

Marquette L. Neal, Clarksville.  
Clover A. Stiles, Floyd.  
Clarence Starkweather, Jr., Greene.  
Helen I. Stanger, Hopkinton.  
Lyle E. Van Scyoc, Tabor.

## KANSAS

Olive M. Rudd, Belpre.  
Lloyd E. Cope, Netawaka.

## KENTUCKY

Barber L. Shelton, Nortonville.

## LOUISIANA

Nola B. Romero, Avery Island.  
Howell H. Smith, Bossier City.

## MAINE

Wesley A. Sawyer, Anson.  
Willie H. Laverriere, Biddeford.

## MASSACHUSETTS

John L. Brigham, Boylston Center.  
John R. Fisher, West Dennis.

## MINNESOTA

Carl G. Bergstrom, Cokato.  
Wesley P. Rathvon, Deerwood.  
Dexter N. Femling, Dent.  
Leroy F. Lingwall, Emily.  
Charles A. Lukens, Hadley.  
Lester H. Egerstrom, Murdock.  
William R. Marx, Preston.  
Alvord J. Dammann, Sanborn.  
Harold C. Olson, Two Harbors.

## MISSISSIPPI

Billy M. McEachern, Ruleville.  
William B. Askew, Sardis.

## NEBRASKA

John H. Rethwisch, Carroll.  
Vernon A. Lamb, Hubbell.  
Ivan Jack Gemmell, Ogallala.  
Alvin O. Jones, Sutherland.

## NEVADA

Bernice K. Morse, Tungsten.

## NEW YORK

Mildred H. Merrell, Afton.  
Bruce E. Champiin, Andes.  
Reginald A. Erick, Angola.  
Maurice W. Keating, Beacon.  
Patrick J. Foley, Bethpage.  
Beatrice L. Stevens, Bridgewater.  
Jeanette Y. Short, Cleverdale.

No. 118—15

Seward M. Dawes, Clinton.  
Irwin H. Dent, Davenport.  
Wendell C. Wilber, Delanson.  
Joseph R. Iadarola, Elmsford.  
Ralph L. Marshall, Freeport.  
Reggie J. Abbondandolo, Greenvale.  
Albert A. Clark, Hall.  
Harry C. Cotier, Hicksville.  
Burdette W. Playfoot, Horseheads.  
Oliver K. Palm, Jamestown.  
Alice M. Bird, Lake Peekskill.  
Ronald M. MacKenzie, Lake Placid.  
Ruth P. Benedict, Lewis.  
William A. Maillet, Lockport.  
James C. Browne, Mahopac.  
John S. Volpe, Manchester.  
Willis Clayton Farnham, Manlius.  
Richard G. Gavette, Margaretville.  
James E. Reilly, Massapequa Park.  
Kathryn D. Probert, New Hampton.  
Howard A. Searle, Newfane.  
Richard Charles Rutland, Olcott.  
George Conrad Sauer, Port Jervis.  
Edna C. Yaple, Rock Hill.  
Joseph Huber, Rockville Centre.  
Wesley H. Kline, Sanborn.  
Cella B. Ferguson, Schuyler Lake.  
Reginald T. Stevenson, Sea Cliff.  
John A. Fiero, Shortsville.  
Roy E. Hodges, Spencer.  
Wilbert J. Regnet, Swornville.  
Joseph F. Ambrose, Thornwood.  
Beatrice V. Conway, Warners.  
William H. Olcott, Wurtsboro.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Pearl E. Taylor, Alexander.  
Ivan O. Wick, Brocket.

## OHIO

Carlton W. Strosnider, Ansonia.  
Gertrude G. Nottke, Berlin Heights.  
Oscar J. Pierce, Coolville.  
Raymond C. Harris, Eaton.  
Harold E. Mills, Franklin.  
John D. Ingram, New Milford.  
Ralph G. Bostwick, North Benton.  
John William Evans, Orville.  
Leo F. Davis, Payne.  
Robert L. Murdock, Ridgeway.  
Clarence B. Stahl, St. Henry.  
Edgar W. Stevanus, Sugar creek.  
LeRoy A. Wright, West Alexandria.

## OREGON

Marie E. Marshall, Cannon Beach.  
Milton H. Ringe, Dundee.  
Audrey S. Phillips, Island City.  
Stella G. Lowe, Rickreall.

## PENNSYLVANIA

James W. Daubert, Allentown.

## PUERTO RICO

Jose Alberto Poventud, Ponce.

## SOUTH CAROLINA

John B. Blanton, Nichols.  
Bennett C. Bedenbaugh, Prosperity.

## TENNESSEE

Albert M. Daniel, New Market.

## TEXAS

Ponder A. Pickett, Big Wells.  
Joe C. Cobb, Lewisville.  
Gilbert R. Thayer, Port Lavaca.

## UTAH

J. Stanford Stahel, Enterprise.

## VIRGINIA

Burton R. Floyd, Buena Vista.  
Virgie C. Rawls, Burkeville.  
Thomas N. Langhorne, Evington.  
Frank J. Horlander, Jr., Meherrin.  
Virginia M. Deane, New Canton.

## WASHINGTON

Glenn R. Fredericksen, Cashmere.  
Fred S. Hughes, Clarkston.  
Arlow R. Evers, Electric City.  
Dwight L. Cruea, Everson.  
Dean W. Larimore, Granger.  
Jack Doty, Greenacres.  
Henry Grosso, Harper.  
Clifford E. Swenson, Harrington.  
Charley T. Garrison, Hoquiam.  
John H. Bonus, Kllickitat.  
Jack A. Middle, Mabton.  
Alice L. Green, Medina.  
Kenneth E. Roberts, Nooksack.  
Robert F. Whitten, Ocean Park.  
Ruby Irene Paulson, Outlook.  
Marion E. Keeney, Pacific Beach.  
Wesley Wayne Gibbs, Woodinville.

## WISCONSIN

Lyle A. Gallenbeck, Burnett.  
James E. Davidson, Markesan.  
Henry W. Luebke, Winneconne.

# House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JULY 12, 1956

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and goodness, grant that in these dark and doubtful days we may turn to Thee for light and leading and discover the power and possibilities of prayer.

Inspire us with a daring faith and an unconquerable hope and may we see our duties clearly and discharge them without fear or favor.

May we never be merely content with the deductions and conclusions of our minds but may we be blessed with those spiritual revelations and intuitions which will make us feel instinctively that we are obeying and doing Thy will.

Help us for our joy and strength to strive more earnestly to bring the power of lofty ideals to bear on our everyday life and daily give witness that we belong to an eternal fellowship.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who is our eternal contemporary. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 9774. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of Volusia County, Fla.;

H. R. 10075. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the town of Bald Knob, Ark.; and

H. R. 10479. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land to the county of Galveston, Tex.

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

H. R. 8817. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the city of Corbin, Ky.; and

H. R. 9842. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases.

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

S. 147. An act to require that international agreements other than treaties, hereafter entered into by the United States, be transmitted to the Senate within 60 days after the execution thereof; and

S. 3958. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 47. An act for the relief of Guiseppa Agosta.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2182) entitled "An act for the relief of the city of Elkins, W. Va.," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DANIEL, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. DIRKSEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3957) entitled "An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. LANGER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 9593) entitled "An act to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WOFFORD, and Mr. COTTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was on the floor of the House all afternoon. Shortly before rollcall No. 98 on the mutual security appropriation bill, I was called back to my office to interview some constituents. Shortly thereafter the bells rang for rollcall No. 98. I waited for the second bells to ring, but they failed to ring. As a consequence I got here on the floor of the House just a minute or so late. Had the second bells rung, I would have been able to vote on rollcall No. 98; therefore I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD record me as voting "aye."

The SPEAKER. It is not possible to do that as it is in violation of the rules of the House. The gentleman from Indiana may state how he would have voted had he been here.

Mr. MADDEN. I made such a statement in the RECORD yesterday, Mr. Speaker.

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the Committee on Agriculture may sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## DELETION FROM RECORD

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike from the permanent RECORD my reference to the distinguished minority leader on page 11192 and 11193 in yesterday's RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the permanent RECORD will be so corrected.

There was no objection.

## SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1957

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 584 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12138) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution waives points of order on the bill that is about to be called up, which is the supplemental appropriations bill. The reason for the rule is that there are some minor legislative provisions in the bill itself, but the main reason for this rule is that the authorization bill for the military construction, while it has passed the House and I believe passed the Senate, has not as yet, as far as I know, become law. While it will be enacted into law in the next day or so, that is the main reason for this rule waiving points of order. The items for military construction have not as yet been authorized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. That is the main reason for asking for this rule waiving points of order, because some law has not yet been enacted?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not some law, but the law authorizing military construction projects for this year.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman say there is no legislation in this bill in connection with the Jones Point bridge?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not to my knowledge. There is no legislation on that matter. If the gentleman will look

July 12, 1956

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

11351

at the report on the bill, he will find listed there the legislative provisions concerning which a waiver is sought. That does not apply to the Jones Point bridge.

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

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I desire to announce that the next order of business after the disposition of the supplemental appropriations bill will be the suspension on the veterans bill, for which permission was obtained yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have permission to sit today and tomorrow during general debate.

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

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has so ably explained, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 12138 with waiver of points of order on the bill. As a member of the Rules Committee, I voted for this rule, although I have a great interest in one certain provision in this bill, as do the other Members from Ohio, and especially Representative SCHENCK, of Ohio.

On page 7 of this bill is a provision for transferring the Air Research and Development Command of the Air Force to Andrews Field. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] has in his district a great portion of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and I have the balance of that installation in my own district. Under the provisions of this bill, on page 7, the Secretary of the Air Force would be authorized to expend some \$6 million for the moving of the Air Research and Development Command headquarters from Baltimore to Andrews Air Force Base in the District of Columbia, where we already have an overcrowded condition. All in spite of the fact we are already spending hundreds of millions of dollars to move Federal institutions and installations out of this congested area in and near the District of Columbia because of dangers involved.

The work of air research and development belongs primarily somewhere close to the Air Materiel Command at Dayton, Ohio, where most of the Nation's war-plane experimentation goes on. The location of the Air Research and Development Command is very important. Prior to 1951, when the Air Force first established an Air Research and Development Command, the Air Materiel Command at Dayton embraced all production, supply, maintenance, and engineering functions at Dayton, Ohio. In order to create the Research and Development Command the engineering functions of the Air Materiel Command were separated therefrom, and most of the personnel to man this new function came from the Air Materiel Command itself.

Since the Air Force had included this research function as a part of the Air Materiel Command for several years before a program of separate research

activity was created, it must be obvious to all that this function still has a very close relationship to the Air Materiel Command itself, and should be a part thereof if it should ever cease to exist as a separate command.

Some time ago the Armed Services Committee of the House investigated this whole matter as to where the Air Research and Development Command should be located very fully and unambiguously recommended to the House, and to the Air Force, that the Research and Development Command should be located near the Air Materiel Command in Dayton, where the two could work together as in the past.

The House itself once voted that the Air Research and Development installation should be moved to Dayton. Then, later, the Senate in the closing days or hours of the last session amended that particular section of the bill to provide that the Secretary of the Air Force should decide where such research and development work should be done, and the House rather reluctantly adopted that Senate amendment.

I note the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which reported this bill said in its report:

The committee has some doubt that the immediate vicinity of the Nation's Capital is the best location for command headquarters of this type—

Referring, of course, to Air Research and Development Command. Further the committee said:

This committee would have preferred that another location had been selected.

Let me point out to you, and I give it to you upon my word as a Member of this House, that the experienced officers and men in this research work in the Air Force, who investigated this whole matter, recommended that the Air Research and Development Command be transferred back to Dayton, Ohio, where for many years it operated as part of the Air Materiel Command, where the two commands could again work together, and where, if peace should come or the world situation grow less tense, the two could again be incorporated into one endeavor.

And let me tell you of some of the steps and some of the plans that are now underway, or are being worked out, if this House approves the removal of the Air Research and Development Command to Andrews Air Base.

Mr. Speaker, first, the present plans envision the following steps:

Step 1: The transfer of a majority of the present training command subactivities from Randolph to Waco. This will result in a consolidation of flight training and technical training operations at one headquarters at Waco with a resulting reduction of some 100, or more, people.

Step 2: Involves the transfer of the headquarters of the training command from Scott Field to Randolph Field.

Step 3: This involves the movement of the MATS headquarters from Andrews Field to Scott Field. In this case, the movement of some 700 training headquarters people out of Scott will be replaced by moving in around 1,200 people in the MATS headquarters.

Step 4: ARDC headquarters will be moved from the present location at Baltimore to take over the present MATS headquarters at Andrews. These moves will require the expenditure of maintenance and operating funds of at least \$3 million and more possibly in the area of \$4 million.

Second. Included in this plan is the creation of a new and additional headquarters building for some \$6 million for ARDC at Andrews. Initially, ARDC would move at some point after the third quarter of fiscal year 1957 into the present MATS headquarters building when it was vacated by MATS for the move to Scott. Perhaps 2½ years later, ARDC would move into the new headquarters and the present MATS headquarters would then be available for the move of people out of the Pentagon and out of the temporary buildings in the Washington area.

Third. The proposal which is really the one under consideration as step 1 involves the new headquarters for ARDC retaining the MATS headquarters at Andrews.

Fourth. The net effect of this series of proposals is the increase in the number of organizations in the Washington area and many people believe this should be undesirable both from a vulnerability standpoint and from the overconcentration of Government personnel in this area. In the studied opinion of many people a more desirable course of action appears to be the construction of a new headquarters for ARDC at Dayton, Ohio, and the movement of the headquarters, when it is moved, from Baltimore to Dayton. This consolidation of ARDC on the same base with its major operating activity should result in both increased efficiency of operation and a total reduction of many people, on the order of several hundred.

Fifth. The proposed move of ARDC headquarters to Andrews, along with the other proposed moves involves the maximum expenditure, and maximum disruption in the Washington area.

Mr. Speaker, may I also point out in connection with the proposed location of ARDC headquarters:

First. The separation of the engineering function—ARDC—from the production, supply, and maintenance functions of AMC in 1951 duplicated a somewhat similar separation of functions during World War II, where supply and maintenance functions were separated from production and engineering. In each case, the reason was to reduce the size of the job that any one person or headquarters would be responsible for—in both supervisory and operational functions. When the separation was made in World War II, the resultant problems were solved somewhat more expeditiously because the two headquarters, which of necessity required a great deal of lateral coordination, were only 3 miles apart.

Second. The major problem caused by the creation of the ARDC headquarters at Baltimore was the fact that the close teamwork and working relationships necessary, particularly at the operating level, were made difficult. In the engi-

neering change proposal area alone, it was difficult enough under a single organization to get timely and expeditious action. With the ARDC headquarters removed to Baltimore, it was my personal experience that serious delays were encountered which might have been avoided in getting changes instituted in production aircraft, particularly when the total engineering responsibility from the cradle to the grave was placed in ARDC.

Third. The other serious difficulty encountered was the fact that ARDC headquarters was created, in the main, from the most experienced people of the engineering division at Wright Field. Therefore, at a very critical time in the build-up of the Air Force, the new WADC and the AMC production division were forced to carry on a tremendously accelerated workload with less people at the project level than they had had before the reorganization.

Fourth. The inevitable minor problems and petty jealousies in connection with any such reorganization as this have been pretty well reconciled. The present commanders—Powell and Rawlings—have established a close working relationship, and personnel and organizationwise, both organizations have, within the last year, attained a stable and clear understanding of their common problems, and the total mission requirements to which they must contribute, for the overall advancement of Air Force technology and the Air Force inventory requirements.

