nationally.

5. As a first step in this direction, the conferences should consider the means of getting more international disputes into the existing International Court of Justice and into new circuit or regional courts of international law. They might appropriately urge the International Court of Justice to exercise the authority which it now has to sit outside The Hague and to establish chambers of three or more members of the Court for hearing and decision of particular cases or classes of cases. Sitting in New York and elsewhere throughout the world, the Court would be more accessible to the parties, and proceedings would be much less expensive. Regional courts of international law could be established by agreements without amendment of the Charter of the United Nations or the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

6. The world conference and the international regional conferences should give special consideration to ways and means of extending the jurisdiction of international courts to disputes between governments and individuals growing out of international business transactions.

7. The world conference and the international regional conferences should also consider the means of expanding and improving procedures for arbitration of disputes growing out of international business transactions and the means of encouraging greater use of legal rules in international commercial arbitration.

8. The conferences now contemplated should not attempt agreement on substantive rules of international law. Restatements of present rules and drafts of new rules of international law should be left to existing official and unofficial groups of experts. If further world conferences are recommended, committees may be created to review progress in various fields of substantive law and make recommendations to further that progress or to initiate new work on old or new problems.

9. The mere fact of holding international regional conferences and eventually a world conference of lawyers on the rule of law among nations would have tremendous import. Lawyers have never before worked together on this subject on a multinational or global scale. The prospect of worthwhile accomplishments has stirred all prospective participants in such conferences.

10. Participants at the conferences would be jurists, practicing lawyers and teachers of law.

11. The conferences should consider establishment of a permanent clearinghouse of ideas, programs, and experience pertinent to the extension of world peace through the rule of law. In this connection they should consider the possibility of proclamations of a World Law Day and a World Law Year to stimulate and coordinate the efforts of lawyers.

12. The U.S. reservation, which presently limits our acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, was discussed extensively. The consensus was that the unilateral determination clause of this reservation should be eliminated. Under this clause the United States and other nations having similar clauses sit as judges of the World Court's jurisdiction in each case filed against them. They decide whether the case involves an international or a domestic issue even though the United Nations Charter prohibits the Court from exercising jurisdiction over domestic issues. As one of the greatest users of the rule of law nationally, the United States must prove that we trust the rule of law internationally. Such leadership on our part is essential.

13. A tremendous grassroots educational program is essential in the United States as well as in other countries. This program should spotlight that it is essential to exercise sovereignty for survival, to build law into the legal vacuum which now exists internationally.

14. World government is impractical and impossible in today's world. This program is directed toward increasing the use of the rule of law in courts and building new law in the world community. This is a practical and meaningful forward step toward a peaceful world.

15. This effort to create a lawful world should be largely financed by private money. It should be a lawyer-to-lawyer-to-people program. As lawyers explain the potential use of law in the world community, the idea should attract tremendous support among laymen.

16. We should do all we can to strengthen the United Nations by urging increased application of, and adherence to, the rule of law in the deliberations and actions of all of its organs and agencies, as well as by urging amendments to the Charter to further the ideal of world peace through law.

17. The objectives of this program cannot be accomplished within a short time. A long-range continuous effort must be planned for by the legal profession of the nations of the world.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The views summarized above are the views of practicing lawyers, not experts in international law, throughout the United States. They are in many instances different from the views that were held by participants in the regional conferences in advance of those conferences. There are doubtless many lawyers in this country, as well as in other countries, who are not fully aware of the imperative necessity for the establishment of the rule of law among nations. Conferences similar to the five regional conferences that have been held in the United States will probably be indispensable in other countries in preparation for effective participation of lawyers of those countries in international regional conferences. A further conference of lawyers of the United States, including those who participated in our regional conferences, would also be desirable before the beginning of the international conferences.

It is realized that not every tension-producing dispute is susceptible of judicial determination. There are political and diplomatic questions and problems which are not justiciable; the program envisioned herein is not to be understood as suggesting that they are. The function of the rule of law is to keep the peace while necessary and desirable changes can be worked out through other means. In a fully developed world civilization all disputes should be settled by means other than force.

The special committee on world peace through law began its study from the premise that, as law has achieved order and stability within nations, it could, if given the opportunity, do the same among nations. With full realization that the unprecedented dangers of today create overwhelming public support for any idea which will prevent war, it has sought to develop plans and programs by which the rule of law can bring about the same order, stability and peace internationally which it has already created nationally.

On the basis of the study made by the special committee, it is believed that the rule of law can justifiably be raised as a new standard of decency in international relations. Years and decades of hard labor are ahead of us before this goal can be realized. The absence of law in the world community is indeed the greatest gap in the growing structure of civilization. To fill that gap, or legal vacuum, is no easy task. The path to success is strewn with many pitfalls and immense difficulties.

Lawyers throughout the world are confronted by a task that they must do. No other group or profession has assumed, or will or should assume, a responsibility equal to ours in translating the idea of world rule of law into reality. Lawyers in centuries of effort have created the legal rules and institutions and procedures which now exist; lawyers of this and other nations are the logical group to do this new work of creating a lawful world.

People everywhere are hoping and searching for some way to avoid the holocaust of missile-atomic war. They know that history teaches that every arms race since the world began has exploded into war by design or accident. They watch the current ever-accelerating arms buildup and fear that war is as certain as tomorrow's sunrise unless a great leap forward is made in the sphere of law. World peace through law offers the greatest potential of all the ideas yet advanced to avoid self-destruction by mankind. The law's proved capacity in achieving and maintaining order and stability within nations augurs well for its success if used between nations.

Lawyers at our regional meetings have signified their willingness to lead the way in a great effort to inform and unite the people of the world in support of this great idea. Through conferences such as those provided for in the accompanying plan, lawyers throughout the world can develop a program to push forward the idea of the rule of law among nations from general concept to proposals for concrete action which will bring the idea closer to reality.

When law replaces weapons in the control of the fate of humanity, this mission of

lawyers will have been completed. In a world ruled by law man can walk in freedom, in dignity, and in peace.

Respectfully submitted.

Charles S. Rhyne, Chairman; Homer G. Angelo, Arthur H. Dean, Erwin N. Griswold, Arthur Larson, Philip H. Lewis, Howard C. Petersen, Herman Phleger, Robert H. Reno, Robert G. Storey, Sr., Lyman M. Tondel, Jr., Loyd Wright.

MAY 18, 1959.

PROPOSED PLAN FOR CONFERENCES OF LAWYERS OF MANY NATIONS

OBJECTIVES OF THE CONFERENCES

(1) To marshal the resources of the legal profession of all countries for the achievement of world peace through law and for the education of world opinion to gain essential public support.

(2) To consider and recommend action on matters within the special competence of the legal profession.

AGENDA

See pages 2 and 3 supra.

PREPARATIONS FOR REGIONAL CONFERENCES

(1) The president of the American Bar Association communicates with the president of the national bar association, or its nearest equivalent, in each of the countries which were represented at the Geneva conference on the law of the sea. He summarizes the results of the American Bar Association study of the feasibility of conducting a conference of lawyers from many nations and suggests the desirability of the establishment of a special committee of lawyers on world peace through law in each of the said countries to cooperate with the American Bar Association special committee in organizing a conference of lawyers in each of the regions specified below and in organizing an eventual conference of lawyers from all the aforesaid countries. He offers further information, technical assistance in promoting the interest of lawyers and financial assistance in connection with arrangements for the regional conferences and the eventual world conference. Subject to the possibility of reallocations for convenience of travel, the regions referred to would be (1) the Americas; (2) Asia; (3) Africa; and (4) Europe.

(2) The formal communications to presidents of national bar associations are supplemented by informal approaches. Some of the aforesaid countries are visited by members of the American Bar Association special committee and its staff. Information and technical assistance are supplied as requested. Within an estimated period of 3 months, correspondence and personal meetings result in the establishment, in each of the regions, of a planning committee, one member of which is designated by the president of each of the participating national bar associations.

(3) The conference planning committee for each region meets at an agreed place and time to work out detailed arrangements for a regional conference. These details include time, place and duration of conference, number of delegates from each country, rules of procedure including limitation of discussion to the agreed-upon agenda, conference rooms, local staff, working languages, simultaneous translations, reporting and social functions.

(4) Provision is made at the same meeting for preparation and advance circulation of working papers (in the working languages) on the topics placed on the agenda. Qualified experts in each of the countries in the pertinent region will be employed. The text of the working papers will be approved by a subcommittee of the planning committee representative of the principal legal systems which exist in the region. The staff of the American Bar Association special committee is augmented to such extent and for such period as may be necessary.

(5) It is anticipated that travel expenses of two lawyer delegates to and from each of the conferences and the subsistence of two lawyer delegates at each of those conferences, for a period of 5 days, will be paid from funds at the disposal of the American Bar Association.

CONDUCT OF REGIONAL CONFERENCES

Subject to determination by the respective planning committees, it is anticipated that:

(1) Each of the regional conferences will last 5 days.

(2) All sessions of each conference will be plenary, with simultaneous translations into the working languages, and fully reported. The working languages will be English and Spanish for the Americas; English and French for Asia and Africa; English, French and Russian for Europe.

(3) At the first plenary session rules of procedure, previously drafted, will be considered and adopted, and necessary committees (steering, drafting, etc.) will be appointed. Special committees may be appointed subsequently to study and report on matters referred to them.

(4) Committees will be small. Their sessions will be informal, provided with interpreters but not with simultaneous translation, reported summarily by assigned members of the conference staff.

(5) Each of the regional conferences will publish a report of its proceedings and recommendations.

(6) Each of the regional conferences will elect three members of a world conference planning committee. The chairman of the American Bar Association special committee on world peace through law will be a member ex officio of the world conference planning committee.

PREPARATIONS FOR WORLD CONFERENCE

(1) The world conference planning committee is convened at Washington. Travel expenses and subsistence of foreign members are paid from funds at the disposal of American Bar Association. The chairman summarizes the results of the regional conferences and submits for consideration proposals of arrangements for the world conference.

(2) After agreement on the arrangements, the president of the American Bar Association invites the president of the bar association, or nearest equivalent, of each of the foreign countries that participated in the regional conferences to designate the authorized number of delegates to the world conference and states that the travel and subsistence expenses of two of these delegates will be paid from funds at the disposal of American Bar Association. If so instructed by the world conference planning committee, he issues similar invitations to presidents of national bar associations of countries which were represented at the Geneva conference but not in any of the regional conferences and to presidents of national bar associations of countries which have subsequently become members of the United Nations.

(3) Working papers are prepared by an augmented staff of the American Bar Association special committee, under substantially the same conditions as indicated above, and circulated in advance in the working languages of the world conference.

(4) The greater part of the staff of the American Bar Association special committee is transferred to the seat of the conference 1 month before the opening date. The staff is responsible for carrying out before that date the instructions of the world conference planning committee with respect to physical arrangements for the conference.

CONDUCT OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE

Subject to determination by the planning committee, substantially as outlined under conduct of regional conferences except as follows:

(1) Duration 3 weeks.

(2) Simultaneous translations into English, French, Spanish, and Russian.

(3) Published report to be transmitted by each delegation to its own government and disseminated to all members of participating bar associations.

(4) A continuing committee of the conference to be established to keep participants informed of pertinent developments.

(5) Arrangments to be made for a proper followup on all of the plans and programs developed at the conference.

BUDGET ESTIMATE

Meetings of planning committees:	
(a) In South America	$13,000
(b) In Asia	12,000
(c) In Africa	6,000
(d) In Europe	7,000
(e) In Washington, D.C., for world conference	13,000
Total	51,000
Nationwide U.S. conference:	
(a) Preparatory expenses	2,500
(b) Expenses of conference	2,500
Total	5,000
Regional conferences:	
(a) In South America	42,300
(b) In Asia	49,500
(c) In Africa	27,000
(d) In Europe	30,000
Total	148,800
World conference	300,000
American Bar Association staff (2 years):	
(a) Salaries of lawyers, translators and secretaries	100,000
(b) Staff travel in field	15,000
(c) Fees to consultants	5,000
Total	120,000
Office expenses of American Bar Association staff (2 years):	
(a) Office rental	6,000
(b) Stationery, postage, etc	10,000
(c) Outside printing and mimeographing, including final report	25,000
Total	41,000
Total	665,800
Miscellaneous (5 percent of total)	33,290
Total	699,090

NOTES

(1) Expenses of meetings of planning committees, the international regional conferences and the eventual world conference are based on figures available with respect to travel to and from the cities mentioned in the report and with respect to maintenance and facilities in those cities.

(2) The estimates include travel and maintenance for two delegates from each of 22 nations for the Western Hemisphere conference; 25 for the Asian conference; 11 for the African conference; 34 for the European conference; and 89 for the world conference.

(3) It is assumed, for budgetary purposes, that all conference halls, meeting rooms, offices, office furniture and equipment will be rented at normal rental prices.

(4) Actual costs may be considerably below the estimates if different sites are selected, or if the number of participating nations is less than that assumed, or if conference halls, etc.; are provided free of charge for some or all of the conferences.

(5) A detailed memorandum on the bases of the estimates is attached.

BASES FOR ESTIMATED BUDGET

Regional Planning Committee Meeting

Travel expenses are estimated on the basis of air transportation, tourist class, round trip; per diem maintenance in accordance with U.S. Government schedules.

If the site selected in South America is Rio de Janeiro, travel expenses will be approximately $12,000; maintenance expenses approximately $1,000.

If the site selected in Asia is New Delhi, travel expenses will be approximately $11,000; maintenance expenses approximately $1,000.

If the site selected in Africa is Accra, Ghana, travel expenses will be approximately $5,000; maintenance expenses approximately $1,000.

If the site selected in Europe is Vienna, travel expenses will be approximately $6,000; maintenance expenses approximately $1,000.

World Conference Planning Committee

On the basis indicated above, if this committee meets in Washington, D.C., travel expenses will be approximately $12,000; maintenance expenses (for a 4-day session) approximately $1,000.

Nationwide U.S. Conference

Delegates would travel to and from this conference at their own expense and there would be no maintenance allowance. Preparatory documents and other similar expenses would amount to approximately $2,500, and expenses of reporting and facilities at the conference site would amount to approximately $2,500.

Regional Conferences

Air travel and maintenance expenses are estimated on the basis indicated above. Rental prices for conference halls, meeting rooms, offices, office furniture, equipment and facilities are estimated, for the most part, on the basis of data obtained from the Office of International Conferences of the Department of State. Service costs are estimated on the basis of data from the same source, supplemented by data from service companies.

Regional Conference in South America

If this conference is held in Rio de Janeiro, the approximate expenses will be as follows:

(a) Room for plenary session	$1,300
(b) Committee meeting rooms	700
(c) Offices	600
(d) Office furniture, equipment and supplies	3,200
(e) Communication services	1,000
(f) Interpreting services (wireless receiver sets and equipment	1,500
(g) Transportation (hire of vehicles)	700
(h) Four interpreters	1,000
(i) One typist recruited locally	100
(j) Two messengers recruited locally	200
(k) Two registration clerks recruited locally	200
(l) Two tape recorder operators recruited locally	200
(m) Transportation of staff personnel from Washington, D.C. to Rio and return	3,700
(n) Per diem expenses for personnel in (m) above	1,000
(o) Travel of delegates	23,600
(p) Per diem for delegates	3,300
Total	42,300

If the conference is held in Mexico City, the savings in travel expenses will reduce the total cost of the conference to approximately $13,400.

If the conference is held in Lima, the savings in travel expenses would reduce the total cost of the conference to approximately $36,400.

Regional Conference in Asia

If the conference is held in New Delhi, the expenses of the conference will be approximately as follows:

(a) Items corresponding to (a) through (l) in Rio de Janeiro schedule	$13,200
(b) Items corresponding to (m) and (n) in above schedule	11,600
(c) Items corresponding to (o) and (p) in above schedule	24,700
Total	49,500

If the conference is held in Bangkok, the savings in travel expenses will reduce the total cost of the conference to approximately $45,800.

Regional Conference in Africa

If the conference is held in Accra the expenses of the conference will be approximately as follows:

(a) Items corresponding to (a) through (l) in Rio de Janeiro schedule	$11,800
(b) Items corresponding to (m) and (n) in above schedule	4,300
(c) Items corresponding to (o) and (p) in above schedule	10,900
Total	27,000

Regional Conference in Europe

If the Conference is held in Vienna the expenses of the Conference will be approximately as follows:

(a) Items corresponding to (a) through (l) in Rio de Janeiro schedule	$11,000
(b) Items corresponding to (m) and (n) in above schedule	3,900
(c) Items corresponding to (o) and (p) in above schedule	15,100
Total	30,000

World Conference

If the World Conference is held at the Hague, the expenses of the Conference will be as follows:

(a) Rental of meeting rooms, offices, office equipment supplies and other facilities	$68,000
(b) Interpreting services	8,000
(c) Communication services	3,400
(d) Transportation (hire of vehicles)	5,000
(e) Cost of contract personnel	39,000
(f) Travel of staff personnel	7,100
(g) Maintenance of staff personnel	3,400
(h) Travel of delegates	105,200
(i) Maintenance of delegates	44,900
(j) Reproduction of documents	16,000
Total	300,000

ABA Staff salaries

Three attorneys paid at the annual rate of $20,000, $7,500, and $6,500, respectively.

Two secretaries paid at the rate of $5,000 per year each.

Translators employed as needed, $6,000 per year.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE STUDIES OF AUTOMATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am often gratified at the widespread recognition and high level use which is made of some of the materials which come into existence, often essentially as byproducts of the legislative process and legislative watchfulness of matters involving the national interest. In 1955 a Joint Economic Committee Subcommittee of which I was chairman made a careful and objective study of the impact of "Automation and Technological Change" on employment levels and our standard of living. Other members of the subcommittee at that time were Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Senator Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; Representative Augustine B. Kelley, of Pennsylvania; and Representative Jesse P. Wolcott, of Michigan. Through similar subcommittees in later Congresses, we have kept in close touch with the problem by regular supplemental hearings and continuing study.

At our pioneering congressional hearing on this intensely important subject we heard the testimony of a carefully selected and varied group of experts from industry and research. The widespread interest and regard for the statements and answers of these witnesses is attested by the fact that printed transcripts of hearings of the committee have long been out of print. It has been necessary to reprint the committee's report—Senate Report No. 1308, 84th Congress—several times to satisfy the public interest in the subject.

Both the hearings and the report have, moreover, been widely quoted and cited both here and abroad. For example, the findings of the Committee have been translated into German and published in the Zeitschrift für angewandte Konjunkturforschung—Journal for Applied Business-Cycle Research. It was widely referred to in the 1957 report of the Director-General of the International Labor Office—Geneva—entitled "Automation and Other Technological Developments." Similar reference has been made in the report of the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research—United Kingdom—published by Her Majesty's Stationery Office in 1956. Innumerable domestic publications, such as a pamphlet by Almarin Phillips entitled "Automation—Its Impact on Economic Growth and Stability," make frequent quotes from the testimony of experts in the Joint Committee's hearings.

Just recently there has been published a book, "Automation and Society," edited by Howard Boone Jacobson and Joseph S. Roucek of the University of Bridgeport in which 11 out of 32 chapters do honor to the Joint Economic Committee's hearings by quoting, with slight editing, the statements of the expert witnesses whose testimony is reported in the committee's hearings.

I am prompted on this occasion to remind Members of Congress that credit for such obviously respected work is of course not always given. While materials developed in congressional hearings are quite properly in the public domain, I am sorry that the authors in the present instance neglected to acknowledge and remind their readers of the debt owed to the Joint Economic Committee and particularly to the debt which the committee owes to those public-spirited citizens, industrialists and union officials who have prepared statements at the committee's request. The respect paid to the Joint Economic Committee's pioneering study in this field by

generous quotation, even though unacknowledged, is testimony of its objectivity, its selection of expert witnesses, and the lasting contribution which such hearings have made to our knowledge of this rapidly developing subject.

ELECTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

(At the request of Mr. HALLECK, as follows:)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, for June 3, through June 5 on account of official business away from Washington, D.C.

Mr. SAYLOR, on June 4 and 5, 1959, on account of official business.

Mr. CANFIELD, for an indefinite period, on account of physicians order for recuperative rest.

(At the request of Mr. MCCORMACK:)

Mr. HAYS on account of official business.

Mr. DENTON, on account of official business.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, on account of official business.

Mr. HEMPHILL, on account of official business.

Mr. COAD, on account of official business.

Mr. MOELLER, on account of official business.

Mr. DEVINE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of death in family.

Mr. KEARNS, for 1 week, beginning June 8, on account of attending the I.L.O. meeting at Geneva, Switzerland.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SLACK, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. ROBISON), for 30 minutes, on June 16.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOGAN.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

The following Member (at the request of Mr. ROBISON) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. DOOLEY.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. WOLF) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. MULTER

Mr. HERLONG

Mr. WOLF

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 758. An act for the relief of Viktors Neimanis;

S. 1197. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended;

S. 1217. An act to add certain public domain lands in Nevada to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation;

S. 1228. An act to amend Public Law 85-590 to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. 1242. An act to authorize the use of the revolving loan fund for Indians to assist Klamath Indians during the period for terminating Federal supervision.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 4, 1959, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1061. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on March 31, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 581, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1062. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the calendar year 1958, pursuant to the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1063. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1064. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the payment of expenses of administration of the workmen's compensation provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act by insurance carriers and self-insurers authorized to insure under section 32 of the act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 3030. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a band in the Metropolitan Police force" so as to provide retirement compensation for the present director of said band after 10 or more years of service, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 643. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the levying and collecting of taxes and assessments, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1938; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6378. A bill to authorize the American Society of International Law to use certain real estate in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of such society; without amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6662. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Hospital Center Act in order to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of such Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 949. An act for the incorporation of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; without amendment (Rept. No. 430). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 4283. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947, as amended, to provide that under certain conditions officers of the executive branch of the Federal Government appointed by the President shall be exempt from such act; with amendment (Rept. No. 431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2368. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 432). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7523. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7524. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of Missouri:

H.R. 7525. A bill to amend section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 7526. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the payment of pension or compensation to veterans concurrently with reserve retired pay under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 7527. A bill to validate the payment of family separation allowances to members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 7528. A bill to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7529. A bill to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 7530. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 7531. A bill to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros on land belonging to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 7532. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts to assist in the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7533. A bill to amend the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956 to authorize the President to provide for participation by foreign governments and citizens of other countries in artistic and cultural activities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7534. A bill to promote the foreign policy of the United States by providing for the appointment of an assistant to the Secretary of State to assure the coherent development of all official international cultural activities of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 7535. A bill to provide that surplus personal property of the United States may be donated to the States for the promotion of fish and wildlife management activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 7536. A bill to provide for assistance to the Klamath County School District, Oregon, in the construction of a high school building on the Klamath Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H.R. 7537. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 7538. A bill to amend the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 with respect to the position descriptions and salary levels of mail handlers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 7539. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7540. A bill to provide financial assistance for the support of public schools by appropriating funds to the States to be used for teachers' salaries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7541. A bill to allow small business corporations which had less than 90 days after the enactment of the Technical Amendments Act of 1958 in which to make an election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 an additional 30 days in which to make such election; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PILLION:

H.R. 7542. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide that foremen shall in certain cases be considered as employees for purposes of that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 7543. A bill to authorize the acquisition of land for expansion of the Grafton National Cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 7544. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.R. 7545. A bill to provide for the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H.R. 7546. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act in order to provide assistance to the States for certain workshops, rehabilitation facilities, and rehabilitation evaluation services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 7547. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARMON:

H.R. 7548. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on cabarets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 410. Joint resolution providing for a White House Conference on Human Public Relations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to provide for a special research inquiry into the causes of chronic unemployment in economically depressed areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 412. Joint resolution authorizing the National Geographic Society to erect a memorial on public grounds in the State of Virginia to honor Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 280. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to a presently contemplated conference of heads of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 14 of the State of Nevada, memorializing the Congress of the United States to grant Federal loans to needy students for graduate studies and provides for repayment over 20 years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 18 of the State of Nevada, memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt the Youth Conservation Act of 1959 and expressing the appreciation of the Legislature of the State of Nevada to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK for sponsoring such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 of the State of Nevada, memorializing the Congress of the United States to prepare adequate State water rights legislation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the State of Nevada, memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the Pittman Act, and to amend the Desert Land Act by eliminating the exception of the State of Nevada from the provision that no person shall be entitled to make entry on desert lands unless he be a resident of the State in which the land is located; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 13 of the State of Nevada, memorializing the Congress of the United States to aid the mining industry in Nevada and other sections of the United States either by imposing tariffs or by other reasonable and effective methods so that the United States may become more prosperous and be assured of a constant supply of minerals necessary for an effective defense program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to pass legislation proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclusive control over public education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to request the Government department administering social security benefits to liberalize the requirements for such benefits, or to enact suitable legislation effecting this end; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 7550. A bill for the relief of Vartanouche Kalfayan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7551. A bill for the relief of Hubert O. Beckles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 7552. A bill for the relief of Willie Lemuel Brooks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7553. A bill for the relief of Hrant H. Shoushanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 7554. A bill for the relief of Kit Fong Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 282. Resolution providing for sending the bill (H.R. 3958) with accompanying papers to the U.S. Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

204. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, American Society of Newspaper Editors, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a redress of grievance and requesting that the officers of the House of Representatives be directed by the House to disclose to the public those transactions concerning the disbursement of public funds for payrolls, salaries, expenses, and such other purposes as are a matter of record; to the Committee on House Administration.

205. Also, petition of Jesse Glenn, Chicago, Ill., requesting support for a civil rights bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORT

The following reports for the fourth calendar quarter of 1958 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $128. E. (9) $352.02.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,770.90. E. (9) $1,770.90.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,033.10.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,531.42. E. (9) $1,531.42.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,968.50. E. (9) $9,968.50.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $11,847.60. E. (9) $10,547.60.

A. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $9,916.90. E. (9) $23,831.76.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $144.25. E. (9) $4,895.66.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $4,178.85.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $15,205.74. E. (9) $3,391.58.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ash, Bauersfeld & Burton, 1921 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Edwin W. Pauley, 717 North Highland Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $9.13.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Balfour, Guthrie & Co., Ltd., 72 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $150.35.

A. George W. Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clearly, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,225.

A. Frederick J. Bell, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Auto Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,792.29. E. (9) $8.70.

A. Bennett Associates, Inc., 6 East 45th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Wool Textile Export Corp., Commerce House, Bradford 1, Yorkshire, England.
D. (6) $11,250. E. (9) $1,998.93.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1219 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,667.57.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,111.01.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. John J. Boland, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $67.88.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Claire Hugo Stinnes, Grossenbaumerstrasse, 253, Mulheim-Ruhr, Germany.
E. (9) $137.

A. Boykin & De Francis, 1000 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen, e.v. Contrescarpe 46, Germany.
E. (9) $247.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $537.50.

A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brown & Lund, Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $82.96.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $21.77.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $40.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street, SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $219. E. (9) $219.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

A. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Leo E. Connor, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lexington School for the Deaf, 904 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Eugene P. Conser, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,250.

A. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Council for Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $72. E. (9) $127.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $109,330.51. E. (9) $575.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee.

A. John F. Deeds, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert J. Demichelis, 640 Central Avenue, Deerfield, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,762.50. E. (9) $223.33.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,031.25. E. (9) $49.73.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $91.93. E. (9) $8.66.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $548. E. (9) $10.

A. The Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10.

A. Mrs. Albert E. Farwell, Box 188, Route 2, Vienna, Va.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Maurice H. Fouracre, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Teachers College, Columbia University, 120th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Nolen J. Fuqua, Duncan, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $535.90.

A. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert N. Hawes, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hardwood Plywood Manufacturers Committee, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $1,096.26.

A. Joseph D. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. William B. Henderson, 1013 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Parcel Post Association, 1013 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,903. E. (9) $1,853.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99. E. (9) $1,120.65.

A. Harold K. Howe, 207 Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 207 Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. John M. Hurley, 302 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
E. (9) $160.75.

A. W. J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
E. (9) $1,585.64.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $56.

A. The Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N.J.
D. (6) $25. E. (9) $1,158.75.

A. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,749.98. E. (9) $271.92.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 1400 Hanna Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 1400 Hanna Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 705 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,873.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $675.33.

A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Franklin E. Kenner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, room 1022, Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,807.66. E. (9) $111.91.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,052.

A. A. W. Koehler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. H. Bull Steamship Co., 115 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Luckenbach Steamship Co., Inc., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marine Transport Lines, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Lamberton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Lamberton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles R. Larson, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $548. E. (9) $10.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. John Lawler, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $55.

A. Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of N.Y., Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $92.61.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago Mercantile Exchange, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $42.23.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Porter Brothers Corp., Post Office Box 667, Boise, Idaho.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $53.02.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,134,33. E. (9) $215.85.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $497.09.

A. Charles E. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $161.71.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $258.70.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $425.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,775. E. (9) $114.60.

A. James D. Mann, 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of America, Inc., 714 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,802.

A. Marks & Trowbridge, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Basic Industries Power Committee, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. The Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $2,725.

A. Ross A. Messer, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $66.48.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,324.99. E. (9) $200.75.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Moot, Sprague, Marcy & Gulick, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N.Y.
B. Basic Industries Power Committee, 400 Erie County Savings Bank Building, Buffalo, N.Y.
D. (6) $38.31. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Alexandria, Va.
B. F. W. Clarke, 112 North St. Asaph Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. Andrew P. Murphy, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $173.03.

A. John H. Myers, 1224 Cleveland Street, Wilmette, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $287.70. E. (9) $501.70.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12,063.94. E. (9) $13,950.59.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $52,041.50. E. (9) $9,717.15.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,177.98. E. (9) $1,856.35.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15,210.48.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $850.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $388.55. E. (9) $230.25.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,383.85.

A. National Bureau for Lathing and Plastering, 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $402,096.95. E. (9) $3,222.11.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $24,190. E. (9) $22,325.71.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $170.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $42,499.36. E. (9) $2,267.94.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,266.92. E. (9) $1,104.66.

A. National Rural Electric Co-op. Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $415.34.

A. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,655.87. E. (9) $9,034.46.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,719.54. E. (9) $1,616.89.

A. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $551.95 E. (9) $1,625.10.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $2,684.48.

A. George S. Newcomer, 900 First National Bank Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $834.93. E. (9) $569.97.

A. Robert J. O'Donnell, Majestic Theater Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Charles A. Parker, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Karla V. Parker, 1729 Union Boulevard SE., Grand Rapids, Mich.

A. The Patent Office Society, Box 685, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $225.

A. Peoples Lobby, Inc., 2011 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $213.

A. Mrs. Esther Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,278.83. E. (9) $200.98.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine & Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.
D. (6) $3,346.14. E. (9) $1,226.25.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

A. Piper & Marbury, 900 First National Bank Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $9.52.

A. Ralph D. Pittman, 500 Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. George B. Soto, 1801 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,268.

A. Gordon M. Quarnstrom, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
E. (9) $13.47.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $104.26.

A. William T. Reed, 5800 Connecticut Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $195.40.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $6,909.68.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $575.

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Royall, Koegel, Harris & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,982.67. E. (9) $3,519.70.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title & Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. General Petroleum Corp., Los Angeles; Richfield Oil Corp., Los Angeles; Shell Oil Co., San Francisco; Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco; Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles; Union Oil Co., Los Angeles.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Ira Saks, 1008 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. James D. Secrest, 1721 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Electronic Industries Association, 1721 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $33.10.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ivanhoe Trading Co., Inc., 274 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3.60.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Coffee & Sugar Exchange, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $54.41.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $836.76.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, 16 Westmoreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $6,059.11.

A. M. Frederik Smith, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,455.04.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $669.49. E. (9) $295.91.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $486.40.

A. Raymond E. Steele, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $183.45.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,331. E. (9) $15,766.85.

A. Ada B. Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 829 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Compagnie Immobiliere Marc Rainaut et Compagnie.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Walter H. Duisberg, 231 South Dwight Place, Englewood, N.J.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ronson Corp., 1 Ronson Road, Woodbridge, N.J.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. S. A. Orci, Geneva, Switzerland.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,638.60.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,135.50. E. (9) $4,517.88.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,350.07.

A. The United States Trotting Association, 1349 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $176.07.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,241.53. E. (9) $2,241.53.

A. Myron Wiener, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Far East Group, Inc., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $50.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,568.87. E. (9) $571.34.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $20.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $53.17.

A. Harley Z. Wooden.
B. Exceptional Children, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $55.

A. Albert Y. Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Flying Tiger Line, Inc., Lockheed Air Terminal, Burbank, Calif.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1959:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed, (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter
12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": _____
14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures
9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditures' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing.
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates*	*Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11:	Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15:	Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL	

PAGE 2

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $51.80.

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,417.45. E. (9) $20.25.

A. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,897. E. (9) $8,131.54.

A. Air Transport Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,482.68. E. (9) $5,482.68.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,170.35. E. (9) $11,170.35.

A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I Railroads in Tennessee.

A. Nicholas E. Allen & Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $21.28.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum & Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,210. E. (9) $6.50.

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway & Motor Coach Employees of America, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,818.28.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $7,249.69.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $6,869.86. E. (9) $6,869.86.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,898. E. (9) $23,898.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL-CIO Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $34,514.59.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $189,931. E. (9) $7,636.76.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lakeshore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $12,670.48. E. (9) $10,720.48.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $20,000. E. (9) $11,362.81.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,340.65.

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $76,419.88. E. (9) $1,523.51.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $770,500.91. E. (9) $5,659.90.

A. American Optometric Association (development fund-legislative), care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,072.62. E. (9) $2,470.45.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $572.55. E. (9) $572.55.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,087.04. E. (9) $1,640. 32.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $22,669. E. (9) $8,937.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $87,661.19. E. (9) $4,476.97.

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,649.76. E. (9) $5,649.76.

A. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 206 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,602.35. E. (9) $23,656.09.

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,625. E. (9) $38.14.

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $32.98.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $15, 803.53.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $15,881.52.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $650.37.

A. American Warehousemen's Association Merchandise Division, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,059.04.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,545. E. (9) $1,705.22.

A. Buist M. Anderson, care of Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.
B. Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.
E. (9) $135.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., care of Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $336. E. (9) $770.95.

A. Robert Anthoine, 1065 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Pension Fund of Local 1, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, 113 University Place, New York, N.Y. and Inter Local Pension Fund, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, 204 South Ashland Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $102.69.

A. Richard H. Anthony, 19 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The American Tariff League, Inc.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $35. E. (9) $1,223.11.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class 1 railroads operating in the State of Arkansas.
D. (6) $221.13. E. (9) $901.80.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. George E. Arnstein, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,169.95.

A. Lester Asher, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois State Conference of Building & Construction Trades, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $2,687.54.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $19,643.73. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Association of American Medical Colleges, 2530 Ridge Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
E. (9) $3,333.36.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25,867.06. E. (9) $25,867.06.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y..

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,218.65. E. (9) $2,218.65.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,040. E. (9) $1,040.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 2, Box 406, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3025 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $1.25.

A. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $389.54.

A. George P. Baker, Soldiers Field Post Office, Boston, Mass.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Baker.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,806.84. E (9) $352.78.

A. Thomas F. Baker, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $102.75.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 90 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $365.75.

A. J. H. Ballew, 1105 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. Roy A. Ballinger, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hartman Barber, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,301.96. E. (9) $703.02.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $670. E. (9) $70.36.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,225.

A. William G. Barr, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Roy Battles, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. E. F. Behrens, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Bert Bell, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala-Cynwyd, Pa.
E. (9) $980.45.

A. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $30. E. (9) $0.75.

A. Helen Berthelot, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,146.06.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,630. E. (9) $593.08.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hudson Biery, 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 4517 Carew Tower, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N.Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, The Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Hull Insurance Syndicate.
E. (9) $238.10.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Massachusetts Indemnity and Life Insurance Co., 654 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert J. Bird, 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. A. H. Bishop, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $30.75.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $550.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Unions of America, Reymond Building, Baton Rouge, La.
D. (6) $300.

A. Joel D. Blackmon, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Federation of Independent Oil Unions, Post Office Box 1449, Ponca City, Okla.
D. (6) $450.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. C. B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Communications Workers of America, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,471.10.

A. W. G. Blewett, 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Peabody Coal Co., 301 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. William Blum, Jr., 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for the Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,715. E. (9) $103.85.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $14.69.

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,926. E. (9) $369.80.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,040.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $293.75.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 502 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $450.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
D. (6) $175.56. E. (9) $510.50.

A. Charles B. Bowling, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $180.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $200.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $620.55.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1122 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $7,541.21. E. (9) $7,541.21.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $46.60.

A. Bryant C. Brown, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. D. Brown, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $386.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,425. E. (9) $1,405.15.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20.20.

A. F. Raymond Brush, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21.25. E. (9) $21.25.

A. Mr. Lyman L. Bryan, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $60.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $31.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $191.06.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $233.35.

A. George J. Burger, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John J. Burke, 1062 West Platinum Street, Butte, Mont.
B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Box 1445, Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $475.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $482.44.

A. David Burpee, Doylestown, Pa.
E. (9) $214.36.

A. J. Edward Burroughs, Jr., Suite 701, Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Unilac, Inc., and its subsidiary, Nestle's Products (Export), Inc., Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,624.99.

A. Hollis W. Burt, Room 1212, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $41.25.

A. Sherman E. Burt, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Coal Sales Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $704.16. E. (9) $21.83.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
B. U.S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $46.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $393.73.

A. Campaign for the 48 States, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $28.13.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,884.62. E. (9) $288.46.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. John T. Carlton, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $269.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson B. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $815.

A. William L. Carter, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.
E. (9) $31.74.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,280. E. (9) $307.78.

A. Jay H. Cerf, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $698.41.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. M. Golodetz and Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 923 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 923 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional De Productores De Azucar, S. A. De C. V. Balderas 36—Primer Piso, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.
D. (6) $6,875.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Enoch D. Chase, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $21.85.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,710.53. E. (9) $5,514.94.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $125.71.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.

A. Herman Clott, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, 941 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,540.50. E. (9) $1,136.39.

A. Joseph Coakley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building Service Employees International Union, 155 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,800.

A. W. H. Coburn, 315 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Western Forest Industries Association, 526 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $649.65.

A. A. C. Cocke, 821 Gravier Street, New Orleans, La.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, room 207, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $659.90.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $328.81.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Sand Products Corp., 2489 National Bank Building, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $15.15.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.
E. (9) $1,000.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 90 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,025. E. (9) $492.91.

A. Committee on Laws, National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,606. E. (9) $1,250.

A. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $6,359.23.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julien D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $35.95.

A. Contracting Plasterers' & Lathers' International Association, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Orval R. Cook, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Advanced Life Underwriters, 708 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cooper & Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $188.46.

A. Ben C. Corlett, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $366.39.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,147.50. E. (9) $1,856.46.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Paul L. Courtney, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, T.H.
E. (9) $0.50.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Savings Banks' Committee on Taxation, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Deposit Guarantee Fund, 1303 Fifth Third Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,275. E. (9) $29.90.

A. A. M. Crawford, 704 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $370.25.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $996. E. (9) $996.

A. Joseph M. Creed, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bakers Association, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $5.80.

A. William A. Cromartie, North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Swift & Co. Employees Benefit Association, 4115 Packers Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,474.20.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 840 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 845 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Paul Cunningham, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John T. Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,926. E. (9) $523.28.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $750.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles L. Cusumano, 42 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Vincenzo Buttaro, 64 Nelson Street, Brooklyn, N.Y., and Miss Domenica Buttaro, via Zuccarine 76, Mola di Bari, Province of Bari, Italy.
E. (9) $40.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. D. C. Daniel, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $629.17. E. (9) $18.17.

A. Joan E. David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $103,004.42. E. (9) $1,712.17.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Swift & Co., Employees Benefit Association, 4115 Packers Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,474.20.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C. I. T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers Life Council, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Businessmen's Committee for Hawaiian Statehood, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C. I. T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers Life Council, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Deeds, 311 Western Union Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Richard A. Dell, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $36.27.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. R. T. Devany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $107.61.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,718.15. E. (9) $93.15.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $3,013.30. E. (9) $213.30.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,750.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,750.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,556.98. E. (9) $21,032.66.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20,577.34.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington D.C.
D. (6) $141.25. E. (9) $26.30.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 239 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,625.01.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $127.50.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $500.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,468.44. E. (9) $84.75.

A. Ben DuBois.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.

A. Stephen M. Du Brul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Read P. Dunn., Jr., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $255. E. (9) $17.97.

A. Stephen F. Dunn, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William E. Dunn, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $6.95.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10.20. E. (9) $105.96.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

A. Harold Edwards, 2400 16th Street., Washington, D.C.
B. National Health Federation, 2454 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $700.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,092.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $61.78.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $8.35.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $219.70.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water Resources, State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,437.50.

A Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,600.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $36.55.

A. Ely, McCarty and Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,510. E. (9) $11.60.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $204.20.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $8,700. E. (9) $5,901.66.

A. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $96,115.83. E. (9) $22,816.67.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 201 World Center Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $150.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La., United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla., and Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) $6,099.96.

A. John B. Fisher, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Coal Shipping, Inc., 17 State Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John B. Fisher, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bangor and Aroostoock Railroad, 84 Harlow Street, Bangor, Maine.

A. John B. Fisher, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. C. H. Sprague & Son Co., 10 Post Office Square, Boston, Mass.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $125.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $25.52.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $203.05.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $2,116.95.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,388.78.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $15,867. E. (9) $6,495.33.

A. Florida Ship Canal Navigation District, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,583.35.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

A. W. Robert Fokes, 400 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. The Florida Savings and Loan League, Post Office Box 2246, Orlando, Fla.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

A. Foreign Policy Clearing House, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,400. E. (9) $5,517.69.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $372.78. E. (9) $372.78.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $737.50. E. (9) $40.85.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $97.95.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pine Craft Road, Greensboro, N.C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $475.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $625.35.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $642.20.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,124.

A. W. E. Fravel, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,750.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 G Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $28,193.23. E. (9) $9,078.39.

A. O. L. Frost, Jr., 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Garrett Fuller, 1210 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Coast Steamship Co., 601 Board of Trade Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $652.50. E. (9) $18.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers., Inc.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $411.55.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $111.37.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,059.80. E. (9) $297.99.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $118.

A. Lief Gilstad, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Henry W. Goodall, 209 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,333.33.

A. John A. Gosnell, Washington, D.C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,863.03. E. (9) $6,131.33.

A. Government Relations Committee of the Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James L. Grahl, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $46.99.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $15,547.20. E. (9) $13,485.35.

A. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $45. E. (9) $10.23.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Businessmen's Committee for Hawaiian Statehood, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers Life Council, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 1001 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $2.05.

A. Gus F. Geissler.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. I. J. Gromfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $36.25.

A. Thomas J. Guilfoil, 319 North Fourth Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. General Finance Corp., 1301 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

A. Rodger S. Gunn, 4618 Highland Drive, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., Post Office Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Mrs. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,753.80. E. (9) $201.89.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,560. E. (9) $435.45.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $137.18.

A. Harlan V. Hadley, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $261.90.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $747.22. E. (9) $16.71.

A. Radford Hall, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $523.51.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.96. E. (9) $184.85.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $523.33.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Conrad P. Harness, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,108.34. E. (9) $30.83.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $200.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 301 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,573.70.

A. John A. Hartman, Jr., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Cable & Radio Corp., 67 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $533.98.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $539. E. (9) $289.83.

A. Glynn C. Hawthorne, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,185.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $151.30.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $857.87.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $17.40.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $333.15.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $550.

A. Chas. H. Heltzel, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
D. (6) $930. E. (9) $211.35.

A. Willon A. Henderson, 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. General Petroleum Corp., 612 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,175.69. E. (9) $1,050.69.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y., and 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $322.93. E. (9) $322.93.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $39.77.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Football League, 1 Bala Avenue, Bala Cynwyd, Pa.
E. (9) $98.76.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool & Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station E, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $78.25.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $218.75.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,325.05. E. (9) $75.05.

A. L. S. Hitchner, Associations Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25. E.(9)$3.

A. George C. Holdrege, 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $4,875.

A. Edward D. Hollander, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 9 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Stanley G. Holmes, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $930.79.

A. Richard C. Holmquist, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $100.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $2,200.

A. Winfield M. Homer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $318.75.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $103,004.42. E. (9) $1,712.17.

A. Lawrence W. Horning, 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. J. Cline House, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.89.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N.Y.
B. National Dairy Products Corp., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $370.80.

A. Erma D. Hubbard, 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
B. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.

A. William T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Robert L. Humphrey, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Industrial Council, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. B. A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.
B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N.Y.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $298.75.

A. W. J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,079.85.

A. Illinois State Conference of Building and Construction Trades, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $2,687.54.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $153,301.04.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,883.77. E. (9) $15,883.77.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $537.50.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $3,353.75.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3.50.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $1,105. E. (9) $1,382.68.

A. Chester W. Jackson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,126.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $182.

A. Andrew Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Harold G. Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $375.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,817.51. E. (9) $52.65.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Societe Internationale, Pour Participations Industrialies Et Commerciales, S.A., Peter Merianstr 19, Basel, Switzerland.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.
E. (9) $232.91.

A. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,749.98. E. (9) $359.23.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,589.76. E. (9) $425.79.