Fifth. The coordination and close cooperation attained by the present project office organization have produced real dividends. ARDC initiates the weapon system offices and retains their management until the production cycle is initiated, then AMC takes over the management at Dayton of the project office, until the weapon system has progressed through production to the point where its management may be transferred to the responsible AMC depot.

Sixth. Coupled with the weapons system offices, the related phasing groups, composed of members from USAF headquarters, tactical commands involved, and the pertinent depots and centers, have resulted in a better job of initial planning, detailed operational and materiel planning, production for the inventory and tactical support than has even been accomplished before in the history of the Air Force or its predecessor organizations.

Seventh. In consideration of the many recommendations advanced, both by those people with responsibility for results and those who are only in an advisory capacity, it is obvious that any headquarters for any Air Force function could be located anywhere in the United States. It has been the repeated decision of many senior commanders that if you are to command an operating organization charged with a major portion of the Air Force mission, such as TAC, SAC, ADC, ARDC, or AMC, that the farther you get away from Washington, the better. This is for the simple reason that too close a location of the headquarters to Washington results in confusion rather than coordination. The person-

nel of the Air Staff are inclined to enter into the operating functions of the separate command. The management of the separate command are inclined to endeavor to take over part of the operations of the Air Staff.

Eighth. From a standpoint of long-range economy, it is usually desirable to locate a headquarters so that it is reasonably equidistant, areawise, from the units which it controls. We should take advantage of long-term positions of base availability, and therefore, possible reductions in long-range operating costs. These factors, under the present program of austerity, become of major importance.

Ninth. There are three major factors which make the Wright Field location for ARDC headquarters of overriding importance, first, at the present time, roughly 50 percent of ARDC's total management affairs are carried on through the project offices, in close coordination with AMC; second, the laboratories at Wright Field are the logical areas for the initiation and technical supervision of practically every major program, except the responsibilities of the ICBM and IRBM; and third, it is a central location, which is certainly somewhat less vulnerable than a coastal location and relatively equidistant from the other ARDC centers, as well as reasonably coequal in distance from the various centers of technical knowledge located, in the main, on the West Coast, in the Northeast, and in the Chicago-Detroit areas.

Tenth. In the past, the Air Force has tried operation of engineering, production and procurement from the Washington headquarters. In each case it was found that superior results were obtained when the operating activities were decentralized to Dayton and the Staff responsibilities of the Chief were carried out in the Washington headquarters.

Eleventh. For the same reasons that have been advanced for the placement of the ARDC headquarters at Baltimore, Andrews Air Force Base, Langley Air Force Base, and other eastern points, adjacent to Washington, we could advance the philosophy that AMC headquarters should also be moved to the Washington area.

Twelfth. If either AMC or ARDC headquarters are located within an hour's drive from Washington, then the duties of that headquarters might well be combined with the Deputy on the Air Staff in charge of that responsibility. Certainly, there is no reason for having two senior officers and staffs essentially charged with the same responsibilities in the same local area.

Thirteenth. For the long pull, it appears that the major justification for the relocation of the ARDC headquarters was the construction of a new headquarters building at Wright Field proper. The only additional problem lies in the provision of more housing under the Capehart Act, or by local construction firms. This, from the standpoint of morale and well-being of personnel in the most critical categories, would be the simplest, most straightforward solution.

Fourteenth. The Commander, ARDC, made strong representation last year be-

fore three congressional committees, in which some of the foregoing facts and many other detailed and related matters were brought to the attention of the congressional committees, with the House committees fully supporting the location of headquarters ARDC at Wright-Patterson.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SCHENCK) speaks on his amendment you give this matter your serious attention, because I am convinced that the Secretary of the Air Force made a bad decision when he went against the advice of the Air Force leaders, the unanimous advice of the House Committee on Armed Services, and the express wishes of the House of Representatives and soon after he took office issued orders to transfer this ARDC installation to Andrews Field.

I hope all the Members will support the Schenck amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT).

(Mr. FLYNT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

#### FORT BENNING A MODEL OF WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AND GAME CONSERVATION

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, in the light of many loose and unfair charges being made that our military personnel are willfully killing game and taking fish on service reservations in violation of State laws and conservation practices, I include herewith an article from the Army and Navy Journal of July 7, 1956, on wildlife management at the Army's huge reservation at Fort Benning, Ga. Further, I am assured that similar programs are in force at many other service installations. The report on Fort Benning's commendable program follows:

#### FORT BENNING CITED AS MODEL OF WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AND GAME CONSERVATION

The fish and game preserve on Fort Benning's 182,000-acre military reservation is one of the richest and best regulated wildlife sanctuaries in the Southland.

That it is so can be credited largely to the Fort Benning Fish and Game Management Association, a voluntary group which has been working since 1949 to make the area abundant with natural life.

The association is an organization of sportsmen, limited in membership to active military personnel on duty at Fort Benning, members of their families, retired military personnel living in the Columbus, Ga., area, and disabled veterans.

Its aim is to conserve wildlife while at the same time affording its members hunting and fishing grounds where they can indulge in their sport within the limits of the game laws of the States of Georgia and Alabama.

The association's new president is Col. Lester L. Wheeler, United States Army, who recently succeeded Brig. Gen. Frederick R. Zierath, United States Army.

To create and maintain a game refuge on the Fort Benning reservation strict laws and regulations were adopted by the association. These are rigidly enforced by a group of 12 men known as Range Guards, who operate under the supervision of the Infantry Center Provost Marshal's Section. Although their duties vary, they are, essentially, game wardens. They are under the immediate command of 2d Lt. Edward B. Rogers, United States Army, Fort Benning's fish and game officer. Lieutenant Rogers is a graduate of the University of Georgia with a degree in

forestry, with a minor in wildlife management.

In addition to seeing that the association's laws are observed, the Range Guards also carry out the group's restocking and feeding program. They plant and maintain some 500 acres of feed patches around the reservation. Also, they supervise prescribed areas for proper biological balance in fish and wildlife control. This balance entails lake restocking and fertilizing, game feeding and trapping predatory animals. Last season, for example, more than 1,000 predatory animals, such as bobcats, opossums and skunks, were exterminated, thereby greatly increasing the game population for the 1955 season.

One program which began last year, but which will be enlarged, is the planting of aquatic foods for migratory fowl. In the past, fowl stopped only for a short while on the reservation. Finding inadequate food, they soon moved on. To remedy this condition, a relatively small area was planted this year. A larger area will be planted next year.

The bag limit set down by the association, as well as the opening and closing dates for the various hunting and fishing seasons, follow the State laws of Georgia and Alabama, since the reservation overlaps into both States. Although the States' seasons permit hunting from opening to closing dates, Fort Benning limits hunting to Wednesday afternoons, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, while still observing the inclusive dates as prescribed by the States.

Last year, Fort Benning opened its deer season early. Critics of this failed to take into consideration that it was opened early by special permission of the Georgia and Alabama Fish and Game Commissions so that members of the Third Infantry Division would have an opportunity to hunt prior to leaving the post for Exercise Sage Brush.

The association also has been charged with allowing the shooting last year of does as well as bucks. This is true. But permission was given by the Georgia Game Commission to reduce the population of surplus old does. However, does were shot only in the Georgia area, since Alabama did not give specific approval for the killing of does.

By and large, at a time when House Interior Committee is hearing charges that military reservations around the United States are flouting State game and fish laws, Fort Benning is in the enviable position of being considered by Federal and Georgia State experts to be the Nation's most productive military wildlife preserves.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming the rule rather than the exception that when appropriation bills come before this House there is a rule waiving points of order. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] says that this rule is made necessary by virtue of the fact that it refers to some law which has not as yet been enacted.

I contend that the rule is also made necessary because of legislation in connection with the Jones Point Bridge for which \$14,325,000 would be appropriated under the terms of this bill, the Jones Point Bridge to be built across the Potomac River down at Alexandria, Va., at the expense of all the taxpayers of the country. There is legislation concerning that appropriation in this bill despite what the gentleman from Virginia may say.

I certainly was prepared to raise a point of order against the legislation in connection with the construction of that bridge and it is becoming something close to an affront to the House to bring these appropriation bills in here under rules waiving points of order.

We might just as well throw out the rule book so far as points of order on appropriation bills are concerned if this sort of thing is going to continue.

The rules specifically provide that appropriation bills shall not be brought into the House containing legislation. If there was some emergency, I could understand waiving points of order, and certainly I would go along, but you can read this bill backward and forward and you will not find a single item in this bill of an emergency nature.

Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of the House to give serious consideration to what is happening when repeatedly rules are being brought in waiving points of order on appropriation bills.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question asked by the gentleman from Iowa a little while ago, I find that I did not give him accurate information on it, and I want to correct my previous statement and explain the purport of the item relating to Jones Point Bridge so far as the point of order is concerned.

So far as the construction of the bridge is concerned, it is water over the dam. It has been authorized by both bodies and signed by the President. It is a very much needed project, not for Virginia or Maryland but for the District of Columbia and the Federal Government itself in getting its people back and forth over the river, where you all know congested conditions exist and have existed for a long time and are getting worse all the time.

Now, so far as the point of order is concerned, I was not aware of it until it was pointed out to me a moment ago after I had replied to the gentleman from Iowa. There is a provision on page 4 in the nature of a proviso which says:

*Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, is hereby merged with this appropriation.

It does not increase the appropriation but just merges the previous appropriation with this appropriation and throws it all into one pot.

Then there is a proviso which I think is not subject to a point of order because it is a limitation on the appropriation and favors the point of view which the gentleman from Iowa takes. That proviso reads:

That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the final consummation of agreements for the maintenance and operation of the bridge and approaches by the States of Virginia and Maryland.

If those things constitute objectionable points of order, of course, it is up to the House what they want to do about it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote of the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 361, nays 30, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—361

Abbutt	Coudert	Healey
Abernethy	Cramer	Hébert
Adair	Cretella	Henderson
Addonizio	Cunningham	Herlong
Albert	Curtis, Mass.	Hiestand
Alexander	Dague	Hill
Allen, Calif.	Davidson	Hillings
Allen, Ill.	Davis, Ga.	Hinshaw
Andresen,	Dawson, Ill.	Hoeven
August H.	Dawson, Utah	Hollfield
Andrews	Deane	Holland
Anfuso	Delaney	Holmes
Arends	Dempsey	Holt
Ashley	Denton	Holtzman
Ashmore	Derounian	Hope
Aspinall	Devereux	Horan
Auchincloss	Diggs	Hosmer
Avery	Dingell	Huddleston
Ayres	Dixon	Hull
Bailey	Dodd	Hyde
Baker	Dollinger	Ikard
Baldwin	Dolliver	Jackson
Barrett	Dondero	James
Bass, N. H.	Donohue	Jarman
Bates	Dorn, N. Y.	Jenkins
Baumhart	Dorn, S. C.	Jennings
Beamer	Dowdy	Jensen
Becker	Doyle	Johnson, Calif.
Belcher	Durham	Johnson, Wis.
Bennett, Fla.	Edmondson	Jonas
Bennett, Mich.	Elliott	Jones, Ala.
Bentley	Ellsworth	Jones, Mo.
Betts	Engle	Jones, N. C.
Blatnik	Fallon	Judd
Boggs	Fascell	Karsten
Boland	Feighan	Kean
Bolling	Fenton	Kearns
Bolton,	Fernandez	Kee
Frances P.	Fino	Kelly, N. Y.
Bolton,	Fisher	Keogh
Oliver P.	Fjare	Kilburn
Bonner	Flood	Kilday
Bosch	Flynt	Kilgore
Bowler	Fogarty	King, Calif.
Boykin	Forand	King, Pa.
Boyle	Ford	Kirwan
Bray	Forrester	Klein
Brooks, La.	Fountain	Knox
Brown, Ga.	Frazier	Knutson
Brown, Ohio	Frelinghuysen	Krueger
Brownson	Friedel	Laird
Broyhill	Fulton	Landrum
Buckley	Garmatz	Lanham
Budge	Gary	Lankford
Burdick	Gathings	Latham
Burnside	Gavin	LeCompte
Bush	Gentry	Lesinski
Byrd	George	Lipscomb
Byrne, Pa.	Gordon	Long
Canfield	Grant	McCarthy
Cannon	Gray	McCormack
Carlyle	Green, Ore.	McCulloch
Carrigg	Green, Pa.	McDonough
Cederberg	Gregory	McGregor
Celler	Griffiths	McIntire
Chase	Gubser	McMillan
Chatham	Hagen	McVey
Chelf	Haley	Macdonald
Chenoweth	Halleck	Machrowicz
Chipperfield	Hand	Mack, Ill.
Christopher	Harden	Mack, Wash.
Chudoff	Hardy	Madden
Clark	Harris	Magnuson
Clevenger	Harrison, Nebr.	Mahon
Colmer	Harrison, Va.	Mailliard
Cooley	Hays, Ark.	Marshall
Coon	Hays, Ohio	Martin
Cooper	Hayworth	Matthews

Meador	Ray	Staggers
Morrow	Reece, Tenn.	Sullivan
Metcalf	Reed, N. Y.	Talle
Miller, Calif.	Reuss	Taylor
Miller, Md.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Teague, Calif.
Miller, Neb.	Rhodes, Pa.	Teague, Tex.
Miller, N. Y.	Richards	Thomas
Mills	Riehlman	Thompson, N. J.
Minahall	Riley	Thompson, Tex.
Mollohan	Rivers	Thompson, Wyo.
Morano	Roberts	Tollefson
Morrison	Robeson, Va.	Trimble
Moss	Robson, Ky.	Tuck
Moulder	Rodino	Tumulty
Multer	Rogers, Colo.	Udall
Mumma	Rogers, Fla.	Ull
Murray, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.	Vanik
Natcher	Rogers, Tex.	Velde
Nicholson	Rooney	Vinson
Norblad	Roosevelt	Vorys
Norrell	Rutherford	Wainwright
O'Brien, Ill.	Sadiak	Walter
O'Brien, N. Y.	St. George	Watts
O'Hara, Ill.	Saylor	Weaver
O'Neill	Schenck	Westland
Osmer	Scherer	Whitten
Ostertag	Schwengel	Widnall
Patterson	Scott	Wigglesworth
Pelly	Scrivner	Williams, N. J.
Perkins	Seely-Brown	Williams, N. Y.
Pfost	Seiden	Wills
Philbin	Sheehan	Wilson, Calif.
Phillips	Shelley	Wilson, Ind.
Plicher	Sheppard	Winstead
Pillion	Shuford	Wolcott
Poage	Sikes	Wolverton
Poff	Siler	Wright
Powell	Simpson, Ill.	Yates
Preston	Sisk	Young
Price	Smith, Kans.	Younger
Quigley	Smith, Miss.	Zablocki
Rabaut	Smith, Va.	Zelenko
Radwan	Spence	
Rains	Springer	

## NAYS—30

Alger	Hale	Smith, Wis.
Andersen,	Harvey	Taber
H. Carl	Heseltan	Thompson,
Bow	Hess	Mich.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.	Van Pelt
Church	Johansen	Vursell
Corbett	Keating	Wharton
Crumpacker	Mason	Wler
Curtis, Mo.	O'Konski	Williams,
Dies	Prouty	Miss.
Gross	Rees, Kans.	Withrow

## NOT VOTING—41

Barden	Gamble	Passman
Bass, Tenn.	Gwinn	Patman
Bell	Hoffman, Ill.	Polk
Berry	Kearney	Priest
Blicht	Kelley, Pa.	Scudder
Brooks, Tex.	Kluczynski	Short
Burleson	Lane	Sieminski
Carnahan	Lovre	Simpson, Pa.
Cole	McConnell	Steed
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	Thompson, La.
Davis, Wis.	Morgan	Thornberry
Donovan	Murray, Tenn.	Van Zandt
Eberhart	Nelson	Wickersham
Evins	O'Hara, Minn.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Patman with Mr. Lovre.  
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Cole.  
 Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Short.  
 Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. Bell with Mr. Van Zandt.  
 Mr. Morgan with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.  
 Mr. Barden with Mr. Gwinn.  
 Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Nelson.  
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. McConnell.  
 Mr. Evins with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.  
 Mr. Polk with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.  
 Mr. Priest with Mr. Kearney.  
 Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Scudder.  
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Gamble.  
 Mr. Burleson with Mr. Berry.