A. George Bliss Jones, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $231. E. (9) $467.36.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $31.90.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $189.91.

A. Edwin W. Kaler, 547 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $8,750.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,780. E. (9) $253.22.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $1,418.97.

A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. George J. Kelly, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $54.

A. Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $37.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $256.70.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $202.18.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, P. O. Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $576.22. E. (9) $1,380.22.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $343.20.

A. Thomas J. Keyes, Jr., 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Fire Fighters, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,186.54. E. (9) $4.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 O Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,628. E. (9) $1,280.64.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $12.50.

A. John A. Killick, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $221.25.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $3,038.45. E. (9) $228.55.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $299.25. E. (9) $5.53.

A. James F. King, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Ludlow King, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. King and Noble, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $880.89. E. (9) $880.89.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $720. E. (9) $720.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 N. Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $36.47.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,807.66. E. (9) $39.72.

A. Clarence C. Klocksin, 3049 N. Hackett Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. The National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $300.

A. James F. Kmetz, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,040.

A. Burt L. Knowles, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $34.50.

A. Robert M. Koch, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $15.

A. A. W. Koehler, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 830 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,313.25.

A. Mrs. Catherine G. Kuhne, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,609.52. E. (9) $4,470.05.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $749.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $999.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 808 Trans-American Life Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $150.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Alan Latman, 210 East 38th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $153.

A. John L. Lawler, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $40.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $411.25. E. (9) $1.20.

A. Warren Lawrence, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $75.

A. Elton J. Layton, 4730 Arlington Boulevard, Arlington, Va.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $100.

A. Gene Leach, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $593.75. E. (9) $7.

A. H. Harold Leavey, 2020 L Street, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California-Western States Life Insurance Co., 2020 L Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,094.50. E. (9) $1,158.42.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13.33. E. (9) $13.33.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,083.33. E. (9) $3,523.66.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $154. E. (9) $8.20.

A. G. E. Leighty, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $3,277.99.

A. Liberty Under Law, Inc., 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $202.05. E. (9) $202.05.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,278.42. E. (9) $13,278.42.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $137.03.

A. Jonathan Lindley, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $13.30.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 215 DeSales Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, DeSales Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $125.59.

A. Walter J. Little, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,015.53.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. General Acceptance Corp., 1105 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Arthur Y. Lloyd, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, P.O. Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $330. E. (9) $152.44.

A. Leonard Lopez, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.90. E. (9) $15.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $136.72.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western National Life Insurance Co. of Texas, 210 East 10th Street, Amarillo, Tex.
D. (6) $200.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place South, New York, N.Y.

A. H. B. Luckett, 311 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $687.94.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,108.33. E. (9) $29.69.

A. A. E. Lyon, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association.
D. (6) $1,050.

A. LeRoy E. Lyons, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,785.66. E. (9) $1,469.35.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $650.37.

A. William C. McCamant, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $20.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,005.60. E. (9) $58.40.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $290. E. (9) $406.60.

A. Robert E. McCormick, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Angus McDonald.
B. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,739.52. E. (9) $186.78.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. E. D. McElvain, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $320.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $781.26 E. (9) $1,262.17.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth, Sterling, Kans.
B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $999.99. E. (9) $250.

A. Edward F. McGinnis, 375 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Taxpayers, U.S.A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $225.

A. William F. McKenna, 535 Lincoln Building, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $111.10. E. (9) $131.11.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,885.20. E. (9) $136.45.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,223.25. E. (9) $33.95.

A. Charles R. McNeill, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $23.70.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., % Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,460. E. (9) $10.45.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Frankel Bros., 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $0.75.

A. John G. Macfarlan, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,750.01. E. (9) $1,043.51.

A. James E. Mack, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Confectioners' Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Maclay, Morgan & Williams, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James B. Madaris, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,462.

A. Albert E. Maddocks, 1883 South Seventh East, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., P.O. Box 2013, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $945.08.

A. William J. Mahon, 1 Gracie Terrace, New York, N.Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New York State.

A. John H. Mahoney, 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. Walter E. Maloney, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, 207 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,040. E. (9) $1,359.03.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1913 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $255.37.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2,475.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,790.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $1,070.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,666.64. E. (9) $417.97.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $273.76. E. (9) $40.31.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, A919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $181.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor & Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,926. E. (9) $528.25.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. The Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $355.69.

A. P. H. Mathews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,222.41. E. (9) $466.84.

A. Joe G. Matthews, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.25.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $4.75.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M.D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $58.52.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $356.25. E. (9) $24.49.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,980.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 9th Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $80.38.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L. & N. Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $393.82.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $46.

A. G. R. Milburn, Grass Range, Mont.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Military Survivors, Inc., 509 Ridgely Avenue, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $2,654. E. (9) $1,044.57.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association, Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,350. E. (9) $1,086.33.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Cross Association, Inc., 55 East 34th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $26.45.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Shield Medical Care Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $29.17.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D.C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D.C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 2211 South Coast Building, Houston.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D.C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,553. E. (9) $256.50.

A. Harold C. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,824. E. (9) $1,076.35.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Slator M. Miller, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Honolulu, T.H.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Seymour S. Mintz; William T. Plumb, Jr.; Robert K. Eifler, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Tennessee Products & Chemical Corp., Nashville, Tenn.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $20.60.

A. Albert H. Monacelli, 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Committee for Municipal Bonds, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $78.75.

A. Walter H. Moorman, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. Maryland Railroad Association, 300 St. Paul Place, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Alexandria, Va.
B. F. W. Clarke, 112 North St. Asaph Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington D.C.
B. American Reciprocal Insurance Association, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chambers of Commerce of St. Thomas and St. Croix, V.I.
D. (6) $652.85. E. (9) $348.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., The American Road, Dearborn, Mich.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry and Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. Giles Morrow, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,625. E. (9) $212.30.

A. H. S. Mosebrook, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,056. E. (9) $417.45.

A. William J. Mougey, % General Motors Corp., Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Bernard R. Nullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
D. (6) $2,600.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Vincent S. Mullaney, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $748.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW, Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW, Washington, D.C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association, Corp., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $111.08. E. (9) $261.70.

A. Paul A. Nagle, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,125. E. (9) $2,125.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $13,750. E. (9) $12.50.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $59,563.65. E. (9) $12,216.17.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $7,269.04.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,234.24.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $979.37. E. (9) $979.37.

A. National Association of Plumbing Contractors, 1016 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $478.50.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $13,550.74. E. (9) $1,738.95.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,450. E. (9) $6,332.03.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $850.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $3,053.58. E. (9) $232.05.

A. National Association of Wheat Growers, Wasco, Oregon.
D. (6) $1,023.67. E. (9) $1,023.67.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9,383.85.

A. National Bureau for Lathing & Plastering, 1401 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $204,389.23. E. (9) $2,802.79.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Committee for Effective Design Legislation, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,550. E. (9) $3,192.19.

A. National Committee for Muncipal Bonds, Inc., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,996. E. (9) $1,684.74.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, University Hospital, Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $1,000.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $5,240.03. E. (9) $5,240.03.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $183.25. E. (9) $600.75.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $168.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations, 3929 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley, Calif.
D. (6) $1,834.23. E. (9) $2,134.82.

A. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of First Class Mailers, 210 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,511.13. E. (9) $1,673.62.

A. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Airlines Association, 1328 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,956.25. E. (9) $1,970.

A. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $585. E. (9) $585.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $710.69. E. (9) $692.17.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $9,732.81. E. (9) $9,732.81.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $111,854.01. E. (9) $12,077.32.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $183,168.31. E. (9) $15,802.94.

A. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,476.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $22,450.59. E. (9) $18,912.60.

A. National Independent Dairies Association, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $32. E. (9) $32.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,794.26. E. (9) $1,598.48.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $287,437.77. E. (9) $1,570.25.

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,573.70.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $689.93. E. (9) $752.98.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,168.65. E. (9) $5,168.65.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $779.97.

A. National Parking Association, Inc., 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $9,375.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $7,020.05. E. (9) $7,020.05.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $8,641. E. (9) $12,104.34.

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,939.70. E. (9) $1,126.80.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $5,240.71.

A. National River & Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $26,455. E. (9) $13,726.43.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $421.71.

A. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $819.28. E. (9) $819.28.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $4,596.48.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $251,551.60. E. (9) $4,896.50.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $30. E. (9) $30.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $2,800.35. E. (9) $2,420.59.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $13,008. E. (9) $3,084.61.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture & Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,700. E. (9) $16,327.14.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $4,368.73.

A. Joseph L. Nellis, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Consumer Organizations, Inc., 9424 Dayton Way, Beverly Hills, Calif.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $142.99.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $6.10.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $323.

A. Paul Nelson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $20.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $4,434.41.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,000.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Henry G. Nolda, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,692.34.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 603 Associations Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $3.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $577.50. E. (9) $61.09.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $253.65.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $133.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, 207 Northern Building, Green Bay, Wis.
D. (6) $100.

A. Brice O'Brien, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. George J. O'Brien, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $27,770.17.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $600.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine Sugar Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Hurley F. Offenbacher, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Fire Fighters, AFL–CIO.
D. (6) $1,160.52. E. (9) $39.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $539.64.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $21.66. E. (9) $1.

A. E. L. Oliver, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Oliver, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,490.

A. Samuel Omasta, 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Inst., Inc., 1015 12th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10.

A. Charles T. O'Neill, Jr., 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $106.60.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,347.08. E. (9) $1,040.93.

A. Clayton L. Orn, 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $164.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $454.54.

A. Vaux Owen, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1729 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,365.39. E. (9) $11.90.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $1,625.01.

A. Edwin F. Padberg, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.
E. (9) $194.42.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,625.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $212.50. E. (9) $4.45.

A. Mrs. Karla V. Parker, 1729 Union Boulevard SE., Grand Rapids, Mich.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $25.39.

A. Edwin B. Patterson, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $958.98. E. (9) $28.03.

A. James G. Patton.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $1,170.17.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $20,000.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Saturday Review, Inc., 25 West 45th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,500.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $278.41.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
E. (9) $64.55.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $5,200. E. (9) $624.65.

A. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Mrs. Esther Peterson, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO., 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,784.22. E. (9) $965.63.

A. Hugh Peterson.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Hugh Peterson.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $316.95.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Bcx 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $21.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. C. C. Woodard, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $10.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $73.12. E. (9) $89.50.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $70.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washintgon, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $40.91.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.
E. (9) $278.36.

A. Ralph D. Pittman, 500 Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. George B. Soto, 1801 Calvert Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.
D. (6) $106,478.69. E. (9) $525.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $827.94.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. James K. Polk, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. The Western Pacific Railroad Co., 526 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Nelson J. Post, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $216.25.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $9.10.

A. Walter I. Pozen, 1519 26th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,800.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $2.26.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Detroit Bakery Employers' Council, 2901 Grand River Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Development Bank for Puerto Rico.
E. (9) $409.58.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,031.25. E. (9) $438.31.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
E. (9) $140.80.

A. Arthur L. Quinn, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Instituto Cubano de Establizacion del Azucar, Agramonte 465, Havana, Cuba.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York City, Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, New York City, United Cerebral Palsy Associations, New York City, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, New York City, National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, Minneapolis, Minn., Association of American Medical Colleges, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $12,583.33. E. (9) $5,693.64.

A. Alex Radin, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $317.24.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $31.25. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $425. E. (9) $83.75.

A. Joseph H. Ream, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley Rector, Suite 506, Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $1,926.67.

A. J. B. Reeves, Ninth and Jackson, Topeka, Kans.

A. K. M. Regan, Post Office Box 172, Midland, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
D. (6) $9,444.22. E. (9) $4,424.22.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,999.98. E. (9) $53.55.

A. George L. Reid, Jr., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wheat Growers, Wasco, Oreg.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $123.67.

A. Herbert S. Reid, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. New York State Association of Railroads, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,312.50. E. (9) $725.39.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 929 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $612.

A. Louis H. Renfrow, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250. E. (9) $7,067.08.

A. Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Retired Officers' Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $96,110.60.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,625. E. (9) $8,798.52.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $7.70.

A. Theron J. Rice, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bill Richards, Orleans, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. James P. Richards, 1536 44th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $31.95.

A. James W. Richards, 4510 Trent Street, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $180.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. CIT Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers Life Council, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Edward McGee Rider, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
D. (6) $1,356.04. E. (9) $136.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor, and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,926. E. (9) $501.30.

A. John J. Riley, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Riley, 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 20th and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hugo J. Ripp, 811 North 22d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $806.19.

A. E. W. Rising, 328 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $318.71.

A. William Neale Roach, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $290.55.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corporation, 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $82.13.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $950. E. (9) $44.30.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $7.85.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $4,333.50.

A. Henry F. Rood, 1301 South Harrison Street, Fort Wayne, Ind.
B. Lincoln National Life Insurance Co., 1301 South Harrison Street, Fort Wayne, Ind.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Maurice Rosenblatt, 316 A Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,300.

A. Royall, Koegel, Harris & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,095.85. E. (9) $2,352.33.

A. Robert M. Ruddick, 738 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United Air Lines, 5959 South Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $590.52. E. (9) $523.27.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $618.75. E. (9) $115.27.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $241.70.

A. William H. Ryan, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,999.88.

A. Ira Saks, 1008 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 508 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $69.47.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 4000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Boston and Maine Railroad, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $205.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. Schoene and Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $19.26.

A. Harold H. Schroeder, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,100.

A. John L. Schroeder, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. V. L. Schultz, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,982.61.

A. J. A. Schwab, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Seaboard & Western Airlines, Inc., 80 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $450.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 582 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry See, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $136.30.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $102.81. E. (9) $1,122.85.

A. Fred G. Seig, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $57.16. E. (9) $17.35.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $53.75.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $34.98.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $893.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 608 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Inc., Washington, D.C. and Airport Operators Council, Inc., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.06. E. (9) $546.66.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $7.80.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $263.73.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $625.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,441.90. E. (9) $884.15.

A. Leonard L. Silverstein, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Women's and Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $3,011.60.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,187.50. E. (9) $19.80.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $606.12. E. (9) $115.64.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $254.85.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $275. E. (9) $85.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,850.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $4,257.

A. Wallace M. Smith, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $1,070.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $183.33.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,362.98. E. (9) $0.80.

A. J. D. Snyder, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825.

A. J. R. Snyder, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $71.26.

A. Marvin J. Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,074.65.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $48,111.50. E. (9) $24,437.26.

A. William W. Spear, 214 National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $460.05.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $4,431.41.

A. Howard M. Sterling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Raymond E. Steele, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. C. A. L. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. B. H. Steuerwald, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. N. R. Caine & Co., 40 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $2.55.

A. Stevenson, Paul, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $74.99.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,583.33.

A. Erskine Stewart, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,208.33.

A. Joseph M. Stone, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local 1, AFSCME, 333 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125.

A. W. S. Story, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Ada B. Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Francis W. Stover, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,750.02.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,615.38.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,250.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Adhesive Manufacturing Association of America, 441 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Reservation, Browning, Mont.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Laguna Pueblo of New Mexico, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nez Perce Tribe, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md., and 829 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 829 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $143.12.

A. William L. Sturdevant, Jr., 8300 Burdette Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. National Counsel Associates, 229 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,300.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. J. E. Sturrock, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $905.59.

A. J. Monroe Sullivan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $843.75. E. (9) $1,096.13.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Walter H. Duisberg, 231 South Dwight Place, Englewood, N.J.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ronson Corp., 1 Ronson Road, Woodbridge, N.J.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Tyre Taylor, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $532.85.

A. William L. Taylor, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $38.87.

A. Temporary Committee on Taxation of Mutual Life Insurance Companies, 7140 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $42,450. E. (9) $40,752.37.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 607 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $6,481.03.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $158.66.

A. Christy Thomas & Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co., 2929 16th Street SW., Seattle, Wash.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans-World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 125 North Center Street, Reno, Nev.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,082.50.

A. Thomas C. Thompson, Jr., 816 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Occidental Life Insurance Co. of California, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $47.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,005. E. (9) $154.97.

A. Arthur R. Thurston, 3929 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3929 Castro Valley Boulevard, Castro Valley, Calif.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $571.55.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $537.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,418.75. E. (9) $196.55.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $129.65.

A. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Richard S. Tribbe, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,620.83. E. (9) $74.47.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,093.75. E. (9) $47.25.

A. Stanley R. Tupper, 154 State Street, Augusta, Maine.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, North Station, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $143.21.

A. Harold J. Turner, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. California Range Association, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $31.10.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Local No. 30, Canal Zone Pilots, I.O.M.M. & P., Post Office Box 601, Canal Zone.

A. Lewis H. Ulman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $800.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $1,138.83.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,299.93.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $239.02.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $31,984.89.

A. The United States Trotting Association, 1349 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. T. Vice, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $370. E. (9) $140.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Carl M. Walker, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $106.70.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $482.13. E. (9) $6.15.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $478. E. (9) $20.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Government Employes' Council, AFL-CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,042.

A. Charles A. Washer, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington D.C.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,645.50. E. (9) $4,919.59.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 165 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 165 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $178.75. E. (9) $3,338.89.

A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, I.C.R.R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
E. (9) $836.01.

A. Merrill A. Watson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $282.90.

A. Robert Watson, Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,413.60.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Thomas Watters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $231.60.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Refining Co., Inc., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $265.89.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $192.35.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $422.27.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corporation, Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William H. Webb, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,824.12. E. (9) $509.97.

A. Donald D. Webster, Room 207, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Conference Studies, Room 207, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $1,132.81.

A. E. E. Webster, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12059 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,803.64.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $116.99.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $621.

A. Joseph T. West, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.
D. (6) $1,185.

A. George Y. Wheeler II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Radio Corporation of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $12,137.13.

A. Marc A. White, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $37.50. E. (9) $105.51.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $50.

A. Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, 2345 Ashmead Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $25.85.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $9.14.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $256.01.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 626 Belleview Boulevard, Alexandria, Va.
E. (9) $2.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.
E. (9) $2.46.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) $40.03.

A. John Willard, Box 1172, Helena, Mont.
B. Montana Railroad Association, Helena, Mont.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Harold M. Williams, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $325.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash, Chicago, Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,700. E. (9) $623.85.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lakeshore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,568.87. E. (9) $411.85.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America.
D. (6) $18. E. (9) $18.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,507.89. E. (9) $1.

A. Everett B. Wilson, Jr., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $538.83.

A. W. F. Wimberly, 873 Spring Street NW., Atlanta, Ga.
B. The Pure Oil Co., 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $4,375.

A. Frank G. Wolliney, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 59 East Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, attorneys at law, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,779.17.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,050. E. (9) $125.18.

A. John H. Young, 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Liberty Under Law, Inc., 1411 Major Street, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $140.

A. Edmund A. Zabel, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,699.98. E. (9) $200.05.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL-CIO.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the first calendar quarter 1959:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____ ←

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employes subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ←

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1 ←

A. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Yugoslav Claims Committee, 61 West 87th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert Anthoine, 1065 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Pension Fund of Local 1, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, 113 University Place, New York N.Y.; Interlocal Pension Fund, Amalgamated Lithographers of America, 204 South Ashland Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. David O. Appleton, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. The Atlantic Refining Co., Inc., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Thomas F. Baker, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. H. M. Baldridge, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roy A. Ballinger, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Barnes Dechert, Price, Myers & Rhoades, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Albert M. Greenfield.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, AFL-CIO, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas D. Blake, 4664 Reservoir Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, the Hill Building, Washington, D.C.

A. BNG Industries, Inc., 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Daniel L. Boland, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Reserve Officers' Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Roger E. Brooks, 923 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. F. Raymond Brush, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurseymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Newman D. Buck, Mount Pleasant, S.C.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation District, League City, Tex.

A. Harold Burke, 140 Front Street, New York, N.Y.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Edward Burroughs, Jr., Suite 701, Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Unilac, Inc., Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Camara Minera De Mexico, Gante, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.

A. Chapman, Wolfsohn & Friedman, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional De Productores De Azucar, S. A. De C. V., Balderas, Primer Piso, Mexico, D. F. Mexico.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. A. H. Chesser, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ernest W. Clausen, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Henry J. Clay, 55 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Howe Sound Co., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. W. H. Coburn, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Forest Industries Association, 526 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Edwin S. Cohen, 25 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Investment Companies, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Sand Products Corp., 2489 National Bank Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Herbert S. Colton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burl Johnson & Association, Box 1115, Fairchild AFB, Spokane, Wash.

A. Robert B. Craig, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fairbanks, Morse & Co., 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph M. Creed, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Bakers Association and National Trade Association.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. William A. Cromartie, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Swift & Co. Employes Benefit Association, 41st and Exchange Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Laurence A. Crosby, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John B. Curan, 5605 61st Place, Riverdale, Md.
B. International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bryce Curry, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Swift & Co. Employes Benefit Association, 4115 Packers Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C. I. T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Businessmen's Committee for Hawaiian Statehood, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corporation 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John F. Deeds, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. John H. Trigg, Post Office Box 5629, Roswell, N. Mex. and Ralph S. Trigg, Box 1312 Albuquerque, N. Mex.

A. Philip M. DeVany, 639 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Porter Brothers Corp., Post Office Box 667, Boise, Idaho.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, AFL-CIO, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington D.C., and Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Douglas, Obear & Campbell, 822 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Anne Archbold, 3905 Reservoir Road, Washington, D.C.

A. Evelyn Dubrow, 1710 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. International Ladies Garment Workers Union, 1710 Broadway, New York City, N.Y.

A. K. H. Easley, Waco, Tex.
B. Amicable Life Insurance Co., Waco, Tex.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Electronics Small Business Council, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employes of America, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George Estok, Bridgeport, Conn.
B. Electronics Small Business Council, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John B. Fisher, Suite 1112, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Estate of Mr. R. B. von Courten, 60 State Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Louis Fisher, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Paint, Varnish & Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Aaron L. Ford, 609 Plaza Building, Jackson, Miss.
B. Joseph Abrams, 33 Great Neck Road, Great Neck, N.Y.

A. Clark Foreman, Post Office Box 1275, Washington, D.C.
B. Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, 421 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George J. Francisco, 68 Narragansett Avenue, Ossining, N.Y.
B. International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Businessmen's Committee for Hawaiian Statehood, Honolulu, Hawaii.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., New York, N.Y.

A. I. J. Cromfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Albert A. Grorud, 816 E Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Yakima Indian Association of Washington State.

A. Alfred N. Guertin, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Walter Guild, 261 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Manufacturing Confectioners' Association, 261 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Thomas J. Guilfoil, 319 North Fourth Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. General Finance Corp., 1301 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

A. C. L. Hancock, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Copper & Brass Research Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. David Hartfield, Jr., 14 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Alleghany Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Ray F. Hesch, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Canal Zone Central Labor Union-Metal Trades Council, Box 471, Balboa Heights, C.Z.

A. Lewis E. Hoffman, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. John H. Trigg, Post Office Box 5629, Roswell, N. Mex., and Ralph S. Trigg, Post Office Box 1312, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

A. A. D. Holmes, Jr., Gallion, Ala.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Stanley G. Holmes, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Steamship Committee on Conference Studies, Room 206, Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Winfield M. Homer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders' Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N.Y.

A. DeWitt S. Hyde, Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry & Dry Cleaners' Association of the District of Columbia, 2400 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clifford J. Hynning, 1821 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Movers' Conference of America, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of Logopedics, 2400 Jardine Drive, Wichita, Kans.

A. International Chiropractors' Association, 741 Brady Street, Davenport, Iowa.

A. Andrew F. Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Harold G. Jacobson, 1476 South Fourth East, Salt Lake City, Utah.

A. Philip F. Jehle, National Press Building.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Frank S. Ketcham, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Movers' Conference of America, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. W. A. Key, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Robert F. Klepinger, Rust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Peninsula Retired Officers Club, Moffett Field, Calif.

A. William L. Kohler, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. Laboratory Apparatus & Optical Instrument Sections, Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Elton J. Layton, 4730 Arlington Boulevard, Arlington, Va.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Gene Leach, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. General Acceptance Corp., 1105 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Ray B. Lucas, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Outdoor Advertising Association of America, Inc., 24 West Erie Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Roadside Business Association, 646 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western National Life Insurance Co. of Texas, 210 East 10th Street, Amarillo, Tex.

A. John W. MacKay, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Clerks Union, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Julia L. Maletta.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.

A. Tommy M. Martin, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cecil Morgan, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, N.Y.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, N.Y.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chambers of Commerce of St. Thomas and St. Croix, V.I.

A. James R. Morris, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Electronics Small Business Council, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Postal Clerks Union, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philippine War Damage Claimants Association, 46 Escolta, Manila, Philippines.

A. E. L. Oliver, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. W. H. Painter, United Fidelity Life Insurance Co., Dallas, Tex.
B. United Fidelity Life Insurance Co., Dallas, Tex.

A. J. D. Parel, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.
B. Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. C. C. Woodward, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.

A. Walter I. Pogen, 1519 26th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Promotion Associates, Inc., 120 North Pitt Street, Alexandria, Va.

A. Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co., 2929 16th Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthur L. Quinn, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute Cubano de Establizacion del Azucar, Agramonte 465, Havana, Cuba.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Logopedics, 2400 Jardine Drive, Wichita, Kans.

A. James P. Richards, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. CIT Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Sand Products Corp., 2489 National Bank Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 77 Lincoln Street, Jersey City, N.J.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Harold H. Schroeder, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John L. Schroeder, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. V. L. Schultz, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. C. E. Schwab, Box 29, Kellogg, Idaho.
B. Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee, Room 1102, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Selvage & Lee, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fluorspar Consumers Committee, 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. P. L. Shackelford, 4545 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. David R. Shelton, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Joseph Abrams, 33 Great Neck Road, Great Neck, N.Y.

A. Ralph Showalter, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. David Silvergleid, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Postal Clerks Union, 918 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. M. Frederik Smith, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 1033 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. John F. Speer, Jr., 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.

A. Ernest H. Staubitz, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D.C.
B. Nebraska Mid-State Reclamation District, Grand Island, Nebr.

A. Steadman, Collier and Shannon, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States Life Insurance Company in the City of New York, 84 William Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eugene L. Stewart, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Laboratory Apparatus and Optical Instrument Sections of the Scientific Apparatus Makers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph M. Stone, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. GPO Press Division Employees Union, Post Office Box 1644, Washington, D.C.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Efron, 1116 Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Fluorspar Importers & Producers Institute, 41 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph C. Swidler, 415 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Power Building, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. William L. Taylor, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Christy Thomas and Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co., 2929 16th Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.

A. Donald S. Thomas, Post Office Box 858, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Life Convention, 4310 Dunlavy, Houston, Tex.

A. Thomas L. Thomas, Rockville, Md.
B. Electronics Small Business Council, 1100 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George O. Tiffany, Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.
B. Unilac, Inc., Ridgeway Center Building, Stamford, Conn.

A. Phillip Tocker, 3335 Herring Avenue, Waco, Tex.

A. Joseph A. Todd, Investment Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. California Range Association, 2438 Tulare Street, Fresno, Calif.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas M. Venables, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Walker, 702 North Owen Street, Alexandria, Va.
B. Society of American Florists, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

A. David W. Wallace, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Alleghany Corporation, 230 Park Avenue, New York, NY.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lion Manufacturing Co., 2640 Belmont Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Manufacturing Co., 3401 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Vera M. Waltman.
B. National Consumers League, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Merrill A. Watson, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert Watson, Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Thomas Watters, Jr., 161 William Street, New York, N.Y., and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York City, and Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., Edwin H. Pewett, Ray S. Donaldson, and Quinn O'Connell, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Atlantic Refining Co., Inc., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Community Television Association, Inc., 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A Albert E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Butte, Mont.

B. The Anaconda Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Nicholas B. Perry, 626 Belleview Boulevard, Alexandria, Va.

A. Frederick L. Williford, 511 Edmonston Drive, Rockville, Md.

B. Society of American Florists, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.

A. C. C. Woodward, 7630 Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, Fla.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Improving the Rural Life of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my colleagues will recall that recently I introduced proposed legislation to establish a Country Life Commission. The purpose of the measure would be to take a long-range look at problems and challenges in agriculture, and come up with some sound solutions on the problems we face today.

Fortunately, the Agriculture Committee in the House of Representatives has seen fit to hold hearings on similar proposals pending before that body.

I have respectfully urged that similar action be taken as early as possible in the Senate.

In view of the fact that we have been unsuccessful in resolving our farm problems—as evidenced by the discussions currently now going on in the Senate—a long-range, objective look at the agricultural scene, I believe, is definitely merited.

As always, I am of course delighted to see individuals and groups, on their own initiative, attempting also to deal with challenges in a particular field.

I am especially referring to the activities of the American Country Life Association, which has as its objective the encouragement and promotion of more satisfactory and wholesome rural life in America.

The annual conference of this association is scheduled for July 13 and 14, 1959. The theme of this conference is, "Making the Most of Human Resources Through Community Development."

Among the specific topics to be discussed at the meetings are:

Economic adjustments in rural life and agriculture;

The rural community as a unit for rural development;

Rural educational institutions and agencies responsible for development.

Recently, I received from Roy C. Buck, president of the American Country Life Association, a statement of the purposes and objectives of that organization. Believing that this represents a thoughtful, constructive approach to dealing with the problems now in agriculture, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD.

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

The purpose:

To study and promote discussion of the problems and objectives in country life.

To clarify and integrate the objectives and efforts of various agencies and organizations that work with rural people.

To facilitate means of the attainment of these objectives.

To sponsor meetings for discussion and media for analysis of problems, trends, and influences affecting the pattern of American country living.

To evaluate the special contributions of country people to American citizenship and freedom.

To aid in rural improvement.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, speaking at Memorial Day exercises at Westminster, Mass., I hailed the unforgettable contributions of American heroes in every generation, who, by their devotion and sacrifice, preserved the Nation.

I said in part:

All of us living in this period of great stress and great threat to our precious liberties must give something more than lip-service to perpetuate the ideals and principles for which these heroes fought and died.

We have special and urgent responsibilities, not only to exercise vigilance, but to work unceasingly to guard and defend the Nation and the Government from the great perils of the hour.

If we would adequately protect the freedoms we cherish, we must exert every effort, and be prepared to make every sacrifice, to safeguard the way of life bequeathed to us by the noble defenders of the country we honor today.