Mr. HALEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. REES of Kansas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

## QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. On July 9, 1956, beginning at page 11015 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there appears a statement, which, among other things, includes the rollcall of the vote on H. R. 7535, known as the Federal aid to education bill, and the vote on the Powell amendment to that bill.

The statement gives the names and the manner in which the individual Members of the House voted on the adoption of the Powell amendment and the passage of the bill, and the State from which each Member voting came, as well as the political affiliation of each Member.

A Member of the other body, referring to the House, among other things, said:

Mr. President, the Washington Post and Times Herald in an editorial on July 7, correctly referred to the Republican vote on the Powell amendment as "cynical politicking." The Post editorial says "Having squeezed what benefit they could out of voting for a rider that doomed the bill to death, most Republicans joined callously in burying it."

The statement also included the editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald, captioned "Ignoring the Children," which, among other things, stated:

The measure was put to death by a combination of prejudice and politicking in an atmosphere of confusion and flagging discreditable to Democrats and Republicans alike, and to the House itself as a lawmaking body.

Both parties must share the blame for unconscionable jockeying for political advantage over the formula for allocation of Federal funds in aid of education.

It is difficult to interpret this as anything but cynical politicking.

Many who are now of school age will suffer an irreparable injury from the shabby conduct of the House of Representatives on Thursday. They have been denied a part of their American birthright.

The RECORD further discloses that from the floor of the Senate, the following statements were made:

If the President's health, or recuperation, or concern over personal political problems, prevented him from exerting some personal influence and leadership in behalf of school construction, where were those junior presidents, Sherman Adams and James C. Hagerty, who have always seemed able to assert White House leadership when they really want to?

No Member of the Senate, perhaps, has been any more dedicated to preserving the civil rights of all our people than I have.

On page A5384 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under date of July 9, 1956, there is a statement captioned "Ignoring the Children" in which the edito-

rial previously referred to is again quoted.

Inasmuch as the statement shows how the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan voted on the Powell amendment and on final passage of the bill when that statement is coupled with the editorial from which quotations have just been made, it is obvious that it was made in violation of the rules of the House, if not of the other body, that it violates the rule of comity prevailing in the Congress, and that it adversely affects the rights, the reputation, and conduct individually in his representative capacity of the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and charges that his vote on H. R. 7535 and amendments thereto were motivated, brought about by improper influences to which he yielded.

Mr. Speaker, I have, in that same connection, a question of the privilege of the House, and in order to save time and consolidate the matter, I ask that they be considered together, if that is possible.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, they can be considered together.

There was no objection.

## QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House and offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk. I ask to be heard on the question of privilege and on the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, on July 9, 1956, beginning at page 11015 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there appears a statement, which, among other things, includes the rollcall of the vote on H. R. 7535, known as the Federal aid to education bill, and the vote on the Powell amendment to that bill. The statement gives the names and the manner in which the individual Members of the House voted on the adoption of the Powell amendment and the passage of the bill, and the State from which each Member voting came, as well as the political affiliation of each Member.

Then followed the same statements quoted in my previous statement and which will not be here repeated.

Mr. Speaker, the quotations previously read in connection with the question of personal privilege are in violation of the rule of comity which exists in the Congress, they adversely affect the rights of the House collectively, its safety, its dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings in that, among other things, the quotations charged that the House acted from improper motives and because of improper influence. They raise a question of the privilege of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I offer a resolution (H. Res. 588) which has to do with the question of the privilege of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, whereas in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 1956, certain articles appear which reflect upon the integrity of the House as a whole in its representative capacity, and upon individual Members of the House; and

Whereas such statements tend to disgrace, degrade, and render ineffective the actions of the Members of the House; and

Whereas the statements so made and carried in the Record adversely affect the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House hereby by the adoption of this resolution most respectfully requests that the other body expunge from its records the rollcall votes and remarks appearing on pages 11016-11017 and the remarks appearing on page A5384 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 1956, under the caption "Ignoring the Children"; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Presiding Officer of the other body.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be allowed to meet this afternoon during general debate for testimony only.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe there has been some agreement on this side that no committee will be permitted to sit while the House is in session. If the gentleman's request includes that, I will have to go along with my colleagues on this side and object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12138) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make 2 unanimous consent requests; first, that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter. I do that in order to save time during the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, second I ask unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to 2 hours, one-half of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

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 consideration of the bill H. R. 12138, with Mr. KILDAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this bill is largely a matter of routine. It is the supplemental appropriation bill—we used to call it a deficiency bill—which is always brought in at the end of the session, making provision for certain regular supply items and for supplemental appropriations. It naturally concerns practically every department of the Government.

The bill is made up by chapters. Each chapter represents supplementals or general appropriations for the year ending June 30, 1957. The bill includes 13 chapters and will be handled seriatim by the chairmen of the respective subcommittees. It embraces, with one possible exception so far as I am aware, nothing of a controversial nature. It consists largely of routine stereotyped matter and procedure. We are tying up all the loose ends and preparing for adjournment with the expectation that we will have provided enough money to carry all departments at least up to the next session in January.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a small bill. All budget estimates considered aggregated \$1,222,849,525. Apparently on the face of the bill it is \$332,685,900 in excess of the budget estimates. However, that excess is merely apparent, as it does not take into consideration the savings made through rescissions, principally in the Armed Services chapter of the bill. When that is taken into consideration, we actually present a bill which is \$32,300,000 less than the estimate submitted to the committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for \$1,555,535,425 of appropriations. I served on one of the subcommittees that was involved in it, and there is a cut of \$625,500. There are other cuts involved, some of which are very good in proportion to the amount asked for. On the other hand, the committee felt they should increase the direct appropriation available for the Military Establishment's construction program.

The construction program is crippled by an amendment which appears on page 10 of the bill as section 309. That is drawn in such shape that if a project the Department starts goes sour it cannot take the money away from it. It has to go on through with it.

They indicate in their report that they want to accomplish something different from that. Whether or not they can supply any language that will accomplish what they want to do, whether or not the provision will be worded so as to accomplish that, I do not know. If they can, I would be willing to go along with it. If they cannot, I think that provision

should be stricken out. Suppose you get a project started for an airfield in France or somewhere like that and France tells us that we cannot stay any longer, or something like that happens. This is pure supposition. I do not mean they have that tendency now. We would not be able to stop the construction work on it. We would have to go on just the same.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. I am in complete agreement with the gentleman's desire to be able to stop projects that should be stopped. It was not in any way the intention of the Defense Subcommittee to bring about the condition which the gentleman fears. Between now and the time the bill is ready for amendment, I should be glad to work with the gentleman in an effort to arrive at some agreement in regard to a change in the language. Of course the gentleman can always offer a motion to strike out the language in the bill.

Mr. TABER. I simply feel that I should call attention to it at this point because I do not feel it is safe to have that kind of language in the bill. I would like to have it corrected, and if it is not corrected it might better be stricken out, in my opinion. But I felt that I should call attention to it and I have done so. I do not think I care to make any extensive comment on the question at this time.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.  
Mr. CANNON. Section 309, which the gentleman has just discussed, is the section on which the gentleman and I are in complete accord as to its general objective. But we have here a proposition which might be the means of turning over to the departments duties and prerogatives of the House the determination of how much money shall be provided and how it shall be used. The Government is wisely divided into three sections—the legislative, judicial, and executive. They are not to encroach upon each other's jurisdiction as laid down in the Constitution. To the legislative branch exclusively belongs the function of appropriating money. From time immemorial, the departments have sought a voice in how much money shall be appropriated for them and how they shall use it after they get it. We have for a long time been trying to bring the situation down to where the appropriations are to be made by the Congress and the action of the Congress accepted and observed by the departments. The money appropriated by Congress shall be administered by the departments in accordance with the directions and for the purposes for which the money was provided by the Congress and not for other purposes desired by the departments.

To insure control of the pursestrings by the Congress rather than by the departments, we have in recent years finally completed and enacted a satisfactory antideficiency law. The purpose of the antideficiency law is to place in

the Congress complete control of the appropriation machinery, rather than in the departments and under this revised enactment it is a penitentiary offense to spend a dollar for a purpose other than that for which appropriated.

Also we have recently enacted a long needed definition of "obligation." But just as fast as we tie these departments down, they try to find some way of slipping out from under the restrictions. And here as usual, regardless of what the Congress does, they are trying to get the money and spend it or refuse to spend it as they please. The gentleman from New York and I are in complete agreement that Congress should appropriate the money and Congress should say how it is to be spent. The departments appear before the committee and have the widest latitude in explaining what money they want and what they expect to do with it. After they have presented their case, the Congress decides whether they have justified their program. After they have had their day in court they should abide by the decision of the Congress. Too often, they have failed to do that. Too often after Congress has appropriated a definite sum of money for a specific purpose, they propose to freeze it and leave it unexpended. In effect they take the position "Congress says that we are to spend it for a certain purpose, but to heck with Congress, we will not spend it at all—or we will spend it for some other purpose." That is in violation of the constitutional prerogatives of the House and is what we are trying to avoid here. After Congress has heard the executive departments, and after they have had their opportunity to present their case, and the Congress has passed upon it, they shall observe both the amount and the purposes which the Congress has incorporated in its appropriation acts.

Section 309 provides for that situation. It speaks for itself. I am anxious to go along with the gentleman from New York to the point where the department shall observe the directions of the Congress. Avoiding any apprehensions the departments may have with respect to sudden emergencies or changed conditions, the Congress is in session the larger part of the year. This year we are to be in recess over a period of something like 5 months; a longer period than the usual recess, but that is exceptional, even that is not too long for the departments, even if in their superior wisdom they feel the Congress has erred and they should take constitutional authority in their own hands.

Sessions of Congress are close enough and the committee staff is always here and the subcommittees can assemble on short notice. The Constitution while somewhat shopworn is not yet completely outmoded.

Mr. TABER. I think this language should be straightened out, if possible. If it is not, I think this section should be stricken out. I agree that the approach should be that the department should do what the Congress laid out for them. On the other hand, I do not like to see it in such shape that there is no opportunity for the Government

to be pulled out in the event that these projects go sour or become no longer needed. I hope as we go along we will be able to cover that.

I do not think there is anything more I care to say unless someone desires to ask a question.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have read this section very carefully. Where does the gentleman find that the language incorporated in section 309 has changed the present authority of the Department of Defense?

Mr. TABER. Well, at the present time the Defense Department or the Budget may impound funds.

Mr. SHEPPARD. They still can under this language.

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Oh, yes, they can.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would listen while I read:

No funds appropriated for military construction shall be made available to the respective military departments in a manner so as to restrict the application of funds to any specific project or installation.

That practically means that they cannot touch funds that are made applicable to any particular project or installation. After it starts there is no way to stop it. That is where the trouble is. It says just that. I do not like to see the Government get into that kind of a position.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Of course I do not agree with the gentleman's interpretation. I will admit he has a right to his interpretation, but I have had it interpreted by a legal division of a Government agency involved, and they do not take that interpretation.

Mr. TABER. I have had several contacts since this thing came up, and that is the conclusion I came to, not only on my own reading of the thing, but on my talks with these other people.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I believe it is not the intention of Congress to deprive the Secretary of Defense of control of the Defense Department at all, in the exercise of authority which it now has.

Mr. TABER. If that is the case, and we say, so, that would satisfy me. If we would put in here just that, "This is not intended to deprive the Department of Defense or its controllers or the budget of any authority that they now have."

If we would add that or similar language I would be satisfied.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is it the gentleman's contention that this is a restriction or not a restriction upon the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. TABER. It is my contention that after moneys are allocated to a project and it gets started they must go right straight through with it without and possibility of salvage or anything of that kind in the event the project goes

sour or is not needed. That is what I do not like about it.

Mr. GROSS. I think the criticism of the provision is that there is no restriction on it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, chapter IV of this bill, beginning on page 10, of the bill and chapter III of the report, beginning on page 8, relate to the Department of Defense. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is chairman of that subcommittee, and at this time I yield him 20 minutes.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AND THE INSECURITY OF OUR OVERSEAS BASES

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us insofar as the appropriation of funds is concerned is largely a bill for military construction. The direct appropriations in the bill, without taking into consideration the transfer of funds from other accounts which have been previously appropriated, amount to \$1,826,000,000 for military public works. If you add to that money which the Defense Department now has which has not been obligated you run that figure up to \$2,699,000,000 for military public works in this country and overseas for this fiscal year. If you take into consideration funds available in this bill and unexpended funds as of June 30, 1956, the total funds available for expenditure after the passage of this bill for military public works will be \$4,500,000,000. So we are talking about a very sizable measure here before us.

#### FOREIGN AID AND THE DEFENSE PROGRAM

Yesterday there was considerable comment in the House in regard to our overseas bases and how secure those bases were for the defense of the United States. I look at our defense program about like this: We are spending about \$35 billion a year for the Army, Navy, and Air Force; we are spending about \$3½ billion for foreign aid which we hope is American aid. In other words, we are spending about 10 percent of the defense appropriations for assistance to countries overseas, for military assistance and otherwise. If we should eliminate all foreign-aid programs, all military assistance overseas; if we should write off all our friends overseas we would probably have to increase this defense appropriation bill by \$10 billion or \$15 billion a year.

Always when the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, and the members of the Joint Chiefs appear before the Appropriations Committee, at one time or another they are asked to state whether or not additional funds would be required for the Army, Navy, and Air Force should there be no foreign-aid program. Without exception and throughout the entire foreign-aid program these high military officials of the Government have always said that vast additional billions would be required were it not for the foreign-aid program. It is much cheaper to equip and finance a native soldier in Turkey or some other foreign area than to maintain an American soldier overseas.



Of course, the program takes on different aspects from country to country. Generally speaking, we spend about 10 percent of the defense budget on foreign aid. We spend about 5 percent of the defense budget on the atomic energy program. That is about the way the defense program stacks up. Of course, it is an unfortunate fact that neither our foreign-aid program nor our military-defense program at home is free from waste and error.

As I said, references have been made to the hazardous aspects of our overseas program of military bases. There are \$400 million in this bill for overseas air bases alone and it is about these overseas bases that I would like to speak to you briefly today.

If foreign soldiers in large numbers were quartered in Washington and in other areas of the United States that would represent a very abnormal and unnatural situation, a very precarious situation, a situation which would more or less be calculated to bring on friction and difficulty. The situation is no different overseas. We have these large numbers of military bases, we have our military personnel overseas in free and sovereign countries. It is a difficult situation, it is bringing about friction, it has brought about friction in Iceland to the extent that we may not be there for very long.

Of course, any Member of the House of Representatives who is opposed to our overseas bases could offer an amendment to strike from this bill the funds in it, running into the hundreds of millions of dollars, for further construction of overseas bases. Most of these funds are not for new bases, they are for the completion of existing bases. I think we ought to face up frankly to the situation with which we are confronted. I would say if no one offered such an amendment it could be assumed that the Members of the House approve the program for overseas bases and the implementation thereof as carried in this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How can the average Member know how many bases there are, where the bases are to be constructed?

Mr. MAHON. I think it would be necessary for Members to read the reports, to study the bill and to have a general overall idea of the complete situation. I recognize that no Member of Congress could get up and say: We want to knock out this overseas base, we want to keep that one. It is an overall question of whether we want to withdraw our forces and our contacts from abroad and rely for our defense solely on Fortress America and provide the additional billions for defense which the adoption of this concept would require. Do we want to adopt the Fortress America concept or do we want to keep these bases overseas in our possession, bases which constitute a ring around the U. S. S. R.?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, how many overseas bases have we at this time?

Mr. MAHON. Well, I do not have the total figure for all services in mind at the moment. I understand that the Air Force has 145 major airbases outside the continental United States. This includes bases in Alaska, Newfoundland, Labrador, Hawaii, and other areas of a like nature. The other two services have a number of installations overseas, but not nearly as many as the Air Force.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Nine hundred, as I get the information from the Department.

Mr. MAHON. Well, 900 is certainly erroneous, if you are speaking of major bases. If you include each individual communications station and like installation, then the total would be several hundred.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is wrong?

Mr. MAHON. That is very much wrong if we are referring to major installations. It is a question of terminology.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the answer they gave me. Maybe it is wrong. Does not the gentleman realize—we will leave the average Member out of it—but the Member from Michigan is almost wholly dependent upon the members of the committee to get that information.

Mr. MAHON. I recognize the difficulties which the gentleman describes. But this is an issue that is so big and represents so many hundreds of millions of dollars that every Member ought to know something about it, and it is for that reason that I have decided to make a statement about it. And, if I may be permitted to proceed a little while, then I will yield later, but I want to make my statement, and I think the gentleman will be interested in it. This is a very serious situation, as I say.

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

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

Mr. HALLECK. I just want to commend the gentleman. I am happy that he is putting these facts before us, because I am quite convinced that it is the failure to understand the purposes of these overseas bases and their usefulness in our own defense that causes so much confusion and concern in the country. I think if the people could have heard the gentleman's statement and understood it, they would know that these overseas bases are the first line of defense for the United States of America and the free world.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is entirely correct. But, I point out how unnatural it is for us to have these bases overseas in these sovereign countries. I point out this, that we are going to lose some of them from time to time, but I will say to the gentleman from Indiana

that perhaps if we lose them all tomorrow they would have already served a most vital purpose. They may have prevented World War III and the expenditure of several billions of dollars and many lives. It is a very important point, and the fact that the base at Keflavik, in Iceland, is threatened—I do not think the base will be lost, but the fact that it is threatened has caused us to, I think, look at this important question again. It is something that the committee has been looking at all the time, and I think, to use Mr. HOFFMAN's words, the average Member of Congress ought to look at it, and that is the reason I am making these remarks.

I read from, I think, the most authoritative magazine that comes to our desk, and I read the following headline: "United States Bases Overseas Going, Going—." And, I think the implication is "gone" is going to be the next thing.

The first paragraph of that story is:

The next few weeks will tell whether or not the United States will be able to keep intact its chain of overseas airbases, built up at great expense in money, time, and effort since World War II.

There is some truth in the statement which I have just read.

Now, I would like to just take a look at some of these bases. Since we are talking about Iceland, which is very much in our minds, let us take a look at Iceland. There is no money in this bill for the base in Iceland, but on the airbase in Iceland we have already spent \$107 million. We have a right to stay in Iceland for 18 months after a decision to terminate the agreement or the life of NATO or for 20 years, beginning to run when NATO was created. Of course, the right to remain is renewable—if we and Iceland so agree.

Look at Greenland. In this bill we have \$6 million for bases in Greenland, but we have already appropriated for Thule, just one base in Greenland, \$225 million, and most of it has been spent. There are other bases in Greenland, running the expenditure for overseas bases in Greenland, under the jurisdiction of Denmark, around \$300 million.

Look at Newfoundland and Labrador. We have already spent \$271 million there, and we have in this bill \$48 million. And, if this program is wrong, we ought to have stopped it yesterday.

Now, in Morocco we are in a very difficult situation. We have in this bill \$27 million for bases in French Morocco; that is, for the improvement of those bases. We have already appropriated—and most of it has been spent—\$355 million on the bases in French Morocco, and you know the difficulty between the French and the Moroccans.

We are now negotiating with the Arabs of Morocco for the further occupancy of these bases. The truth is we are over the barrel. We have spent our \$355 million. Some wise man may say, "Well, why did you do that?" But it was done at a time when it appeared that world war III was in the offing. It was done on a crash program. And it is well that it was done. But in my judgment, we

must recognize the difficulties involved. Of course, the people in Morocco would like to have \$400 million a year, perhaps, for our occupancy of the bases there. We cannot and would not pay it. So we have got to negotiate with the Arabs for a continuation of that program, which is an unhappy situation. But when you deal with sovereign countries you must take into account the facts of life. For the Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya in North Africa we have in this bill \$2½ million. We have already appropriated in previous years \$70 million. Our tenure there is until 1970.

Of course, these can always be renewed; that is, if the two countries agree.

In the Azores we have in this bill \$4,200,000 for a base there. We have already appropriated \$77 million. Our base rights in the Azores expire in December of this year. We are now negotiating for the continuation of that tenure.

In Bermuda we have a 99-year lease, negotiated just before World War II. We have \$17 million in the bill for that base. We have spent previously \$57 million.

In Spain we have a terrific program. It is a kind of combination of foreign aid and military aid. The program in Spain calls for the expenditure of \$827 million. About half of that is for the bases and about half is for economic aid of one kind or another. We are in the midst of that program. We are constructing 4 big bases. Some additional bases are on the schedule for future consideration.

We have in this bill for Spain \$37 million. We have already spent on the program there for air bases—American Air Force Bases—\$127 million. That is, we have made those funds available.

The Navy has a program in Spain in excess of \$80 million. So we have a very large program there. The late and able Admiral Sherman originally negotiated for those bases. It was necessary to get bases in Spain, which are very important to us, and to do that it was necessary for our Government to make certain economic concessions and advances in order to raise the economic standard of the people of Spain. So, as I say, that is an \$800 million program.

Here is another very big program, the cost figure will almost shock you, if we can be shocked any more by big figures. In Alaska, since 1950, we have provided \$900 million in funds for the Army, Navy and Air Force, just short of \$1 billion.

For our worldwide radar network, the radar fence, the DEW line, the Pine Tree line and other lines for radar to detect the approach of the enemy to an overseas base or to an American city or industrial complex we have provided in this and in previous bills the sum of \$796 million, a very sizable program.

We have gone into great detail from time to time as to the tenure on our overseas bases. We would like to have ironclad assurances that we can stay on them as long as we want to, but those are free countries and we cannot get that assurance.

I mentioned that in connection with NATO the tenure is for a 20-year period

beginning in 1949 and it can be renewed if the powers agree. It is on a 10-year basis in Spain, where we are paying \$825 million. It is renewable. If we should happen to leave, there is an agreement with Spain that we will be reimbursed for some of the physical properties we would leave there. There is no real agreement with England as to tenure. It is just an open-end affair, but perhaps that is as good as any of the rest of the agreements.

It is not possible to get an agreement to stay in a sovereign country any longer than the people in that country want you to stay. I discussed the situation in Morocco. I think we must face up to this. When you vote for the \$400 million here just for airbases alone, plus funds for Army and Navy requirements, you might just as well face up to this, that any time any country in the world says, "You must pack up and go home," we can do only one of two things. We can pack up and go home or we can go to war in order to stay there. That is the very precarious position which we occupy in regard to our overseas bases.

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

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. In other words, we are in these various countries as a guest of these countries and not as an occupying, victorious group, so that, being guests, any time our hosts find that they do not want us in the house any more, they can do to us just as we would to guests in our own home, ask them kindly to make their departure.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

I do not believe this matter has heretofore been presented in as brutal and factual a way in the House in general debate as the situation really warrants.

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

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

Mr. HALEY. Would it not be a fair statement to say that the committee and the Congress as a whole must follow the advice of the people who have the responsibility for the defense of this country? That is as far as we can go.

Mr. MAHON. I think we need to receive their advice, consider their advice and, if we differ with them, argue about it with them. Then, if we are positively sure they are wrong and we have the better proposal, I think it is up to us to propose it because I think we do have a definite responsibility.

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas this one question to bring this all up in a bundle. We have only one potential aggressor. What we have done in effect is to bring those bases in a sort of a semi-circle around that potential aggressor, starting in Alaska and going through

Japan, Korea, the Philippines, southern Asia, with the single exception of India, Pakistan, Turkey, Greece and Italy, France, Germany, and England. Is not that true? We have brought any area of the potential aggressor within the range of our planes within a few hours.

Mr. MAHON. We have brought them within that range or are bringing them within that range.

In order to get that in proper perspective, let us assume for a moment that the Soviets had bases in the Caribbean, bases in Canada, and bases offshore in the Atlantic and the Pacific. We could then realize the terrific advantage our country does have in this perilous world. We can also realize why the Soviets will dedicate any effort and any money that may be advantageously expended from their viewpoint in order to dislodge us from the overseas bases. It is a very important operation from our standpoint and from theirs.

Mr. SPRINGER. And in the maintenance of these bases in these countries, this is in our own self interest; is it not and that is why we are maintaining these bases are over the world.

Mr. MAHON. Correct. That is the reason we are providing the funds. I think even if the program blows up eventually it has perhaps already been worth the money. But, I am convinced it will not blow up in the near future.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I notice on page 33 of the report, there are three items that I think should be explained. They are as follows:

Various TACAN-----	\$1,160,000
Various locations, special-----	1,240,000
Aircraft control and warning---	148,458,000

I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas whether or not this appropriation in these amounts means that the military now is setting up their own airways and the operation of their own airways.

Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman that this is not in conflict with the agreement between Civil Aeronautics and the military as to the phasing in of different control programs within this country. Some of these stations are set up for classification purposes. There is secrecy involved in some of these operations around the world and there are difficulties in setting forth the whole picture.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman say whether or not the military is now adopting TACAN as their distance measuring instrument as against the VOR, DME used by civilian aircraft?

Mr. MAHON. I think they are in the process of adopting the TACAN program over a period of years. I think it comes out of an agreement which has been reached with the CAA and with the Department of Defense. Insofar as we were able to determine in our hearings this year, there is no longer any controversy with regard to that question.

Mr. BOW. Do we understand that there is nothing in this that will establish a separate airways for the military in

1956

this country and that they will be controlled by the CAA?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is absolutely correct in that statement.

Mr. BOW. So that we will have no confusion in the air between the two agencies?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit a brief summary as to construction funds provided in the pending bill for Army, Navy, and Air Force. Before doing so perhaps I should point out that in the regular military appropriations bill which I presented to the House earlier this year approximately \$34.5 billion were provided for the general overall program for the Department of Defense, exclusive of military construction. In the bill now before us the total value of new programs submitted to the committee by the three services was estimated at \$2,967,000,000, divided as follows: Army, \$351 million; Navy, \$445-million; Air Force, \$2,161,000,000.

The appropriations requested to finance the above programs are as follows: Army, \$193 million; Navy, \$400 million; Air Force, \$1,228,000,000. Of this total of \$1,826,000,000, the amount of \$785 million was recommended to be derived by transfer from other funds previously made available to the services.

The committee has approved for funding a total program of approximately \$2,305,000,000, or a reduction of \$662 million most of which is applied to the Air Force.

The full amount of the budget estimate, \$1,826,450,000, was approved by the committee, except that the amount of \$428 million, rather than \$785 million, is to be derived by transfer. The committee felt that instead of a proposed transfer of \$357 million from the Army stock fund to the Air Force for construction purposes, a better and more clean-cut procedure would be to make a direct appropriation, which was done. However, this action will have no effect on the United States Treasury, because at the same time the committee recommends a rescission of \$357 million in the Army stock fund.

The total appropriation of \$1,398,450,000 included in the bill will be augmented by an estimated unobligated balance of \$873 million, making a total of \$2,699,450,000 available for obligation in fiscal year 1957.

As to expenditures in 1957, the total availability for this purpose will be approximately \$4,526,000,000. Of this amount, approximately \$2,700,000,000 represents unexpended balances as of June 30, 1956.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, the committee has approved the budget estimate of \$400 million for the public-works program of the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 1957. This provides for appropriations of \$165 million in new money and \$200 million to be derived by transfer from the Navy stock fund and \$35 million from the Marine Corps stock fund.

The military public-works program of the Department of the Navy, including those projects presented to the commit-

tee for funding approval in connection with the 1957 program and those which have been approved in the past, but not yet funded, amounts to \$636,764,700. The committee feels that the difference between this program and the total funds available for construction was entirely too great. Therefore the Department of the Navy was requested to analyze its overall program and submit to the committee a priority list containing all of the items in this program listed in order of their essentiality. Using this priority list the committee has approved a funding program of \$541,318,700, a program approximately 20 percent greater than the total available funds of approximately \$451 million which includes \$51 million of unobligated balances from prior year appropriations. Specific details of the committee action will be found in the committee report.

In considering the military construction estimates, the committee did not have available the conference report on the military construction authorization bill.

The bill as reported by the committee is based generally upon the military construction authorization bill as passed by the House of Representatives. Subsequent to reporting this bill to the House, the conference report on the authorization bill has been agreed upon by the House and Senate conferees. This has resulted in the deletion from the authorization bill of funds for certain Navy housing at the Naval Observatory in Washington. Since this item was included in the authorization bill as passed the House, and was given high priority by the Navy, the committee approved the project in the overall construction program set forth in the report accompanying the supplemental appropriation bill. Inasmuch as there is now no authority for this construction, I take this opportunity to inform the House that this item is accordingly stricken from the approved program as set forth in the committee report on page 22, and from section 307 (b) on page 9 of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I have just been handed an excerpt from the editorial page of this afternoon's Washington News which has just reached the newsstands. There is an editorial here castigating the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and me because, as it intimates, we have sabotaged legislation which would save \$4 billion a year. The News has brought this matter up at a time when both of us are recipients of a flood of letters from responsible businessmen all over the country asking us why we are not willing to save \$4 billion a year? It is a very natural and pertinent question.

Four billion dollars is an enormous amount of money. Its purchasing power is so great that the finite mind of man cannot begin to comprehend its vast extent.

But the long and distinguished record of the gentleman from New York, is sufficient guaranty that if it was possible to save that amount of money he would save it. And that is true notwithstanding his efforts to increase administra-

tion expenditures these last few weeks for purposes he formerly opposed.

Incidentally I have saved some billions myself including \$64 billion at one time.

Either of us would be glad to take advantage of the opportunity to save that amount of money.

But of course there is no such opportunity. The assertion that we could save \$4 billion annually is absurd. It is the most fantastic statement that could possibly be made. After it had been circulated through the press of the country, we had the Director of the Budget, Mr. Brundage, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and I asked him how we could save \$4 billion a year or how any agency of Congress could save \$4 billion a year by the enactment of legislation or the adoption of any recommendations that might be made to us along the lines so widely publicized.