Military strength alone, though essential and vital, will not meet this challenge. Economic prosperity, though imperative, will not of itself preserve this Nation.

Only the indomitable will and fierce determination of free Americans to live by the spiritual tenets of religion and patriotism that have nurtured and built our national greatness can stem the surging tides of revolution and moral deterioration that are beating upon our shores, threatening to destroy our institutions and invading our very homes.

It is for all of us, regardless of class, creed, or station, as never before, to cease petty bickering, bury inconsequential differences, renounce selfishness and greed and rally as a united people resolved and dedicated to defend the peerless edifice of American liberty, if we hope to preserve freedom and spiritual values in a world where tyrannical, powerful forces are marching to enslave mankind. Victory will be ours, if we emulate the inspiring example of those who gave their all that American freedom might live.

The Soviet Cosmic Rocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, by now those who believe the Soviet lunik or mechta was a hoax have had their say. The officials who are equally convinced it performed approximately as advertised have also been heard. There have been opportunities before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics for rebuttal and counterrebuttal. Short of a full disclosure by the Soviet Union, little more is likely to be gained by pursuing the subject.

The committee, of which I am a member, will write its report in due course. Personally I suspect that the editors of True magazine which carried Lloyd Mallan's articles wish they had done more independent checking of the material

before printing it for national circulation.

Having heard a parade of witnesses, some with access to all the facts available and equipped with the scientific training to evaluate these facts, the conclusion is almost inescapable, as these witnesses have testified, that a Soviet rocket was launched, that it went to the vicinity of the moon, and that the only reasonable interpretation is that it is now in orbit around the sun.

The hearings have been instructive in a broader sense. They have brought forth many illustrations of the problems of scientific fact gathering, interpretation, and evaluation. They have also thrown some light on the general scope of Soviet scientific endeavors and capabilities. They illustrate a need for continued committee study of Soviet scientific programs, whose size and impetus give pause to our own policymakers. The hearings show the importance of the work this committee is conducting in study of our own science education and manpower needs, dissemination of technical information, research and development programs, use of computers, and a number of other matters.

Perhaps it is time that we turn from worrying over past Soviet accomplishments to steel ourselves for the surprises which lie ahead, and that we make sure our own house is in order to meet the challenges which will confront us.

Anniversary of the Death of Khristo Botev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there have been many great leaders who fought and gave their lives for the cause of freedom and liberty, and who are not as well known to the people of the free world as they should be. Many leaders who have left their memorable legacy in their homelands and among their own people are hardly known to other peoples.

Among such gifted, resourceful, daring, and liberty-loving men Khristo Botev of Bulgaria ranks high.

As a matter of fact this doughty defender of oppressed Bulgarians and defiant challenger of the Ottoman regime in the Balkans was one of the truly great champions of freedom in 19th century Bulgarian history. As a writer as well as a fighter, in his youth he became a leader of the Bulgarian people in their fight for freedom. Though he lost his life in his youth in the bloody massacres perpetrated by the Turks in 1876, 83 years ago, today all Bulgarians of whatever persuasion pay homage to his memory.

I am glad to join Americans of Bulgarian descent in paying my respects to the memory of this great fighter for freedom, the immortal Khristo Botev of Bulgaria.

Cartoonist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, in my Fifth Florida District, an honor has come to a friend of mine who is one of the great editorial cartoonists of our age. His name is Lynn Brudon. Since 1943 he has worked for the powerful newspaper of central Florida, the Orlando Sentinel.

Now the Sentinel has two honors. The first, of course, is having my friend, Lynn Brudon, on its staff. The second is this: the Orlando Sentinel is the only newspaper in the United States which 7 days a week—year in and year out—publishes a color cartoon on the front page.

After making another of its studies on mass communication, analyzing the influence of the Brudon cartoons, the Center for Practical Politics, located at Rollins College and organized under a grant from the Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation, invited Mr. Brudon to stop by for a visit. When he arrived the conference room was overflowing with central Florida leaders from my district.

Under the signatures of Mayor Robert Carr, of the city of Orlando, Mayor J. Lynn Pflug, of the city of Winter Park, Prof. Paul Douglass and Miss Alice McMahon, who guide the policy of the distinguished educational enterprise which contributes so much to Florida politics, presented to my friend, Lynn, a plaque on which were inscribed these words:

> Lynn Brudon, editorial cartoonist, the Orlando Sentinel since 1943, cynical protagonist of public rectitude, whose acid pen exposes folly, sham, and pretense and champions integrity, competence, and sound judgment in leadership.

As a part of this study the Center for Practical Politics sent interviewers all over the metropolitan area to find out whether they read the Brudon cartoon and whether they agreed with it. The statistical tabulations of the interviews showed that the Lynn Brudon cartoon is a major influential feature of communication.

From the content analysis of the cartoons, Judy Baez, center analyst, described the cartoon idiom of Lynn Brudon as—

> both goodnatured and constructive, which in general is a tonic acid helping people to see their problems so that they can laugh at themselves while others laugh at and with them.

I wish you could know Lynn Brudon, Mr. Speaker. On the day the Center for Practical Politics was going to honor him he was so overwhelmed with work that he said he couldn't leave his drawing board. And he wouldn't—until Henry Balch and William Conomos called him into Martin Andersen's office and ordered him to take a half hour off. And that's all the time he did take off.

With a modesty which characterized his life, Lynn Brudon was touched by the tribute to him—so much so that he made one of the few talks of his life. With a sincerity expressive of the highest ethics of journalism, Lynn said to the distinguished citizens—and my constituents—who had gathered to honor him:

> I never intend in any of my drawings to put any venom in what I cartoon. Sometimes people come to me and say: "You say you weren't mad at me when you drew that. God help me if you had been." What I try to do is pick an incident and help a man to see his folly and laugh at himself. I can laugh at myself. My drawings are like an editorial. Time and time again I've sat there drawing and said to myself: "No, that's not it. I've flopped this time." The next day the man calls up for the picture.
>
> The Sentinel likes to bring out issues. If it's right, we stand up and say so. If it's wrong we holler. Mr. Andersen says: "I can hire all the big national cartoonists in the country—but we don't live in New York or Chicago or California. Our beat is central Florida."
>
> Now what I do is keep track of issues. It is my job to keep the record straight. It's not a big job. But it's an important job. And best of all it's my job. I like it.

Mr. Speaker, because of my job here in Washington, I missed that conference to honor Lynn Brudon just as he almost missed it himself because of his duty to the Sentinel. I merely want to call the attention of this House to my hope that our world can have more men like Lynn Brudon in it. For 16 years I have known him and respected his courage and his political judgment. For more than a quarter of a century I have known his publisher, Martin Andersen, and worked with him to make central Florida become the great region that it is. To Lynn Brudon I send my own personal greetings and congratulate the Center for Practical Politics on the outstanding research in communication which identified the work of this great visual journalist to honor.

DAV Services in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EARL HOGAN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Indiana citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly or indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Indiana, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some

country allied with it, during time of war. I have been a member of the DAV since 1946.

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran very substantially. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger, its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff, of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these national service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

DAV SERVICE FACILITIES IN INDIANA

The DAV presently maintains one national service officer in Indiana, Mr. John H. Weiss, located in the VA regional office, 36 South Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis. The department adjutant is Mr. Gerald M. Smitley, 436–438 K. of P. Building, Indianapolis, Ind. The Department service officers are Mr. George McWilliams, 117 South Williams Street, South Bend, Ind.; Mr. Ralph Kincaid, Post Office Lock Box 248, Indianapolis, Ind.; and Mr. John Roth, Courthouse, Boonville, Ind.

Four hospitals are maintained by the Veterans' Administration in Indiana; a 200 bed general and medical hospital at Fort Wayne; a 486 bed general and medical hospital at Indianapolis, a 241 bed tuberculosis hospital at Indianapolis and a 1,650 bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Marion.

The DAV department of Indiana has nationally appointed representatives to the Veterans' Administration Voluntary Services Advisory Committees at each of the Veterans' Administration hospitals servicing Indiana veterans. These DAV representatives and the hospitals are as follows: Fort Wayne VA Hospital, Leo N. Cashdollar, 909½ Powers Street, New Haven, Ind.; Indianapolis VA Hospital, Mrs. Helen Miller, 257 East Minnesota Street, Indianapolis, Ind., and Mr. Bernard Van Sell, 219 South Arlington Avenue, Indianapolis, Ind.; Marion VA Hospital, Mrs. Mary Schmidt, 705 West Franklin Street, Hartford City, Ind.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $106,493,000 for its veteran program in Indiana, including $30,729,528 disability compensation to its 36,031 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Indiana furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities.

About 19 percent—7,092—are members of the 69 DAV chapters in Indiana.

This 19 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officer in behalf of Indiana veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimate)	50,486
Claims folders reviewed	42,072
Appearance before rating boards	20,275
Compensation increases obtained	3,370
Service connections obtained	1,275
Nonservice pensions	2,116
Death benefits obtained	209
Total monetary benefits obtained	$1,989,250.71

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Indiana veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

SERVICES BEYOND STATISTICS

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guaranty loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities. Civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations, and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claim.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 1.7 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Indiana with a consequent loss of about $476,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Indiana to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

COSTS OF DAV SERVICES

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again about $22.70

for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

METHODS OF PROVIDING SERVICES

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 13,917 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Indiana residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

MEMORIAL HONOR ROLL

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000 exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having thus been nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignment of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation, to which it recently added another $100. Since then every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,000, equivalent to about $5 per DAV member—an excellent objective for all other States. Benefactors from 30 States have, up to this time, become enrolled on the memorial honor roll.

Inasmuch as only the interest earnings from special donations will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in maintaining its national service officer program in the State of residence of each such benefactor, this is an excellent objective also for Indiana. Each such special benefactor is enrolled on a permanent memorial honor roll which, updated, is then included in the annual report of the DAV and of its incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, to the U.S. Congress.

Each claimant who has received any such free rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue this excellent rehabilitation service for other distressed disabled veterans and their dependents in Indiana by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can, and should, also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interest and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veterans' organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV. I consider it a privilege and an honor to belong to the Disabled American Veterans.

Address by Secretary of the Treasury at University of Houston Commencement Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address delivered by Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson at the commencement exercises of the Univeristy of Houston, at Houston, Tex., on Saturday, May 30.

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

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ROBERT B. ANDERSON AT THE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON, HOUSTON, TEX., MAY 30, 1959

This evening I should like to talk about a trilogy—men, money, and minds. The effective merger of men, money and minds is an aim of the educational process. It presents pressing problems with which you as university graduates are particularly concerned.

The most obvious characteristic of a civilization, society, or nation is that it is an association of people. It is directly concerned with human beings—their wants and needs, their fears and hopes, their capacities and limitations. We in this country believe that the sole purpose of a political economy is to make life for people more decent and rewarding and free. We believe further that by giving the individual the maximum chance for expression, the whole community—whether one nation or many—may more nearly reach the goal of fulfillment for all its members. This is our objective, however imperfectly we may have realized it so far.

One of our greatest challenges today arises out of the fact that the human community is growing very fast—and its needs are growing in proportion to its numbers. There are well over 2½ billion people living today. By the time you have been out of college as long as I have there will easily have been added a billion more. That means, if you please, 100 million more Americans by the time your children sit where you do now.

Talk about growth. Your generation is obviously in for a lot of it.

Within the next 25 years we will virtually double the producing capacity of America. We are going to have to create some 35 to 40 million new jobs. We shall need something like 1 million additional schoolrooms and 30 million more homes. We shall have to build hundreds of thousands of miles of new highways and thousands of new hospitals, and somehow find room for 60 million more automobiles and trucks. We must develop more than 10 million acres of bare land for homes and streets in our spreading metropolitan areas. The development and conservation of water resources will be a major task, and so will the development of an energy base to meet a demand which may well triple.

These are a few of the problems with which the process of growth will confront us. We must solve them in terms of benefits to people—and in ways which maintain and strengthen our traditional freedoms. We know that our growth will not be even; there will be difficult problems of time and adjustment. Some of the answers must wait on yet undiscovered scientific truths; others on the refinement of data already known. All require the coordinated action of millions of Americans and all require staggering amounts of money, running to the hundreds of billions of dollars.

This brings me to the second point: money. From what source are we going to accumulate the necessary capital for a doubling of output over a 25-year period?

From just one place: savings. The excess of what we earn as a people over what we spend. There is no other acceptable source.

To achieve these savings, individuals must set aside a part of their earnings. Corporations must retain some earnings for capital account. Improvements and techniques which enable us to increase our savings potential through using our resource more efficiently must be constantly sought. These are the principal sources of investment funds, whether they are used to build a steel mill, a highway, a university, or a space ship to Mars.

Wealth is not created merely by increasing the number of dollars in the economy. It cannot be brought into being by Government decree. Wheels must turn, hammers must fall, and people must work with mind and hand, before anything definable as wealth emerges. We owe the handsome increase in our standard of living to technology, invention, and hard work—not to any fiscal or monetary legerdemain. We live better than we used to because we produce more.

There are hopeful signs in our economy that Americans are becoming increasingly aware of that simple but important fact. They are becoming increasingly alert to both the dangers and the futility of trying to bring about greater growth during periods of prosperity by simply pouring more money into the economy. With governments, as with individuals, spending in excess of income must be financed by means of loans. During periods of high activity, when the private demand for loan funds is high, a considerable part of Government borrowing must come from the banking system. Such borrowing is inflationary—it increases the number of dollars in the economy without necessarily increasing the things that can be bought with them.

Backed by public opinion, outstanding leaders of both parties in Congress are now giving strong support to a program for sound management of the Government's fiscal affairs. One of the significant developments behind this attitude is the resilience which our economy has recently demonstrated. Despite the predictions of many, the change from recession to recovery occurred with little direct Government intervention. In most sectors of activity the economy has now advanced beyond its former record highs. While there are still areas of employment dislocation, it is heartening that employment generally continues to improve noticeably contrary to some predictions that large-scale Government intervention would be required to open up job opportunities for many of those out of work.

These experiences have served to demonstrate once more a long-standing characteristic of the American economy. Reasonable stability of prices is not the enemy of a high rate of economic growth. Rather, we find that economic progress has thrived on the basis of sound money when the inflationary impact of war finance is taken out of the picture.

A notable example is the tremendous economic growth which took place in this country during the latter part of the 19th century, when prices were in a general downtrend following the rise associated with the Civil War. Again, from 1910 to 1915, manufacturing production expanded by almost one-third against a background of moderate price decline. In the 1920's, also, national output increased 50 percent during an 8-year period characterized by remarkable price stability. More recently, between 1951 and 1955, a high level of prosperity was accompanied by relative stability in the broad indexes of wholesale and consumer prices.

In the face of this evidence, there are still some who unwisely argue that continual deficit spending and the inflation which it promotes are somehow necessary to encourage growth. But what really happens when inflationary forces are at work in the economy?

First of all, the buying power of both current earnings and accumulated savings begins to shrink. This brings cruel hardship to those who cannot bargain effectively for wage and salary increases and to those living on past savings—annuities, pensions and so on. Savings eroded through price inflation command fewer goods in exchange. They have less ability to transform human effort and ingenuity into productive capacity and in consequence their potency as a positive instrument of economic growth is seriously weakened.