He said—and I quote from page 848 of the hearings, part 2, supplemental appropriations bill, 1957—he could not make any estimate because, as he said, it was too intangible. Then he closed by saying: "I feel satisfied that we will save several million dollars."

I said to him, "Several million?" He said, "Yes." Then I said, "There is a great difference between several million and the \$4 billion advertised."

In short, he did not assure us that he could save \$1 million, much less \$4 billion, and at no time was he willing to say positively that he could assure us he could save any specific amount by the use of any device or the adoption of any Hoover Commission recommendation, and this is the Director of the Budget talking.

Then the testimony began to assume a very familiar trend. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has been here a long time, and I have been here with him. Practically every year some department comes up telling us, "We can save a lot of money. Give us an extra amount in our appropriation and we will have millions."

Sure enough, Mr. Brundage began to tell us he would make large savings and asked us for more money in his appropriation. He wanted \$405,000 more than he had this year in order to save something. He did not say how much.

We gave him \$375,000 for extra personnel in the Bureau of the Budget, with the hope that he really could save something. But frankly, I have little hope of getting material results.

I am going to include in the Record at this time an excerpt from page 41 of the report. It is as follows:

## ESTIMATED SAVINGS

The committee wishes to point out, in passing, the dangers of arbitrary and unfounded assumptions as to the value of revisions in financial management and accounting systems per se. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government quoted its task force claiming savings from improved financial management—to amount to \$4 billion. Many well intentioned persons, corporations, and associations have spent much time and money bombarding the Congress and the public to effect these savings. No witness appeared before the committee during con-

sideration of the 1957 budget request to point out, nor could the Director of the Bureau of the Budget at the present hearing identify any part of these savings. It is preposterous to assert that a mere change in recordkeeping, unaccompanied by specific reductions in appropriations, can result in any appreciable savings, let alone such a vast sum as \$4 billion.

The committee is fearful that forcing the entire Federal fiscal structure to the accrued expenditure concept of appropriating is a professional accountant's dream that may well become the taxpayer's nightmare. In approving \$375,000 of the pending estimate for the Bureau, the committee is therefore approving the strengthening of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget, but without subscribing to the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government in their entirety.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Brundage claims he could save several million dollars in connection with the new funds he was getting, without any legislation. This editorial denounced the gentleman and it denounced me because we were opposed to insertion in the bill that was before the Committee on Government Operations a provision to reestablish and require the Congress to operate on the basis of contract authorization instead of appropriation of funds. The appropriation of funds brings before the Congress the exact amount that the projects will cost to completion. Contract authorization brings before the Congress only the initial amount. When you have a contract authorization, perhaps 1 percent of the total which the thing is going to cost will be included, and you can get it through the Congress much easier than you can a big project which will cost a billion dollars or \$600,000,000, or something like that. That is the kind of thing that they tried to fasten on us. You and I both opposed that sort of thing before the Committee on Government Operations, and the Government Operations Committee saw that it was in the interest of the Government to refuse to use the contract authorization business.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, the criticism of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], I think, was certainly out of line and unfounded. The argument all boils down to the simple proposition, if you do what they ask you to do you are giving them, in truth and in effect, the departments downtown, a blank check, because you give them the power to bind the Government by contract. There must be a payday later. Is not that about the situation?

Mr. CANNON. Definitely.

Mr. TABER. And it will cost a lot more money.

Mr. THOMAS. It is bound to; there is no escape from it.

Mr. CANNON. Supplementing what the gentleman from New York has said, the departments ask Congress for contract authority; that is, authority to go out and make contracts for some spe-

cific purpose. They lull us into a sense of security by explaining plausibly that they are not asking for an appropriation, merely an authorization. And on that account we are not so meticulous in screening the proposition.

Armed with contract authority, and without particularly adequate consideration, they contract to spend enormous sums of money, and when we come back next year and find an appalling bill awaiting us and begin to go into the details they say: "This is an incurred liability, you authorized this contract. It has been carried out. There is nothing to do but appropriate the money to pay for it."

It is the most reprehensible form of appropriation legislation, the most dangerous form of extracting money out of the United States Treasury there is. The gentleman from New York opposes it and I oppose it.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. The hearings to which the gentleman from New York and the chairman of the committee are referring were held before the committee presided over by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS]. In view of the fact that some of our constituents have been led to believe that by some little change here in Congress we could save \$4 billion, I think it would be good if all Members could get a copy of the hearings and read them carefully.

I sat through all the hearings with the other members of the subcommittee and listened to Mr. Brundage, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He could not pinpoint the saving of any money.

To try to foist upon the American people this cruel hoax, that Congress could save the huge sum of \$4 billion by a slight change in language is utterly ridiculous and absurd. This hoax ought to be exposed on the floor for what it really is, and I would like to commend the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from New York for their position in this instance, which I think is absolutely correct.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the excerpts to which I made reference.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a consent request.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks just made.)

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

(Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the recommendations in chapter III with respect to the Army, Navy, and Air Force military-construction programs come to you with the unanimous

approval of the three panels of the Armed Service Subcommittee.

They come to you also with the unanimous approval of the subcommittee as a whole and, as far as I know, with the unanimous approval of the full committee.

I shall, therefore, make no extended statement.

The committee has gone into the situation with great care. It has realized the vital importance of this program particularly in the light of new developments in weapons.

It has realized that the overall program cannot be completed in a short time, that it will require a number of years for completion.

After careful consideration it has recommended approval of all funds requested by the Bureau of the Budget for this program in fiscal 1957; namely, \$1,041,450,000 of new money net.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I wonder if the gentleman can reconcile his statement that the committee is granting all money requested with the statement that I find in the report on pages 20 and 21 regarding certain projects which are justified by the committee as being immediately essential to the Navy, while it appears to me there are \$200 million which has not been granted toward essential naval programs.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman is perhaps confusing the amount of funds which the committee recommends be made available with the value of the projects which it has approved as a fiscal 1957 program for the respective departments.

Mr. PELLY. Did the Bureau of the Budget not request any more than the amount allowed by the committee?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. So far as new funds are concerned, the amount recommended is 100 percent of the budget request.

It has been the practice in recent years however, to request approval of a far larger total in projects than the dollars requested for application to projects in any given year.

Mr. PELLY. The ceiling then of \$451 million for naval facilities was put in by the Bureau of the Budget and not by the committee?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. PELLY. I do not want to take the gentleman's time if he is going to be short of time; but I do appreciate his information on this because I am greatly concerned that many of the projects left out are essential ones.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Briefly speaking, the naval program in which the gentleman is interested calls for an appropriation of \$451 million in 1957 to be applied to projects aggregating in the total about \$541,318,700. In other words, there is a 20 percent leeway or elasticity provided for, in the discretion of the Department, but the new funds recommended, as I have stated, are 100 percent of the total requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Similarly if we look at the whole program here—Army, Navy, and Air Force—which, of course, has been thoroughly screened, not only by the Committee on Armed Services but by the Appropriations Committee, you will find that the projects in respect to which the 1957 money may be applied aggregate about \$2,305,000,000, representing a decrease as the result of screening from a figure of about \$2,967,000,000.

The overall result is that you have all the new funds requested, and a total of \$1,041,450,000 net, for application against projects aggregating about \$2,305,000,000, in the discretion of the several departments.

Section 309, about which some discussion has been had on the floor, is designed to speed up the program and to preserve the elasticity insofar as the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget are concerned.

Mr. PELLY. My concern is due to the fact we have just discussed the foreign air bases. I look upon our aircraft carriers as mobile bases. In case we lose any of the foreign bases we will have to look to the aircraft carrier. Now, on the west coast we have no facilities for repairing battle damage on a modern aircraft carrier. The drydock facilities are not large enough. As I understand, this is a ceiling on the amount that is allowed on these justified and essential facilities for the Navy, and would not allow for any planning funds for a large drydock, which takes 5 years, from the time that planning funds are appropriated, to complete.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman that the approved projects, as distinguished from funds, insofar as the Navy is concerned, follow exactly a priority list submitted to the committee by the Navy Department.

As far as planning funds are concerned, I think and I hope—the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], will correct me if I am wrong—there is a segregation of these funds which could make available the necessary funds for planning such a project as you have in mind, even though the project itself might not be sufficiently high on the priority list to warrant starting construction.

Mr. Chairman, I assume that the details of chapter 3 will be taken up under the 5-minute rule. I have no further general comments except to express the hope that the recommendations of the committee will be approved.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

(Mr. FLYNT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD following Mr. FLOOD.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be my Support-the-President Week, earlier this week on the foreign-aid bill and now to support his request for \$37.5 million to build a second national airport at Burke, Va. Because of the parliamentary situation and the tactical situation again, similar to yesterday, I am not going to introduce here in the House the necessary amendment to this supplemental appropriation bill. I

have discussed this matter with the distinguished leaders in the other body who are concerned with this matter, as am I; the Senators dealing with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the subcommittee dealing with aviation matters. They have indicated that under all the circumstances they feel it would best be done this way. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Commerce, which includes the CAA, and he is of the opinion with me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no sense in burdening this committee with the situation dealing with our safety at the National Airport here. It has gotten to the point of saturation for several years. The near misses, the close problems we have had for years are of record for all who wish to read, and you have all read about. I have no interest in the Burke airport one way or the other except as I have told you for years on this problem I have a high regard for the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is now talking to you and his neck and I also have great love and affection for all of you, my brothers in the House, who use the National Airport. It is a menace and it is a hazard; it is a death trap and it has been for years. Now, all the technicians who know this problem, the Secretary of Commerce, the Commission of the President of the United States which reported to him in December, all favor this new airport at Burke, Va. I must resist this opposition of the delegation from Maryland and a few men from Virginia, like my friend [Mr. BROXHILL] who is nearby. If I represented that district, I would be upset about it, too. But the sum total of these parochial nearby suburban interests cannot match the general national welfare and the general safety of the hundreds of thousands of people who come in and out of Washington National Airport.

I am not going to burden you with telling you how many minutes it takes to go to this place and how many to go to that place. We have been through that for years. I have taken these trips in cabs; I have gone with newspaper and radio men; I have traveled in the limousines from the Mayflower and from the Statler; I have gone in private cars and in my own car. "You pays your money, and you takes your choice" on how long it takes to get from here to there. You can get any kind of figures that you want.

There is that white elephant that our good friend Tommy D'Alesandro, who used to be in this House, gave birth to out at Friendship. The people who know, the air transport people who run the airlines, and the pilots who fly the planes and the Commission appointed by the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, and now the President himself, who sends up to this Congress a request to appropriate the money to begin the construction of this new airport at Burke, Va., have told you what are the facts. I am on the side of the angels on this at this time; it could be otherwise in a crash at National Airport.

I hope the House will not wait until there is a terrible tragedy and hundreds

of people are killed by crashes over this overburdened airport, now the National Airport. You should meet this issue.

I am not going to introduce this amendment. I am advised by distinguished Members of the other body from these contiguous, adjacent States to which a great many Yankees from New York have come and bought horse farms, that they are going to be upset by airplanes. That leaves me cold. And while I have love and affection for the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROXHILL], the distinguished Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBERTSON, and all these great leaders and great Senators and great Representatives, "That has nothing to do with the case tra la," as far as the rest of the United States is concerned.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Now I yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. LANKFORD. I should like to advise the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I have as much regard for his neck as I have for my own. I am not going to burden him or the Members with how many minutes it takes to go from this place to that or the other, but I wonder if the gentleman realizes that within a 13-mile area of Burke, there are 6 major airports and 5 minor ones. And I wonder if the construction of the airport at Burke would relieve this congestion which is paramount in our minds today.

Mr. FLOOD. The technicians and the experts have decided. The President has resolved this controversy and asked funds for Burke, Va. I am not going to substitute the opinion of my friends from Virginia and Maryland for theirs. The overwhelming, disinterested, informal, and the best opinion declares for a new national airport at Burke, Va. We have delayed overlong; further delay would amount to gross negligence.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, it was with particular interest that I listened to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania in announcing to the committee that he would not introduce his amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 12138, for the purpose of including in the appropriation for the building and completion of a metropolitan Washington airport to be located at Burke, Va.

I especially noted that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is nonetheless enthusiastic about the Burke airport site, but that he apparently feels that such an amendment will stand a better chance of adoption and inclusion in the bill in the other body than it would here.

Let me commend my distinguished colleague for his interest in this particular question, for he is probably as well informed on the particular subject as any Member of this body. I know that his support of the Burke airport site stems from motives of air safety and convenience just as my opposition to the Burke airport site has its origin in these same high motives.

Therefore, I regret that he saw fit to withhold his amendment from consideration by this body because I think that full and ample time should be allowed

to this House to debate the advantages and disadvantages of the Burke site. We all know that in the limited time allowed that this subject cannot be properly discussed if and when it reaches us in the form of a conference report.

Therefore, it is my desire and my purpose at this time to outline to you some of the reasons dealing primarily with air safety, why I am very strongly opposed to the development of the Burke airport site as a major airport facility to serve metropolitan Washington.

As some you may know, I have just returned, along with eight other Members of this body, from an extensive inquiry into the facts surrounding the recent major air tragedy which apparently took place in mid-air over Grand Canyon. Let us bear in mind that there is absolutely no similarity between the area over Grand Canyon where air traffic is very slight, and the metropolitan area of Washington, where the air traffic density is almost as heavy as in any part of the United States. The committee which investigated the Grand Canyon disaster is not yet ready to announce any conclusions because in all probability we will take considerably more testimony. However, the findings of fact which are thus far undisputed indicate clearly the need for utmost caution in future planning and development of air safety regulations. With the testimony which we heard last week still fresh in my mind, I wish to inform this body that I am of the firm opinion and belief that the installation of a major airport at Burke, Va., within a small radius circle from the present Washington National Airport, would intensify air hazards much more than would be the case if no additional major airport facility for metropolitan Washington were planned.

This is not to say that a properly planned and located airport facility would not provide greater safety, but I think extreme thought should be given and extreme caution should be exercised in determining exactly where this new airport facility should be located.

The Burke site would, in my opinion, be especially dangerous because it would add to the existing local airport congestion not only additional flights, including takeoffs and landing in this area, but it would necessitate a third major air traffic pattern within an 11½ mile circle, which would cause many planes from one traffic pattern to properly or inadvertently enter into another traffic pattern under what is known as "holding conditions." Please bear in mind that within the 11½ mile circle to which I refer would be located the Washington National Airport, Bolling Air Force Base, Anacostia Naval Air Station, Andrews Air Force Base and, if authorized and completed, the new airport site at Burke, Va., not to mention at least two private airports within the same circle, and also Davison Army Air Field at Fort Belvoir, Va., which is accommodating more and more air traffic each month.

It seems to me to be absolutely foolhardy and extremely dangerous to add another major airport to what is already perhaps the most congested air traffic

area of similar size anywhere in America.

We all realize the desirability of removing part of the present air traffic congestion from this 11½ mile circle to which I have just referred, but let me tell you as strongly as I can that the building of Burke airport is not the answer. Instead of eliminating air hazards it would probably create perhaps the greatest single air hazard existing anywhere in America.