Second, continuing inflation brings about maladjustments in the economy which beget recession—and recession is the enemy of sustained, rewarding economic growth. When we dilute the worth of the standard by which we measure value, dislocations necessarily result. Businessmen who must replenish their inventories and capital equipment at higher prices raise their prices in turn. Labor demands and gets higher wages which add further to costs. People are discouraged from saving—indeed, many in the fixed-income groups find it impossible to save. With declining savings, sufficient capital to finance normal growth is not forthcoming, and the cost of available capital is high. Programs for expansion and improvement are cut back, and output may be restricted—at the same time that costs are rising. And so the spiral goes.

Now the most hopeful aspect of this entire situation is that it happens to be one of the major problems that we can—and must—do something about.

As a primary step, we can exercise the discipline and restraint needed to keep Government spending within Government income during prosperous times like the present. The evidence of growing support on the part of Congress and the public for sound fiscal policies gives hope that we can be successful in reaching this goal in fiscal 1960.

In other areas, also, it is within our power to keep inflationary pressures from growing so strong as to disrupt the process of growth. Any practices which act as a continual spur to costs and prices must be carefully examined. Waste and inefficiency must be eliminated—not only in Government, but wherever they may be found. In all of our affairs, public and private, we must endeavor to look at the whole economy; not just at the sector of it with which we ourselves are most concerned.

This is a task for the mind—the third element of the merging process I mentioned earlier.

What a person does is something which comes from the inner part of his being. It is the fruit of his mind. And in a free society, each individual has a personal responsibility for developing his powers of judgment and decision to the fullest.

Goethe has said that what one inherits from his father he must earn all over again, or it will not be truly his. This is a penetrating commentary on the quality of wisdom required in our own day. We must earn, all over again, the freeedom and security, the capacity for growth and adaptability to change, which constitute our American heritage from the past.

It is true that there are periods in an individual's life, as in a nation's, when change seems to be occurring almost imperceptibly. At these times, little seems to be required beyond the application of established rules and precepts received unearned—as Goethe would say—from the past.

But when change takes place rapidly or abruptly, a crisis may occur. Decisive new actions may be required. It is not enough, then, to look only to patterns of the past. What we require are principles which have been developed from historic precedents and out of our own experience and ingenuity. In the absence of such principles, the tendency will be to take a negative attitude. Generalities will be sought which can obscure the need for action, and reasons will be found why things should not be done.

Let me give you an example right out of recent newspaper headlines. There are those few who are coming forward with reasons why we should not maintain a balanced budget, why we cannot plan to pay off any of our huge debt at any foreseeable time. They cloak their arguments with the generality that more growth is needed—and then move on to the false assumptions that inflation stimulates growth and that a creeping erosion in the value of the dollar need be of little concern. The end result of what they are advocating is a destruction of values which will advance so slowly that it will not be noticed by the naive and trusting.

How long could we expect the habits of thrift and savings which have built this country to survive in such an atmosphere? How could we, under any circumstances, morally justify a program which is a continuing invitation to unsoundness as a way of purporting to meet our obligations? I leave these questions with you. As educated people, I hope and believe that you will never be deluded by those who say that safeguarding the value of our money isn't really very important.

It is the responsibility of each one of us to develop convictions strong enough to replace a shallow approach of this kind. And this can only be done by dedicated thought—by the application of mind to the experience of the past and the problems of the present. More than four centuries ago, Leonardo da Vinci wrote: "Wrongly do men cry out against experience and with reproaches accuse her of deceitfulness. * * * Experience is never at fault; it is only your judgment that is in error."

Today, a great deal—probably more than any of us can now comprehend—depends on the judgment of the American people. It is not too much to say that the future of freedom in this world may depend on what we do and what we achieve here in America during your lifetimes.

We are living in a time of great international tension—but it is also a time of great promise. Our particular system of competitive enterprise is superbly equipped to meet the growth needs which are clearly foreseeable in the period just ahead. With the maintenance of discipline in both our public and private affairs, the possibilities for the further development of the American economy are truly dazzling.

We are starting off on firm ground—a fact, you may be sure, which is being carefully evaluated in other countries as well as in our own.

The American private enterprise system is sound.

It is healthy.

It is growing.

It is capable of adjusting to changes which are inherent in the growth process.

It is capable of adjusting—we have recently seen—without resort to the dangerous stimulus of massive Government intervention.

Economic growth is compounded from many ingredients. It requires basic research—in an atmosphere of free-ranging inquiry. It requires technological advance, following closely on the leads provided by research. It requires an efficient production process—and the planning which goes with successful marketing and distribution. It requires mobility of resources, so that the old and outmoded can give way to the new and improved without crippling aftereffects. It requires, finally, sufficient savings and investment to make all of these things possible.

Let us never forget that the merger of men, money, and minds which is the essence of the growth process can be fruitful only if we keep steadily in view this important truth: Values, in whatever form they may take—a political system, a university education, a powerplant—have no meaning except in relation to people.

Woodrow Wilson once said, "Sometimes people call me an idealist. Well, that is the way I know I am American."

In the eyes of the world, America stands for freedom and humanity, as it has throughout our history. We can be rightly proud of the fact that the first postage stamps issued by the Republic of Indonesia turned out to bear the portraits of Washington, Lincoln, Franklin, and Hamilton, side by side with the founders of the new republic.

But we cannot rest complacently on the achievements of our forefathers. During the past 15 years 700 million people in 20 countries have won political independence. Whether these new nations swing toward

East or West will depend largely on you—on what you in your generation do to help them achieve the conditions of living which give scope for the inventiveness and resourcefulness of the human mind.

This, then, I conceive to be our Nation's charge to all of us: Enter your chosen professions with a keen awareness of the lessons of the past and the challenges of the future. Apply your minds not only to the problems of daily living but also to the pressing national and international issues which must be resolved if freedom is to be preserved at home and furthered abroad. In so doing may we remember the inquiry of Edwin Markham, the American poet who was deeply dedicated to the cause of his fellow men:

"Why build these cities great
If man unbuilded goes.
In vain we build the world
Unless the builder also grows."

Our Agricultural Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunately true that it has become popular to be against agriculture and to oppose the efforts of those of us who seek to solve the many and perplexing problems of this important phase of our economy.

It is deplorable that much of the publicity so unfavorable to our farmers is based on information coming from the Department of Agriculture. The impression left on casual readers of press and periodicals is that farmers are chiselers and seekers after handouts. If the truth were told in full, the public would have a far different picture.

The current newsletter of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. IKARD] tells in a clear and concise manner some of the favorable aspects of the agricultural program which ought to be read and remembered as the Congress prepares to wrestle with some of our most troublesome problems.

The newsletter follows:

(By Congressman FRANK IKARD)

Recently the House acted upon the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. While there can be no real question but what our present agricultural program needs to be changed in many respects—in fact, probably completely reworked—there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the program, and about the use for which the funds appropriated are used. Many implications recently in the press leave the impression that all of the money spent by the Department of Agriculture goes directly into a farm subsidy program. The truth of the matter is that a great number of activities are carried on by the Department of Agriculture for the benefit of the public generally and should not be charged to the farmer or to those engaged in farming exclusively. In the first place, the Department is the largest regulatory body in the Federal Government. It administers over 50 different laws, many of which protect the consumer, such as insuring clean, healthy meat and poultry through Federal inspection, and the grading of meat products. Second, all of the farm commodity export program is is handled through the Department. Third, millions of dollars in the form of loans are made annually through the Farmers Home Administration and the REA. This money is all in the form of loans, and the rate of repayment has been very high. The Department also conducts an extensive market research program which has developed new handling methods of farm produce and has provided the technique for reducing food handling costs, all of which are of primary benefit to the consuming public, and about $22 million a year is spent on the eradication of brucellosis which is primarily a program to protect the health of the public. The Department of Agriculture also disposes, through sales to friendly foreign countries, of a substantial part of our agricultural surpluses. Up to now they have sold over $7½ billion worth. It also administers the school lunch program and the program which provides dairy products to veterans in Armed Forces hospitals. In addition, the Department also handles soil and water conservation work which is one of the most vital and important programs to those of us living in the Southwest. The simple point is that even though there is a need for substantial revision in our agricultural program, much of the expenditures that are allegedly charged up to the farmer never reach him but are spent on programs for public benefit.

Remarks by the Honorable Edwin B. Dooley, Memorial Day Services, Larchmont, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day is a period of tremendous spiritual significance to millions of Americans, particularly the bereaved families of war dead, and the friends and neighbors of those who have made the supreme sacrifice in behalf of our country.

In my hometown of Mamaroneck and its villages of Mamaroneck and Larchmont, fitting tribute is reverently paid annually to the deceased members of the Armed Forces.

On last Memorial Day, I was one of those chosen to pay homage to the departed men and women of the Armed Forces who once lived in these communities.

My remarks follow:

On this day which is commemorated across our country, we pause to pay reverent tribute to those who gave the full measure of their devotion to this great land, and we pause also to reflect on the course which our country has taken since these men and women whom we honor, made the supreme sacrifice.

It has been said, and said sagely, that the pragmatic axioms of the past are not a reliable index to guide future actions. Never was a fact so evident as that is today.

Without in any sense diminishing the stature of the Father of our Country, whose memory is enshrined in every good citizen's heart, it must be said nevertheless that the admonition he gave us against foreign alliances was made at a time, before days were telescoped into hours—before space was annihilated by supersonic speeds, and before nations were so interdependent on one another.

The course of our country, its material wealth, its idealistic concepts, and its immutable ties to the free way of life, delineate in bold lines its historic destiny. By all the tenets given us by God, through our Judeo-Christian heritage, and by all manmade patterns of life, as evidenced by our common and statutory law, we are irrevocably committed to accept the Biblical phrase, "I am my brother's keeper."

Therein lies all the justification needed for our global generosity—for our constant effort to feed the world's hungry; to give inspiration and moral and physical aid to the distressed multitudes of the Asia-African block who are rising in belated revolt against the unmoral imprisonment and abuse they have endured through the centuries. If we believe in freedom as we proclaim so steadfastly, then we believe that the people of Nyasaland, of Ghana, and of other areas of the world have the same God-given right to preserve their destiny, unhampered by the imperialistic whims of other nations and other men.

We believe that Vietnam has a right to repel the invasions of the Communists, that each nation and each people in fact has an innate right, a tacit right, if you will, to fashion its own destiny.

But today with the world teetering recklessly on the brink of self-annihilation, with mankind's ingenuity focused on the problem of how to devise the most destructive instrument of mass slaughter attainable, it is necessary, yes, even urgent, that we reexamine our attitude toward our allies and our attitudes toward ourselves, with the aim of trying to rescue reason from chaos, and of preserving what we can of our way of life and the precious heritage which was handed down to us from our forebears.

First, I think that in appraising our position we must express thanks to our Almighty Father for the infinite variety of blessings he has showered upon this land and on our generation.

He gave our forefathers a source of natural wealth virtually unprecedented in human history. Sturdy and courageous people that they were, they could not have survived had it not been for the boundless forests, the rivers teeming with fish, the rich soil, and the proper climate.

Europe and other lands from which our ancestors came had long since exhausted their resources. And from the bounty inherent in the new land our forebears built the great cities, the industries, the educational institutions, the norms, and the culture which are ours today.

Now we face the supreme test of whether those things which are ours can be preserved for ourselves and our children's children.

When we reflect on the fact that a fleet of enemy submarines halted momentarily off our coast has the power to virtually obliterate all of us, and our culture, we realize that we have reached a critical stage from the standpoint of our chronological history—a turning point in our destiny.

We have reached a time when more than ever before we must be willing to make sacrifices for our country that Americans were never called upon to make before. I am not referring to the imminence of sudden extinction which the present strategy of warfare makes possible, but rather to the need for sacrifice of material things in order that our Government can have the resources to carry on.

The burden of our defense program is oppressive, but so long as the Communists continue to threaten, so long as Khrushchev makes a mockery of international diplomacy, and a toy of protocol, we must of necessity keep our sinews of preparedness sturdy and

resilient. All of this costs money and our taxes are our chief source of revenue. We must be willing to pay our fair share, if we are to survive.

We must too sacrifice certain illusions, the illusion for example that we can stand alone in this tumultuous and somewhat fearsome world.

We must of necessity forge stronger the links which bind us to friendly peoples of distant lands, not out of humanitarian impulses alone but out of enlightened selfishness so that we may weather any storm that may eventually buffet us.

We must sacrifice funds if need be for the development of our young people's minds—and for the just remuneration of those who teach them—in order that they will be fittingly equipped to meet the problems which they will be called upon to face. Fluency in language, adaptability to science, flexibility of mind and loyalty to country are the virtues our young people must acquire if they are to adjust to the swiftly changing patterns of the world.

As one prominent aspirant for high office put it, "He who sells freedom cheaply is a deceiver, or is himself deceived. He who sells it cheap or offers it as the byproduct of this or that economic system is a knave or a fool. For freedom necessitates infinitely more care and devotion than any other political system. It puts consent and personal initiative in a place of command and obedience. It supplants the harsh and oppressive disciplines of dictatorial tyrannies with individual devotion and personal initiative."

All of these qualities are compatible with adherence to our principles, and to the heritage which the honored dead handed down to us.

Ours is a great land, but we must respect other men and women who love their native lands; ours is a great and opulent country, but if we are to enhance it, we must be willing to do our fair share in its behalf.

One thing is certain, in this confusing world, we have much to be grateful for, and we must never lose heart. Ours is a land rich in blessings, ours a tradition bright as a star. All of us must ever be grateful, for out of gratitude flows patriotism and loyalty undying.

Address of Congressman Carroll Reece, Prepared for Delivery at Virginia Intermont College, Bristol, Va.-Tenn., May 31, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. CARROLL REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address prepared for delivery at Virginia Intermont College, Bristol, Va.-Tenn., May 31, 1959:

RESPONSIBILITIES OF FREEDOM

I

It is the custom of speakers, on occasions such as this one, to make profound observations regarding what is wrong with the Government of our great Nation and how the legislators are standing at the crossroads of destiny.

The heartening part of history is that there always seems to be another destiny beyond the one which has, according to the orators, been irretrievably compromised.

But this is going to be a different kind of speech—sort of a "man bites dog" proposition.

I am not going to talk about what is wrong with the Government of the United States—I am going to talk about what is wrong with the people of the United States.

For a man in public office this could be a dangerous form of heresy, but I have reached the time of life when one builds up a certain immunity to criticism.

At any rate, the subject of my remarks will be the character of the American people and the responsibilities of freedom.

This particular audience is particularly important to this subject because it is the women of a nation who are in the best position to shape the character of a nation.

I do not necessarily agree that the hand that rocks the cradle is the hand that rules the world, but I do agree that it is the character-forming period spent at our mother's knee that gives our lives the trajectory which guide us to the right or wrong decisions in our adult life.

II

As a public servant, I hear a lot of complaints from members of the general public about what goes on in the halls of government and I would like to register some of my complaints about what goes on outside of the halls of government.

In the first place, there is no point in criticizing the Government in Washington because what it does is generally only a reflection of what the general public wants it to do.

That is the kind of government we set up—government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

If we have bad government, therefore, it is because we have bad people.

I would not go so far as to say that the American people are bad but it must be said that for some time now their judgment has been bad in many instances.

Let's look at some of the problems that have been created by misguided public opinion.

Let's start with what most people consider our No. 1 problem—inflation.

Inflation is fun.

It is always fun to spend money which has not yet been earned—that is, it is fun in the beginning, until the results begin to come home.

Inflation begins in Washington.

But why does it begin at all?

Because the people want it to.

You may say that the people do not want it to and in a way you would be right, but in a much more important way you would be wrong.

The people do not want inflation, but they do want the Government to do things for them, which can only be accomplished through inflationary spending and in inflationary processes.

As long as people wish the Government to do more things for them there will be political candidates eager to promise the fulfillment of their wishes and when the bitter fruits of inflation come to their dining-room table they have no one to blame but themselves.

Our trouble, as citizens, is that we believe so many things that are not true.

One of these things is that Government has any money to give anybody without taking it away from somebody else, or even from the same people it gives it to.

Common sense tells us that there is no such thing as something for nothing, that there is no such thing as a free meal, but our selfishness prevails over our commonsense.

III

As an illustration I would like to quote a few sentences from an editorial on the fallacy that Federal aid is free by the American Economic Foundation.

It was written by two friends of mine, Fred Clark and Richard Rimanoczy.

Here is what the editorial says:

"Money, in political affairs, is the original shell game of now you see it, and now you don't."

A good example is the illusion that Federal aid is free—that it is something for nothing.

The way to dispel this illusion is to check it against two of the prime principles of economics.

The first is: Nothing in our economic life comes from nowhere or goes nowhere; there is always a source and a destination.

The second is: Government cannot give the people anything that it does not take from them.

With these two truths in mind it doesn't require much detective work to discover that Federal aid is money taken from the people, sent to Washington, and then returned to the people.

Federal aid therefore is money that could have been local and State aid, had that money stayed within the States.

To the best of our knowledge, only one State, Mississippi, gets back as much as it puts in.

IV

At this moment you are probably thinking: "But there must be more to it than this. The States and cities are always short of money and the Federal Government is always loaded."

You are right—there is more to it than this: the Federal Government has a legal right to counterfeit all the money it wants to as long as it stays within the debt limit, which Congress raised to $288 billion.

"Counterfeit" may be a slightly inaccurate word but it comes very close to the truth.

Here is the way it works.

Cities and States, when they need money, must get it from the people in taxes or borrow it privately against future taxes.

In other words, cities and States must raise real money—money that has been earned.

But the Federal Government, when it needs money, can put its I O U's (that can become permanent debt) into the banking system and cause the banks to create brand-new unearned money, money that takes on value only by taking away part of the value of the earned money.

That is what counterfeit money does, and that is why we use the word "counterfeit."

Another word for this money is "inflationary."

You may say: "But this bottomless Federal purse contradicts your statement that everything Government gives to the people must first be taken from the people."

On second thought, however, you will see where you are wrong: This money is taken from the people invisibly because, as previously suggested, when it is spent the value of the people's money goes down by approximately the same amount.

For example, the $12 billion the Federal Government is adding to the money supply this year (June 1958 to June 1959) will subtract about $12 billion from the value of the rest of the money.

The people will give up that $12 billion just as certainly as if it had been taxed from them.

This, too, should be ample evidence that Federal aid cannot be free.

Yet, we continue to keep pressure on the Federal Government to give away money that must first be taken away from us or borrow it and then take from us threefold to repay it.

V

Back of public approval, or at least tolerance, of deficit spending is the rather unadmirable notion that in some way or other,

when government goes deeper into debt it saves us taxes.

Actually, deficit spending is triple taxation.

The first payment is made almost immediately, because the spending of the unearned money subtracts an equivalent amount from the value of the total money supply.

This payment is really an invisible capital levy affecting everyone—rich or poor—young or old—employed or retired.

The second payment is made over the period during which interest is paid on the debt.

This payment may amount to more than the debt itself.

If the interest were 2½ percent per year and the debt were allowed to run for 40 years (a not-at-all impossible situation) we would have paid out enough interest to retire the debt.

(Today about $8 billion a year of our tax money is required to pay interest on the Federal debt).

The third payment, of course, is when the debt is actually paid off.

This, too, must come from our tax money.

So we can easily see, even though we may refuse to look, that the $12 billion of deficit spending in the current fiscal year could cost the American people $36 billion.

By no stretch of the imagination could a rational person consider that this deficit saved anybody any money.

But still we persist in our delusion.

VI

Another blind spot—closely related with our attitude toward deficit spending—is our stubborn belief that higher wages—in themselves—mean a higher standard of living.

Here again we are acting against commonsense but our ignorance seems invincible.

Suppose we reduce the argument to ridiculous proportions and see what happens.

Let's suppose that tomorrow morning everyone received twice as much money as they are now getting for their contribution to society.

We can easily figure out what would happen.

No more would be produced.

No more things would be on sale.

But there would be twice as much money paid out for the production.

So the price would have to become twice as much.

Nothing else could happen.

Everybody would agree that this 100 percent unearned raise would be obviously stupid—but almost everybody would eagerly accept a 5 percent unearned raise if they could get it.

Like many other problems of human nature this is an imponderable.

It cannot be explained—it can only be observed.

And as long as there are paymasters weak enough to continue to give unearned increases the practice will continue.

But don't try to blame it on the Government.

VII

Another source of self-generated trouble is our attitude toward employment and unemployment.

About 25 years ago some English socialists planted the economic theory that 100 percent full employment is both possible and desirable.

The American mind was fertile soil for this planting and today public opinion is largely behind the idea that corporations can and should be expected to provide 100 percent full employment, and if they fall down on the job the Federal Government must do something about it.

The only thing wrong with this idea, as a little study will disclose, is that corporations do not provide employment, or, at least do not generate it.

Our confusion arises from the fact that employment is measured in payroll and payroll comes from corporations, therefore the corporation must be the employer.

But another look at the situation reveals that the payroll came from the customers, so if payroll is synonymous with employment the customer is the employer, or at least, generates employment.

This puts the corporations in a different light.

They are responsible for employment only to the extent that they are responsible for finding customers.

But this cannot be done by management without the cooperation of the men and women in the plant whose relative efficiency and productivity is frequently the reason why customers are either found or not found.

Unless the people on the payroll cooperate in producing goods of a quality and price that will win the customer, there is nothing that management can do to prevent unemployment.

This raises the question of why the labor leaders, whose purpose is to further the welfare of their union members, so frequently throw roadblocks in the path of management instead of trying to smooth the way.

It also raises the question of why labor union members, many of whom must know the truth, permit their leaders to handicap instead of help the very people whose job it is to find them employment.

But as long as these union members want their leaders to have the power to interfere with management's effort to provide employment there is little that the Federal Government can be expected to do about it except to provide the machinery for freedom of action by the union members and that is just what we are trying to do.

The fact that our system works as well as it does is proof that there is a destiny which shapes our ends, roughhew them though we may.

VIII

There is another facet of 100 percent full employment that raises a serious economic question were the Federal Government to take the extreme measures that would be required to provide it.

One-hundred percent full employment in a growing economy insures chronic inflation.

To its sorrow, socialist England discovered this hard fact when the Socialist Government set out to guarantee it by Government fiat.

Here is what happens: in a growing economy there are always new businesses that must be able to find workers.

Under 100 percent full employment all of the people who want to work already have a job.

What happens, therefore, is the only thing that could happen: the new business takes workers away from old business by offering them more money; old business to retain their workers raises the wages.

As we know, when higher wages are not offset with higher productivity, they simply add to the cost of production and cause higher selling prices.

The result is an endless inflationary spiral.

It is interesting to note that in England the author of the full-employment theory, Lord William Beveridge, was personally ruined financially by the results of his own plan.

He wrote the plan in 1944.

In 1956 he denounced it in a speech made before the Racial Reform Group Conference in London.

In his very personal remarks Lord Beveridge told his audience that he had retired with what he thought was enough savings for a happy old age.

Under full employment, however, his savings had lost about two-thirds of their purchasing power due to chronic inflation.

The following was the high point of his speech.

"The underlying reason is claims of each industry (meaning each labor group) to fix its own money wages by sovereign action. Under full employment that is leading to the destruction of the value of money and is spreading widespread poverty among all who are trying to live on savings or fixed pensions."

The answer is a normal amount of unemployment—perhaps 3 percent of the labor force.

It must not be thought that this 3 percent consists of a starving desperate impoverished people.

Many of them don't want a job right away.

Most of them have rainy day savings.

Many of them live in families where there is more than one income.

Moreover, the unemployed is a constantly changing group.

The average period of unemployment being about 120 days, the actual number of people involved in unemployment in a year would be about four times the percentage for a given year.

So manageable unemployment is not a fearsome problem—it is essential to economic stability.

You may hear speeches challenging this statement but you can be thankful that the Government in Washington does not push the panic button every time there is a mild recession.

IX

The final observations I would like to make are more general than the foregoing.

They are rather hard to put into words.

The present generation of Americans do not seem to love their country the way it was loved by previous generations.

Nationalism, today, is almost something to be ashamed of.

This was dramatically demonstrated during the brainwashing of American prisoners in Korea.

This was probably the largest sampling of national character that was ever conducted in controlled conditions and accurately recorded.

Regarding the results, I would like to quote from a recent radio sermon by the Reverend John F. Fisler, delivered for the Protestant Council of the City of New York.

Dr. Fisler went into a great deal of detail some of which I will read to you.

The Amercan prisoners did not behave as on previous occasions when Americans were captured.

They did not organize. They did not try to escape. They did not steal telephone and radio equipment in order to transmit reports to our lines. They did not defy the enemy with the usual American spirit.

Many of those who died, died not from disease, cold or hunger, but from what the Army psychiatrists are calling "give-up-itis." They would go to bed, pull the covers over their heads, and, in 48 hours, they were dead. Fifteen hundred men died in this way.

Dr. Fisler quoted part of the communication from the chief of intelligence of the Chinese People's Volunteer Army in Korea to his chief in China.

"Based upon our observations of American soldiers and their officers captured in this war for the liberation of Korea from capitalist imperial aggression the following facts are evidenced: The American soldier has weak loyalties to his family, his community, his religion, his country and his fellow soldier. His concept of right and wrong is hazy. Opportunism is easy for him. By himself he feels frightened and insecure. He underestimates his own worth, his own strength and his ability to survive. He is ignorant of social values, social tensions and conflicts."

What Dr. Fisler says is certainly not true of our soldiers generally but it is true of the significantly large numbers who yielded to the brainwashing.

X

I don't suppose anybody knows for sure just what has come over so many of our young Americans.

They don't seem to believe in what we used to call the homely virtues and the eternal verities.

They know all about the faults of our country and the weakness of our economic system but we don't seem impressed with the fact that we still have the finest civilization this world has ever known.

These young people knit their brows and shake their heads over the social injustices in a nation that does not automatically provide economic security.

Angry young men write about the tyranny of conformity and hard work.

What these people are expressing, without knowing it, is their reluctance to take on the responsibilities of freedom.

Freedom is for strong men and, with it, must go self-reliance.

But most people can acquire the strength when they acquire a full appreciation of freedom.

The difficulty of appreciating freedom is greater for the American people than any other people on earth because we enjoy so much of it with so little effort.

We have a tendency to see only the burdens of freedom.

But there is good news for those who don't believe that freedom isn't worth the effort: of all our responsibilities it is the easiest to get rid of—all we have to do is elect the men who are all too eager to take over the problem of making our economic decisions.

What can one say to a man who is weary of being free?

You should remind him that every adult, as a child of God, has the moral responsibility to be free.

As a matter of fact the idea of personal freedom came from the teachings of Jesus.

The entire Western World is rooted in these teachings.

That is why communism must attack Christianity.

Communism is a form of emotional dependency upon somebody or something else and the desire for security through obedience.

To the Communists, Christianity and self-reliance are synonymous.

Their weapon against them is fear—the fear of personal failure—the fear that drives the individual backward to the childish instinct for security.

But the self-reliant Christian is not defeated by fear.

He has, in his religion, a mother, a father, a partner, a counselor, and a comforter.

There is, for him a different type of security through obedience—the security that comes from obedience to God's will.

With God at his side the most deserted of men do not feel alone, the most beleagured men do not feel fearful, because he has the strength and courage that overcomes panic and despair.

He does not fear economic hardship because in a Christian society there is always Christian charity.

XI

To sum it all up what I am really trying to say to you all is that a good index of America's belief in liberty, self-government, and self-reliance is the strength of America's belief in God.

And if faith in God is the foundation of our civilization, the strength of our civilization depends upon the strength of that faith.

That is why, in spite of any of the superficial signs of character deterioration that may occupy some of the headlines today, I cannot believe that the American dream is failing, because Christian faith is growing.

It may sound odd for a politician to say that good government is to a great extent a religious problem, but good character is a religious problem, and good government depends upon the good character of its citizens.

There is evidence to back up the correlation between Christianity and character: Not one of the American prisoners in Korea who had deeply religious convictions were successfully brainwashed by the Communists.

XII

If America's problem were a highly intellectual one, I would have less hope for our future, because mass education at the intellectual level is difficult.

But it is not an intellectual problem—it is merely a matter of commonsense motivated by good character.

Most people know what they are doing wrong; in fact they feel a little guilty about it.

And it is the American conscience that, I believe, will guarantee our future.

It needs a little prodding, but it is still a healthy conscience.

It needs a lot of self-appointed missionaries to talk as I have been talking, and I believe those missionaries will appear.

I hope that right here, in this audience, a few of them may have been enlisted even as I spoke. Good luck and may God bless you always.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1959

Rev. Joseph S. Johnston, D.D., minister, Reveille Methodist Church, Richmond, Va., offered the following prayer:

Breathe on us, Breath of God,
Fill us with life anew,
That we may love what Thou dost love,
And do what Thou wouldst do.

Father, in the brief compass of this day we cannot do everything. But we can do something. Help us to know what are the important things, and to do them.

Save us from loss of life through the careless use of time, the waste of energy, the mishandling of our opportunities; keep our thinking straight and true; and when we grapple futilely with problems that seem immense, remind us that in Thee is wisdom adequate for every need. Thou hast dignified our lives by giving us significant work to do; save us from the foolishness of trying to do it without Thy aid. Let these moments of prayer be meaningful moments of waiting in which we attune our life to Thy purposes, and then as coworkers with Thee move forward to establish the reign of Thy will where we are.

In the name of Jesus Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 3, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour; and I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

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

AGREEMENTS FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS IN ADVANCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to raise a question with the distinguished majority leader.

I observe that yesterday a Member of the Senate reserved 30 minutes of time today after the taking of the vote on the bill authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I would suggest that if we fall into the habit of reserving time ahead, although the amount thus reserved could be for longer or for shorter periods, it could run well into the future. As a practice, I am afraid that would certainly destroy the flexibility of Senate operations.

I would be reluctant always to object to such a request—knowing, of course, that, within reasonable limits, a Senator is able to obtain the floor at almost any time. But I believe that a practice of reserving time 1 day or 2 days ahead would present some difficulties. So I make this suggestion for the consideration of the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the distinguished minority leader present his