Let us now turn to an alternative proposition and let me say that except for a desire to provide the greatest possible air safety I have no preference either way between the proposed Burke site and the Friendship, Md., airport site. If I thought for one second that Burke would provide even an infinitesimal bit more air safety than the Friendship Airport would provide, then I would be coming to the support of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and championing his espousal of the Burke site, but as I see it, after a careful and exhaustive study, I am convinced that converting Friendship International Airport into the second major Washington area airport would provide infinitely more air safety and equally as much convenience to the Nation's Capital, its residents and its visitors. I wish that every Member of this body could already have personally visited and inspected the facilities of Friendship Airport. The best way I know to describe it is to say that it is the equal of any in America in physical facilities, including runways, taxi strips, aprons, ramps and terminal facilities. It can probably be best described as saying it is a first class airport accommodating second class traffic density.

The Friendship Airport is well beyond the 11½-mile circle to which I have repeatedly referred. It is out of the present danger zone, so far as the creation of a new major air traffic pattern is concerned. I am informed that the traffic pattern of Friendship Airport does not conflict under any existing conditions with the traffic patterns of either Washington National Airport, Andrews Air Force Base, Bolling Air Force Base, Anacostia Naval Air Station, Davison Army Air Field, or either of the two private airports which are located in Virginia within the 11½-mile circle.

Therefore, no new traffic pattern would be created, because Friendship has an existing air traffic pattern which does not in any way conflict with or interfere with either of the other air traffic patterns in what we refer to as the Washington metropolitan area.

The runway facilities at Friendship International Airport are already capable of accommodating any existing commercial airline aircraft, and we are reliably informed that the runways at Friendship can and will accommodate by 1959 jet air transports of the DC-8 and 707 types of commercial aircraft.

We have a ready-made solution to the problem of relieving the congestion at Washington National Airport and in the airspace over the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C. That is by converting Friendship International Airport into the second major airport to accommo-

date commercial aircraft serving the Washington metropolitan area.

By diverting a substantial portion of the present traffic of Washington National Airport to Friendship Airport a large portion of the air traffic congestion now existing over Washington can be and will be eliminated; whereas the development of the Burke Airport site, while eliminating takeoffs and landings at Washington National Airport, will not only fail to eliminate air traffic congestion in the airspace over metropolitan Washington, it will actually increase both the air traffic density in the airspace over Washington and increase the air hazard over Washington, because it can be assumed that when the second major airport serving metropolitan Washington is placed into operation that the flights into and out of this area will substantially increase.

Let me now come to another reason why the Friendship site is much to be preferred over the Burke Airport site. The residents of Maryland and the area adjoining Friendship, together with most, if not all, public officials in that area not only have no objection to converting Friendship into the second major airport serving the Washington metropolitan area, but they actually want it; and I believe that this will possibly be reflected by questions asked of or conferences with the representatives of that general area. On the other hand, the residents, public officials, and Members of Congress who are directly concerned with the Burke, Va., site are almost unanimously, if not unanimously, opposed to the authorization and completion of a major airport at the Burke, Va., site.

If the Maryland officials and the Virginia officials were not in accord and if both wanted the new facility or if both did not want the new facility, then I think that this body could properly and appropriately disregard the views of either and both. On the other hand, when the Virginia public officials and the Maryland public officials appear to be in complete accord that both prefer the Friendship site and that neither prefer the Burke, Va., site, then I think we who reside in and represent other areas can well afford to listen to their considered judgment and respect their mature and well-considered opinions on this subject.

I am sure that you will be interested to know that in December of 1955 the Commerce Department submitted to a subcommittee of the other body a report relative to the selection of a site for the supplemental airport for Washington. That report discussed in detail the various sites that had been considered, among others being the site known as Annandale, Va. The Annandale site is located 3½ miles northeast of the proposed Burke Airport site.

I am of the firm and considered opinion that the construction of an airport at Burke, Va., would add to the congested air traffic in the metropolitan area, and this is further borne out by the statement made by the Commerce Department in its report. As I have just stated, Annandale is located 3½ miles

from the Burke site, and in discussing the Annandale site the Commerce Department pointed out that an airport would, at that location, interfere with the operation of Washington National Airport under extreme flying conditions to the extent of 30 percent, and the consideration of its proximity to Washington National Airport would reduce the capacity at Annandale to 60 percent. They also stated that an airport at Annandale would interfere with the operations of Andrews Air Force Base and Washington National Airport. It seems hard to believe that a separation of 3½ miles would cure this contention to any extent.

Since the tentative selection of Burke Airport as a site in June of 1951, there has been a great deal of development around that area, particularly to the north and east. At the time the site was selected, the CAA plans showed that the dominant runway for north and south approaches would be pointed 18 degrees east of north, which would throw the approaches east of the town of Fairfax, Va. Since that time, however, the CAA has found it necessary to relocate these runways, and they are now planned to run directly north and south, which makes the westernmost runway point directly to the town of Fairfax. The town of Fairfax is 2.62 miles from the edge of the airport. In this approach zone are located several schools, several churches, and the county courthouse building, to say nothing of the enormous residential development in this area. Since the selection of Burke Airport site in 1951, the Fairfax County population has increased from 98,000 to approximately 175,000, and a great deal of this development being in the area east and north of the Burke Airport site, mainly in Springfield and Fairfax areas.

In addition, the Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County has in the meantime made provisions for and supplied sewers for a great deal of the area which, of course, is designed for increased use.

Repeating some portions of what I have previously said, an examination of a map will readily show that if the Burke Airport were constructed, you would then have 5 major airports located within a radius of 11½ miles, namely Andrews Air Force Base, Anacostia, Naval Air Station, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington National Airport, and Burke. In addition, in this same radius there are located 2 small flying fields, Washington-Virginia at Baileys Cross Roads, and Falls Church Airport near Falls Church. There is also located a 4,800 foot landing strip at Fort Belvoir, known as Davison Army Air Field, the use of which is constantly increasing.

Another matter which gives the people in Fairfax County grave concern is the depreciation of property values by reason of the location of a major airport in this site. While it is admitted that the area actually taken for the airport is at this time undeveloped to any great extent, the areas surrounding the site are in the process of rapid development.

Under the FHA and VA policies in existence at the present time, they have refused to insure mortgages within the so-called approach zones around major airports for a distance of 2½ miles from the end of the runways in triangular or fan-shaped areas, starting at the extreme ends to 6,000 feet. If this policy were followed at Burke, it would kill the use for residential purposes about 5,000 acres, in addition to the land taken for the airport itself. We have no assurance, however, that with the coming of jet planes that this policy will continue. As a matter of fact, in San Diego, surrounding Miramar Field, the FHA has refused to guarantee mortgages as late as March of this year within a radius of 20,000 feet, or 3.7 miles from the airport. If this policy were followed at Burke, it would kill the use of several thousands of acres of land in already developed sections.

Mr. Chairman, let me urge that this body fully acquaint itself with the respective advantages and disadvantages of the Burke site and the Friendship site, so that if this matter should come back to us in the form of a conference report and the decision is to be made by this Congress on the relative merits of the Burke, Va., airport site and the Friendship, Md., airport, that this body would and shall vote down any conference report to a supplemental appropriations bill which will include funds for a major airport at Burke, Va.

Let me caution you that a vote to authorize the construction of a major airport at Burke, Va., within the 11½ mile circle to which I have repeatedly referred, will in my opinion be a vote against air safety in this area and might even be a vote in favor of increased air hazards, regardless of the high motives of those who sponsor and advocate the proposed Burke airport site.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

(Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, primarily under chapter III you are being asked to appropriate almost \$1½ billion for military construction. That is fifteen hundred million dollars. A great portion of that goes to operational bases that you must have if the Air Force is going to fly their planes and if the Army is going to train, and the Navy to operate.

We are moving now into a series of expanded bases for the B-52's which require greater runways, and different types of maintenance facilities. There is also the matter of fuelling systems and many other construction items, all of which cost a great deal of money.

One portion of this relates to housing for our military, and their dependents. Over \$100 million will be provided in this bill for approximately 85,000 housing units.

The Army, as some of us older men knew it, was considerably different from today's Army. It used to be considered primarily a single man's Army. The

soldier could pick up and go and come as the exigencies of the service required. That is no longer true. Even the youngest enlisted man, for the most part, is a married man and you must have a suitable place for him in which to live with his family.

Housing is a requirement. It is a factor in reenlistment, but I would point out to the services that it does no good if we provide many, many more units of housing if the men do not have the opportunity to live in those houses with their families.

During the hearings I called the attention of the officers of the Air Force to one young man who is the very type of man we and they want to keep, a fine youngster, a highly trained and very capable pilot. He loves the Air Force and he loves the B-47 that he piloted. But he is not staying in the service. As a matter of fact, he is already out.

The armed services will tell you these military men are going out to take jobs in private industry at much higher wages. That is true, only in part. This young man went out and took a job with private industry at considerably less than he was earning as a B-47 pilot. I was surprised when I heard about his service termination because I knew of his love for the Air Force. The reason he gave was simply that in the last year as a B-47 pilot although there was housing available—sure, they have it—he could only be home with his wife fewer than 30 days out of the entire year. That housing does not do any good if the services do not change some of these programs and permit these men to have a little more stabilization in their lives.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. POFF. I wish to associate myself with the remarks the gentleman is making. I have had several letters from servicemen both at home and abroad who are primarily concerned about their careers for this one reason. Will any of these 84,000 housing units be placed at overseas bases?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Some of them go overseas, yes.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As the gentleman from Texas pointed out, we have some rather difficult situations overseas. Some of the housing will of necessity have to be trailers, but I have been in those trailers. Of course, it was some 35 years ago, when my wife and I were first married, but if we could have had quarters as modern and as comfortable as those trailers are we would have been two very pleased young people, who were nevertheless quite happy in some rather humble quarters.

Another subject that has been discussed, and we mentioned it on page 10 of the committee report, relates to the guided missiles. The men who are behind these various projects feel that these are the real answers. This is natural. If they did not have that enthusiasm they would not be worth their salt on the job. We had some witnesses before us, and many of them told us how

fine Nike is—and Nike is good and will do a good job—and others came in to tell us how wonderful Talos is and will be—and Talos will do a good job. We did not ask, as some have reported, that we have you might call a "duel" between Talos and Nike. Most of the presentations on these items have been made by the advocates, those men who have worked with that weapon, perhaps a civilian with a contractor, all of whom are sold on that one weapon. So the committee has recommended, and I think quite properly, that the Secretary of Defense immediately appoint a committee of disinterested persons who are qualified to pass on the merits of each of these defense weapons and let them make a report to the Secretary as to which should be used, not necessarily ruling the other out entirely. The rivalry in development between the two systems is a good thing, because each of them has something good and each has something that the other might well adopt.

The idea proposed is to have disinterested people on that committee, nobody connected with the companies building either of these missiles, nobody connected with the Department of the Navy or the Air Force or the Army that has lived so closely with it, because sometimes they live so close to the things that they cannot actually see problems in connection with their project. We believe that was a good recommendation. It does not call for any so-called dual proposition at all.

There are many subjects in the bill about which we could talk. As the chairman of the military subcommittee [Mr. MAHON] has pointed out, we do have bases pretty widely around the world, roughly between 750 and 1,000 going all the way from installations where perhaps there may be 3 to 5 military on each up to, our big base camps and depots for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Some of them are huge installations and we do have a rather considerable number of billions of dollars invested in them. There was a time right after the end of the war when we were in, for instance, Japan and Germany as occupying victorious troops. But that day and time is past. We are no longer there as occupying victorious troops, but we are in each one of the countries of these allies as guests. We are there by their sufferance—most often under a treaty, but you know and I know that any of these treaties can be abrogated at any time the host nation desires to end it. If they say we are no longer welcome in their land even though we may be there to protect them from some possible attack, there is only one thing that we could do. We may hesitate and we may tell them that we do not like to leave and that we think it is vital that we stay, but when all is said and done, if they do say, "The time has come when you have worn the welcome off the mat," there is only one thing we can do, and that is to leave. It would be the same situation exactly if these other troops were in this country and we felt that they had outlived their welcome. We would ask them to get out, too. As the

gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] mentioned, the only other alternative would be by force of arms to stay. Of course, we are not going to do that. As tenuous as our tenancy may be, those bases are an essential element in our defense and the construction should be financed by these appropriations, as recommended by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, unless there are some further questions, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

[Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to get away a little bit from these military problems and call the attention of the committee to an item on page 25 of the bill dealing with the Department of Public Health for the District of Columbia. I understand this item was reduced some \$126,000 in committee. Unless I can get the approval of the committee, I do not propose here to offer an amendment to restore it. Rather, I would hope to have it restored in the other body because I do not feel I have the time to make the full explanation which would give us a fair chance of having the item restored here in the House. But, it deals specifically with the salaries of interns at the District of Columbia General Hospital. These interns, according to the information I received, now get about \$1,500 a year whereas the interns in other Government supported hospitals in this area, for example the Freedmen's Hospital and St. Elizabeths Hospital get in the neighborhood of \$2,500 a year. It seems to me these interns at the District of Columbia General Hospital should be at least brought into line with the interns in the other Government supported hospitals in this area so far as their pay is concerned. I would like to call the attention of the members of the committee to this item and, if possible, between now and the time the bill is read for amendment, perhaps get consent to increase that item to the extent of at least \$126,000 so we might take care of the salaries of these interns.

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

Mr. HYDE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan in regard to this subject.

Mr. RABAUT. I realize that the gentleman wants to increase this by \$126,000 above the amount now provided in the bill of \$121,290. Under the instructions of the full committee that is the amount we are reporting to the House, and it would be beyond my power as chairman in charge of this chapter of the bill to accede to the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. HYDE. I think there was some misunderstanding in the committee with respect to the item. It was stated it was needed to stimulate acquisition of new interns. Of course, it is hoped that the increase in salary will do that, but the primary purpose of it was simply to bring the salaries of those interns in line

with the salaries of the interns in the other hospitals.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not think the gentleman need worry about the salaries. I refer the gentleman to page 63 of the report:

Testimony was presented to the committee that an increase in the salary schedule would aid in recruiting interns and residents at the District of Columbia General Hospital. Testimony was also presented that recruiting for fiscal year 1957 has already been completed.

It was under those two statements that the committee decided it would not be quite proper to give them any more money at this time.

Mr. HYDE. Yes. I am familiar with that statement, and that is where I think the misunderstanding enters into it. It may be that it was a poor argument made by the advocates of this particular item. The real reason for the \$126,000 which was stricken out, was to bring the salaries of the interns in this hospital in line with the salaries of the interns in other Government-supported hospitals in the area.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. As I understand it, they had completed their recruiting. We did not feel that it was the place in a supplemental appropriations bill to start a rat race between the various hospitals to recruit these people, when they had already recruited their quota for the present fiscal year. They can come up at the next regular appropriation and we will consider it.

Mr. HYDE. I appreciate the feeling of the subcommittee and that is the reason I do not expect to propose an amendment on the floor, but I hope the gentleman may be persuaded, in the event it comes into conference on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I have a very unusual request to make at this time. Rather it is an unusual request for me. That is, I would like to urge the Committee not to appropriate any more money for my congressional district at this time than is now in the bill. There is now included in the bill \$49 million for the construction of a CIA building, there is \$14,300,000 for the construction of a new bridge. That is enough money for any congressional district to have in any one particular bill. I refer to the threat to include in this bill an appropriation of \$34 million for the construction of a new airport out at Burke, Va. I say, "a threat"—I do not believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] will offer the amendment today, because he knows it will be overwhelmingly defeated. I think the strategy is to try to get the other body to put it in the bill and then the conferees can adopt it and possibly ram it down the throats of the House in the closing days of this Congress.



1956

I realize that the facilities around here are crowded. At least the technicians and experts say they are crowded. I guess we have to take their word for it, but I do not believe that all of the alternatives to this congested situation have been fully explored. As pointed out by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANRFOORD], a few moments ago, there are five—he said six—there are five major airports already existing in this area and they are not operating to their full capacity. That is in addition to several minor airports. We have helicopter service between Fort Belvoir Army Base and the Pentagon, who are not permitted to fly over 500 feet, because they will come in contact in the congested approach to the National Airport.

It seems to me we should redistribute the traffic and use the present airports. The construction of another airport at Burke, Va., 22 miles away, I maintain will not eliminate the congestion which is existing in this area now. It was reported the other day that there were approximately 24 near collisions around the National Airport. Those near collisions were in the air approaching the National Airport, within 10 to 20 miles of the airport. To construct another airport within a 22-mile radius of the National Airport will not do anything to alleviate that danger which exists. We do not have airplane crashes on the ground, these tragic disasters have always occurred in the air because of congestion in the air—and sometimes without any congestion whatsoever as occurred in the recent tragedy out in Arizona.

So I maintain that the construction of an additional airport in this area will not alleviate the danger of congestion in the air in the metropolitan area of Washington.

Another thing, this so-called Burke location which is 22 miles away is not suitable for the construction of an airport and its runways from the standpoint of the terrain. It would cost millions of dollars additional to make that land adaptable to airport use over what it would to buy farm land that is already level.

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

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman in his position in opposition to the Burke airport. I am going to try to help him and the people of Virginia by relieving them of the burden of another bridge over the Potomac.

Mr. BROYHILL. I would just like to leave things as they are. I would not want to make it any more than it is nor would I want to make it any less than it is for that area insofar as what is included in this bill is concerned.

Another thing: Of course the gentleman from Pennsylvania says the Maryland and Virginia delegations should be ignored here. I think it would be totally improper for the Congress to ignore the complete delegation and the views of the delegation of the two States that are involved in this thing. Certainly in Fairfax County if an airport is constructed it would be in a residential area. The northern Virginia area is sometimes re-

ferred to as the bedroom of the Nation's Capital. The effect of building a major airport in the middle of this area would be to make a large section of the district uninhabitable. The people living there now are opposed to it and the local government is unalterably opposed to it. I hope that if funds for this should be inserted in the other body that the conferees will not agree to accept anything which is so overwhelmingly opposed.

If it is inserted in this bill in conference I shall oppose it on the floor when we consider the conference report.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the disastrous collision which occurred over the Grand Canyon last week has served to focus the Nation's attention on the necessity for taking immediate steps to assure greater safety in air travel. All of a sudden we hear about near accidents occurring in the Washington vicinity and it is certain that this is a condition which is prevalent in every metropolitan area throughout the country. The CAA is suddenly galvanized into action. They are now prepared to speed up the 5-year air safety program which the Department of Commerce took years to approve.

But one wonders whether or not we can ever obtain the safety in air travel we desire and need unless we clear up the confusion that now exists in the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

I am a member of the appropriations subcommittee considering funds for the Department of Commerce and related agencies. In March of this year, in hearings before my subcommittee—and I refer your attention to page 239 of the hearings, the following colloquy between the CAA people and myself occurred:

Mr. YATES. All right. Then I come back to the question I asked. The major cut was in air-navigation equipment. What did you ask for in the amount of about \$15 million that the Bureau of the Budget eliminated?

Mr. BASNIGHT. Airport surveillance radar and approach lights at airports.

Mr. YATES. What amounts?

Mr. BASNIGHT. Approximately \$14 million.

Mr. YATES. Can you tell us what items are represented by the approximately \$50 million and the amounts for each?

Mr. BASNIGHT. I can give you the approximate figures. The radar would amount to approximately \$10 million. The lights, approximately \$4 million.

Mr. FLOOD. The radar would be only in certain great centers?

Mr. YATES. Are those not necessary? They must be, obviously, or you would not ask for them if they were not necessary. I ask the administrator that question."

Then Mr. Rothschild got into it:

Mr. ROTHSCHILD. The decision of the Bureau of the Budget was made on the basis that this equipment was not obtainable within the fiscal year.

Mr. YATES. Did you testify, did you know when you asked for the money for this equipment, whether or not it was obtainable during this fiscal year?

And Mr. Charles J. Lowen, Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, said:

Mr. LOWEN. I testified to Mr. Bow's question earlier. We said this was money, this

\$40 million is approximately what we could handle this coming year.

Mr. YATES. Did you know this at the time you asked the Bureau of the Budget for \$64,900,000?

Mr. LOWEN. I was not Administrator then. Mr. YATES. Do you check to see whether the equipment is available before you make up your monetary requests?

Mr. ROTHSCHILD. Wherever possible, yes.

Mr. YATES. In this case you determined, did you tell the Bureau of the Budget that it was not available or did they tell you it was not available for this year? They cut the money. Somebody must have known whether or not it was available.

Mr. ROTHSCHILD. The first figure was a horseback figure, Mr. YATES. They took the 250—

Mr. YATES. You don't mean the Department of Commerce goes to the Bureau of the Budget with horseback figures.

Mr. ROTHSCHILD. I mean that in this instance this was a horseback figure. CAA took the \$250 million in round numbers for this airways implementation plan and said it is going to take 5 years; we need a fifth of it every year. That is how the amount of money was arrived at in the first instance.

As you see from the hearings, we were interested in providing all the money necessary to assure the installation of equipment which would protect those traveling by air. Fourteen million dollars of necessary equipment was stricken by the Bureau of the Budget. The CAA said that it could not spend the additional money. And yet 2 days ago the same people appeared before a subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee of the House and said, "Yes, we can have improved air safety in this country; all we have to do is buy it." The impression was given that if Congress appropriates the money, the 5-year program can be speeded up.

Mr. Chairman, our committee was ready to provide the money, but the agency said it did not want it. Mr. Rothschild, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, stated that he could not spend the money because he could not buy any equipment. Two days ago, Mr. Lowen, the Administrator of CAA, said he could buy the equipment but that he was short of manpower to operate the equipment. The fact remains that if there is any delay in providing equipment which will improve and make air travel safer, it will be attributable to the administration rather than to the Congress.

Another example of the confusion that exists is shown by the testimony given before the Government Operations Committee 2 days ago with respect to VOR-DME—distance-measuring equipment. Let me read to you from page 231 of the hearings:

Mr. Bow. I will yield to you now, Mr. YATES.

Mr. YATES. I just wanted to point out, Mr. Rothschild just stated to you he was happy to report as to what they proposed to do. Glancing over last year's hearings, I read from page 179 when Mr. Rothschild says:

"I am happy to report to you that the Air Coordinating Committee which brings together all agencies interested in such matters yesterday agreed unanimously that VOR and DME are still the nationally and internationally approved distance-navigation equipment for common system use and while they may be superseded by TACAN it is too early to definitely estimate when

this may take place. For this reason, the Department is of the opinion that the amounts requested for installations of new distance-measuring equipments for maintenance and operation of existing facilities should be retained in the budget."

All throughout the testimony last year, and I have had occasion to read it today and yesterday, there was a driving impetus on the part of the administration, even by Secretary Weeks who stated that as long as—let me quote from what Secretary Weeks said—I just want to make this comment—on page 15.

"I just want to add this comment in response to a question by Mr. Preston about VOR-DME. If it will not be ready for 3 years and if VOR-DME will make flying safer in the meantime, personally I would spend the money."

Has Mr. Weeks changed his mind on that? Mr. ROTHSCHILD. No, sir, and I don't find any fundamental conflict between what you just read and what I just said.

Mr. YATES. May I point out your conflict? Mr. ROTHSCHILD. Yes, sir.

Mr. YATES. Last year you asked funds for DME. This year you are not asking for funds for DME. Last year you stated that flying is made safer as a result of DME, as you thought it was when you were asking for funds for DME. Do you this year come before us and say that flying is not made safer through DME equipment?

Mr. ROTHSCHILD. We are asking funds—

Mr. YATES. Are you going to answer my question?

Mr. ROTHSCHILD. I hope to—for the operation of some 241 installed DME's.

Mr. YATES. You are? I was under the impression that somebody here testified a few moments ago that you were not asking such funds.

Mr. ROTHSCHILD. We are not asking funds to install any new DME but we are asking funds to continue to operate those which are installed and operating. Now we will not have total and complete coverage of the United States with those which we plan to operate this year but—

Mr. YATES. May I ask why that is so? Is it because you are not as sure of DME this year as you were last year?

Mr. ROTHSCHILD. That is exactly right.

Yet barely 3 months later, before the Government Operations Committee, witnesses from the CAA testified that DME equipment would help unsharpen air traffic, directly contrary to Mr. Rothschild's statement. Last year the Secretary of Commerce asked our subcommittee to appropriate funds for additional DME equipment upon the recommendation of the Air Coordinating Committee—that VOR and DME are still the internationally approved distance navigation equipment for common system use. This year, Mr. Rothschild admitted in our hearings that the Air Coordinating Committee is still of the same opinion as to DME's importance. The Department of Commerce changed its mind.

Why did the agency change its mind? That is one of the mysteries of which the Congress has not been apprised.

I read further from the hearings at page 235:

Mr. YATES. Why are you not emphasizing DME to the same extent that you did last year?

Mr. ROTHSCHILD. Because VOR-DME is not good enough to meet the tactical requirements of the military, period.

Mr. YATES. We also have the civil aviation that we must worry about and until such time as the military can show the TACAN should be adopted by both the mili-

tary and civil aviation, why shouldn't the civilian airlines, then, in order to make flying safer adopt DME-VOR?

Mr. ROTHSCHILD. Because I don't think it is a good expenditure. This is my own decision. I don't think it is a good expenditure of public funds to go out and install more DME and operate more DME, not VOR but DME, and spend the public money in that manner until there has been an indication that the industry needs it more than it has indicated up until now.

The decision against DME is Mr. Rothschild's? What about the CAA Administrator? Is not his opinion important?

Mr. Chairman, I gained the impression from the hearings that the Administrator of the CAA was not given a free hand in the operation of his agency, that he was subject to the domination of the Under Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary. After some study, I have come to the conclusion that this agency should be set up as an independent agency with the duties and responsibilities vested in the Administrator and not scattered among many people in the Department of Commerce as it now is. The interests of safety, of efficiency and of economy require that the Department of Commerce and the Civil Aeronautics Administration be separated. The CAA has a tremendous job to do and its policies should be established by the person responsible for its operation rather than by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, we shall make progress when we get rid of the confusion in the Department of Commerce, when we place the responsibility for a national airways system efficiently and safely operated, in one person trained for the job. We shall not make progress as long as there exists in the CAA a vacillation, weakness of purpose, a spirit of delay and postponement. The Congress is willing to support a worthy and progressive air safety program. It is up to the executive branch to supply such a program.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question or two. Since I am going to offer an amendment to strike out the Jones Point Bridge proposition, I would like to ask the committee what under the language contained in the bill is the amount of the unexpended balance to be added to the \$14,325,000? What is the unexpended balance that is to be added to the \$14,325,000?

Mr. PRESTON. It is a very small amount. This was left over from last year. The exact figures I have not at hand.

Mr. GROSS. Maybe a half million dollars?

Mr. PRESTON. It would not be that much, I am sure. A few thousand dollars. It is the customary procedure when you make an additional appropriation to merge the funds.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Now, under Central Intelligence Agency there is an item providing \$49,000,000. There is also provided, I believe, \$8½ million for road building. Am I correct in that? Will someone tell me how many miles of roadway will be

constructed and what kind of road this is?

Mr. BROYHILL. That is for the completion of construction of the George Washington Memorial Parkway which starts at Mount Vernon, follows the Potomac River, and is ultimately due to go to Great Falls. This was authorized by the Congress as far back as 1932. By piecemeal method we have gradually extended that boulevard up to just beyond Key Bridge. It is not fair to Central Intelligence Agency to charge them with \$8½ million for the parkway. It was the intent of the Congress to build that parkway up to and beyond Key Bridge.

Mr. GROSS. How many miles will be built?

Mr. BROYHILL. I would say approximately 4 or 5 miles.

Mr. GROSS. Four or five miles for \$8½ million?

Mr. BROYHILL. That is correct. It traverses rough country and there are some pretty hilly banks there alongside of the Potomac River.

Mr. GROSS. That is still a substantial figure for that mileage.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman from Virginia, that up on those rocks by the Potomac there are some very fine building sites being picked up.

Mr. BROYHILL. There are a few building sites up there, but the boulevard comes back away from the river and goes up the stream bed after it gets to Chain Bridge.

Mr. GROSS. On page 9 of this bill I find that there are to be 50 housing units built at a cost of \$1,589,500, or an average cost of \$31,790 per unit, topped with a \$75,000 house for the superintendent of the Air Force Academy; \$50,000 each for two units for the deans, and \$30,000 each for 44 units for department heads and \$31,500 for 3 units for the deputy chiefs of naval operations to be constructed at the United States Naval Observatory, Washington, D. C.

Does not the gentleman in charge of those items think that will be pretty plush living for these people? The gentleman from Kansas awhile ago said there are a good many of our servicemen living in trailers.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, years ago we started an academy for the Army at West Point and then later a Naval Academy. Now we are building an Air Force Academy.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that.

Mr. MAHON. I opposed the building of that. I took the position we ought to have a national defense academy, but the House did not sustain that position. Now, if you are going to have an Air Force Academy, which we can expect will be there as long as the Nation stands, you want to have first-class construction. Of course, many live in homes, the extremely well-to-do, ranging from \$50,000 to \$100,000 in some areas. Well, the Superintendent of the Air Force Academy ought to have a residence certainly reasonably adequate,

1956

with all the entertaining he has to do, and \$75,000 for an Air Force Academy Superintendent's home for the United States of America I do not think is too much.

Mr. GROSS. Wait a minute. There is no land acquisition cost, is there?

Mr. MAHON. Well, the land has already been bought.

Mr. GROSS. Of course it has.

Mr. MAHON. The land would not be very much. It is a very small item insofar as the actual area is concerned where the building would be built. We have there 17,000 acres, as I recall, and this would occupy a very small part of the land.

Mr. GROSS. It just seems to me that you are providing pretty plush living quarters for a very few people.

Mr. MAHON. Why not do a fairly plush job for the Superintendent of the Academy and make it one where the construction cost originally will bear fruit in that the additional repairs during the years will not be so great? Why not have a real first-class home for the Superintendent so that when our own people go there they can say, "This is the home of our Superintendent, and we are proud of it." The armed services asked for \$90,000, and I supported them in that request, but the committee in its wisdom reduced it to \$75,000.

Mr. GROSS. I understand the gentleman's position, but I disagree with him. I do not think we have to appropriate \$75,000 to build a house for the Superintendent of the Academy nor do we have to spend \$31,500 to build houses for three deputy chiefs of naval operations at the Naval Observatory. Something tells me there is a limit to the endurance of the taxpayers of this country.

On page 14 of the bill I find an item that is recurring in appropriation bill after appropriation bill. This is comparatively minor, \$9,000 for entertainment for the Export-Import Bank. I wish you on the Committee on Appropriations and the Foreign Affairs Committee would stop this business of \$800,000 for entertainment, liquor and whatever goes with it, for the State Department. Now we have \$9,000 for the Export-Import Bank. I wish you would give a little attention to putting the brakes on these people. As I recall the figures, there is another \$45,000 or \$50,000 appropriated this year to some 29 representatives to NATO for, as they call it, hospitality allowance. Let us get down to earth with regard to this business. We have some taxpayers to take into consideration in this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, if the representatives of this Export or Import Bank—what did you call it, Export or Import?

Mr. GROSS. Export-Import Bank.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the representatives of this bank, the officers and these other fellows, would eat up some of this surplus grain and wheat, that would be one thing, but they have

to have that higher class entertainment, I understand. What did the gentleman mean when he said, "All that goes with it"?

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps they have to have this entertainment allowance to make some of those so-called soft loans to foreign countries, loans that may or may not be repaid. Does the gentleman suppose that that is the reason?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman means, to coax the people to take the money?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, to spoon-feed them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman comes from Iowa. When the gentleman refers to entertainment, what kind of entertainment does the gentleman have in mind? Does the gentleman know what kind of entertainment this is to be?

Mr. GROSS. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think the gentleman ought to find out.

Mr. GROSS. I have had no intimate experience either with the Export-Import Bank or the State Department.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman ought to find out what kind of liquor they are drinking.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] about the cost of the parkway up to this CIA Building, I would like to state that the actual cost of the paving itself would amount to \$1,300,000. Incidentally, the parkway would extend 6 miles. The other costs were for the grading. As I said before, it is very rough terrain. That amount is \$2,700,000. Then there are structural costs, such as bridges over these little streams, and so forth, which would cost \$3,900,000. The cost of the land is \$500,000.

Incidentally, the State of Virginia and the communities involved, I am very proud to say, are paying for half the cost of the land.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] such time as he may require.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, having something to do on the Navy panel to the extent of \$400 million in this public works program, I ask unanimous consent that my comments pertaining to the same be inserted in the RECORD following the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. On page 26 of the printed report there is an item of \$11 million for advance planning. Could the gentleman tell me if that \$11 million has been earmarked for any particular plans, or are those just general funds that may be used in carrying out the committee recommendation to do more in the way of advance planning, for economy?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No, those funds are not earmarked there. They are for the

practical purpose of having adequate and proper planning. Also we suggested to the Department that they finalize their plans for certain projects. They have a perfect right to apply the funds where they think it necessary.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the explanation of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] in response to my inquiry. However, I have been informed, and I believe authoritatively, that the advanced planning funds amounting to \$11 million included with the military public works program under yards and docks facilities cannot be used for final plans and specifications of one or both of the west coast drydocks which have been listed as essential projects and given priority listing by the Navy.

This may be a very serious omission. The committee recognizes the timelag involved if planning funds are not included this year. It will take a minimum of 6 years to get a drydock which will accommodate the *Forrestal*-class carriers in the event of needed repair of exterior battle damage on their hulls. As the committee knows, these modern carriers cannot pass through the Panama Canal and must go around South America to get from one coast to the other.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this lack of flexibility in the House bill which would prevent projects from being included at the discretion of the Navy was discussed yesterday when similar legislation was before the Appropriations Committee in the other body. The purpose of my making this statement is to urge consideration of the House conferees in due course to working out greater flexibility. As I understand it, sufficient funds are available. It is more a matter of redtape. I am sure that under the House bill the Navy could come back to the committee and ask to reschedule various projects, but I believe that this should not be necessary and that the Navy should have some discretion in the matter.

I have in mind that at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard there is a high priority project for a new drydock. Planning funds have been requested in the amount of \$1,300,000. These funds must be made available or we will have a serious weakness in our defense on the west coast for years to come. The Bureau of Ships recognizes this and I trust that when the legislation comes to conference, the conferees will do likewise.

THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICA'S OLDER PEOPLE DEMAND ATTENTION NOW—IT IS TRAGIC TO PROCRASTINATE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in the first session of this Congress, I introduced House Resolution 172 calling for a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives. The purposes of the committee, as stated in my resolution, would be to investigate the status of older people in our Nation and to determine how the Federal Government can cooperate with State and local governments and with private industry and voluntary agencies to provide better

conditions of living for this growing element in our population.

In my opinion, the need for a Committee on Problems of the Aging has become immeasurably more important than it was when I introduced my resolution. During the 15 months that have elapsed, the older population of our country has increased by almost half a million persons and now stands at the unprecedented figure of 14½ million 65 years of age and over.

The need for action is urgent now, Mr. Chairman, but will become even more so. The continuing increase amounting to 1,000 older persons each day will give us a population of 21 million older people within another scant 20 years. We are in the midst of one of the greatest humanitarian problems and social challenges our country has ever faced.

In my own small State of Rhode Island, the population of older people has almost doubled over the past 25 years, increasing from about 40,000 in 1930 to 80,000 today.

And while the number of older people increases their situations, their position in our society continues to deteriorate. Over the past decade, for example, we have listened to a great deal of talk about jobs for older people. Yet, during this same period the proportion of older men in the labor force has continued to decline. Just this spring the Census Bureau reported that the percentage of men 65 and over who are working has reached its lowest point since the depths of the depression. Surely there is need to investigate the factors in this deplorable situation.

The amount of income available to purchase the necessities of living and to meet the costs of medical care which increase with age is another matter that requires continuous study. There has been some improvement in the income position of the aged over the past 5 or 6 years. The old-age and survivors insurance program is now making payments to 6.5 million older persons. Private pensions, railroad retirement pensions, and retirement programs of governmental agencies are gradually reaching more of our older people.

Yet, statistics collected by the Bureau of the Census show that two-thirds of our older people are having to get along on less than \$1,000 a year. A recent study from the University of California compares the amount of income received by older persons with careful estimates of the cost of living. The conclusion reached by these California scientists, is that almost one-half of our older couples and about three-fourths of our older individuals do not have enough income to live at a minimum standard of health and decency.

With regard to the all-important matters of housing and medical care, the situations of older people have continued to deteriorate since I introduced my Resolution 172. The number of older people continues to increase while the present administration complacently insists that there is no need for a public housing program for them.

Three-fifths or more of our older people are suffering from one or more long-

term illnesses and many of them are in desperate need of medical care. What does the administration do about it? It proposes, Mr. Chairman, a reinsurance program for surgery and hospital care. It is difficult for me to see how low-income older people could benefit from a reinsurance program when they do not have the money to pay the basic premiums in the first place.

These are some of the major problems confronting a growing number and proportion of our population. They are problems of great urgency because they are serious problems and because they affect many of our older people and their families who are so eager to help them but who are primarily and necessarily concerned with the welfare of their own children. These circumstances compel our attention; they are some of the reasons underlying my action in introducing my resolution for a Select Committee on Aging to study the problems and determine how they are to be met.

#### THE NEED FOR HOUSING

Let me be more specific, Mr. Chairman, with reference to some of these matters. Let me take the matter of housing as an example. In Rhode Island, we made an intensive study of the circumstances and needs of our older population. In 1951, a Commission was set up to study the problems of the aged. Two years later this Commission presented the results of its study in a report entitled "Old Age in Rhode Island."

One of the tragic conclusions reached by the Commission is that 33 percent of our older people are without central heating in their homes and that 27 percent are forced to live in housing that is grossly substandard in other respects. These are largely low-income people—those for whom the administration says no housing program is needed.

Among those who are trying to live on public assistance, the situation is almost twice as bad for some 53 percent of these were found in dilapidated housing or lacking the basic sanitary facilities. And let me point out, Mr. Chairman, that we, as a society, are fostering this kind of living. Every time a public assistance grant is made to cover the rent of an older person living in a dilapidated or unsanitary dwelling, we are subsidizing the continued existence of that dwelling. Surely our consciences will drive us to do better than this by our aged folks.

The picture I have been describing, Mr. Chairman, is that of my own State of Rhode Island. I wish that I could assure my colleagues here in the House that the older people in their own districts are living more comfortably. But I cannot do so. The figures that I have cited for my own State parallel those reported by the Bureau of the Census for the country as a whole. Decent housing for our senior citizens is a nationwide need.

Yet I have not presented the total housing problem by any means. What I have described is merely the physical characteristics of the places our older people are forced to call their homes. I have said nothing about the tremendous

loneliness and isolation of large proportions of our aged couples and particularly of the millions of older people who are widowed or who were never married.

It was because of these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, that on February 24, 1955, I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill, H. R. 4368, which would authorize the admission of elderly single persons to housing projects. In the interim, I have strongly supported all legislation which would provide adequate housing for our older people and give them the encouragement and assistance which they need so much.

In Rhode Island, I am glad to say we have made a beginning in correcting this situation. We have incorporated living units for older people into two of our public-housing projects in the city of Providence. I can report that they are proving to be a boon to the few older people fortunate enough to find places in them.

But, we also need more studies of the housing problem. We need to know what kinds of housing are best suited to older people. We need to know where it should be located with reference to other facilities in the community. We need to know how much special housing is needed. And, perhaps, most of all, we need to know what kinds of housing older people themselves really want. Too much of what we provide for older people is what others think will be good for them. Older people have a right, I submit, to speak for themselves and should be encouraged to do so.

This whole matter of housing is one of the things I had in mind, Mr. Chairman, when I introduced my resolution for a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging. I am sure you will agree that the need is a critical one.

#### WE MUST DO SOMETHING ABOUT EMPLOYMENT

One of the major financial problems of our older people is, as I said earlier, that of paying for medical care. Geriatricians are in full agreement in their recommendation of annual or even semi-annual medical checkups—and our President is setting the pattern for them—for early diagnosis and treatment, and for prompt restorative services when serious illness does come. Yet thus far, Mr. Chairman, the present administration has been almost completely silent on the subject of how our older citizens are to pay for these services.

A few years ago, one of our colleagues introduced a bill to provide comprehensive medical insurance in connection with the old-age and survivors insurance program. A few months ago, this proposal was revived. I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, that this is the best way to do it but I do know that the very exciting results of medical research may as well be left undiscovered if they are not to be translated into medical care for all of our people.

We are living in a changing, dynamic society. We can never assume that our work is done. We must be striving always to improve our programs for financial security and for the maintenance of health. And this is another reason I am asking you to appoint a

1956

### Select Committee on the Problems of Aging.

THE HEALTH OF OUR OLDER CITIZENS MUST BE MAINTAINED

I do not wish to explore the whole vast field of health, Mr. Chairman, but I do wish to point out that during the past 10 years we have stepped up the funds for research, for rehabilitation, and for the construction of medical facilities. We have made a start and I am proud of the part I have taken in making this record. However, we still have a long way to go.

There seems to be a rising opinion among medical people and gerontologists that much of the current disability and deterioration among older people is totally unnecessary.

This is another area, Mr. Chairman, that well could be explored by the select committee I have proposed. My emphasis thus far has been on the financial aspects of hospitalization and medical care but, beyond these, there are very important humanitarian considerations. Longer years of living will be nothing more than more years of misery, Mr. Chairman, if they are to be spent in sickness and in progressive decline in a mental hospital. Our older citizens want to be healthy and they want to remain in their own homes and communities. We cannot go on putting them out of sight in any convenient storage place.

#### MUST OUR OLDER PEOPLE FIGHT A LOSING BATTLE?

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make one more point before I come to my concluding recommendation. I spoke earlier about more opportunities for employment and I believe they are of utmost importance. On the other hand, we must recognize that a great many, perhaps the majority of our older people, will have to look elsewhere for their principal satisfactions of living.

Sixty percent, or about four million of our older men and 90 percent or about 7 million of our older women are not working and are not likely to work again unless it is in some form of part-time employment. These people, all past the age of 65, have completed, by and large, their family responsibilities and ended their work careers. These 11 million men and women and a good many more below the age of 65 represent the achievement of longer life; they are people whose lives have been extended beyond the period in which they made their principal contributions to society. It is they who helped build the society we have and we owe them a great deal.

The tragedy is that we have not formed new ways in which they can be useful and enjoy the satisfactions of belonging and self-sufficiency. Our tendency has been to set them aside and to ignore them when we should have been providing new opportunities through which they could be useful and opportunities through which they can build new human contacts and friendships after their children have gone from the home and particularly when widowhood comes. We have, in short, created longer life and more

years in retirement without making them self-sufficient, useful, and meaningful years.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the major uncharted area in the field of aging. Social isolation, lonesomeness, and inactivity lead to physical and mental deterioration and dependency as surely as night leads to day and day to night. Gerontologists have reached this conclusion over and over again as they have studied older people and their ills.

In Rhode Island and in a number of other places, important experiments have been taking place in finding new occupations and new satisfactions for this part of our older population. In Rhode Island, the facilities of adult education are being opened to older people and they are beginning to respond in sizable numbers. In two of our Rhode Island communities, we have established community centers for older people; centers in which they may spend their time with friends, working in the arts and crafts; taking courses in citizenship, in nutrition, and in a score of other things, or just enjoying themselves in games and sports. And, perhaps even more hopeful is the initiative older people themselves are taking in looking for voluntary services they can perform for the community. Thousands of our older citizens have reported that they are happiest when they are doing something for other people.

These new ways of maintaining active interest in life, of continuing their usefulness to the community, and of becoming more informed and, hence, better citizens, are perhaps forerunners of a new life for older people. We must encourage them and we must continue to experiment. And above all, we must study these programs to see what they mean to our older citizens, to see their effect on maintenance of health and zest for living; to see, in brief, how we can bring life to the added years. This, I suggest, is another reason why there is need for a Select Committee on Problems of Aging.

#### NEED FOR ACTION IN THE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. Chairman, last spring, at the time of the budget hearings, I was very much disappointed that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Labor reflected very little awareness of the urgency of the matters I have just reviewed.

The problems of our aging and aged people are far greater and much more varied than the people in the administration seem to realize. What we need is a concerted attack on a broad front. I have directed the heads of these Departments to present such a program when they come up with their 1958 budget requests.

In my opinion they will not be giving due recognition to the needs of our older people until they develop special facilities in these two Departments to deal with all of the problems of aging. An office of services to older persons is long overdue in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such an agency is badly needed to coordinate the programs scattered throughout the Department, to keep track of the new knowledge

and experience coming to light over the country, to provide information and consultation to the States and communities trying to develop programs and services for older people, and to maintain liaison with national organizations at work in the field.

The problem of employment is of special significance. A job is the best guarantee of a satisfactory income in the later years; it enables the older person to maintain his status of independence and usefulness, and is an important factor in preventing physical and mental deterioration. For all of these reasons, I should like to see the Department of Labor set up an office of older workers. An office of older workers could bring to bear more effectively the programs for older workers now carried on within several Bureaus, could step up its studies of the problems of older workers, and play the leading role in a nationwide effort to provide more jobs for this important group in our population. Together with the Civil Service Commission, an office of older workers could work toward the more effective utilization of older workers and toward the development of improved personnel practices regarding older workers within the Government.

#### ACTION IN THE STATES AND COMMUNITIES

There are important steps that should be taken by the Federal Government to meet the critical situation I have described. However, I do not wish to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Federal Government should bear the total responsibility. Quite the contrary, I believe that aging is the concern of everyone, of all levels of Government and of many other agencies in our national life. I believe firmly that every 1 of the 48 States and all of our communities must set up special programs and services for older persons.

In my State of Rhode Island, we have adopted this pattern. Five years ago Gov. Dennis J. Roberts set up a study commission on problems of the aged and subsequently converted it into a permanent Governor's committee on aging. The legislature has provided it with a paid staff. The result is that in Rhode Island we are beginning to make progress.

In the Federal Government, Mr. Chairman, we must make provision for encouraging and helping these State and local groups. We must remember that we have a shared responsibility even though some of our departments seem to lose sight of it.

It is clear to me—indeed, recent events have forced the conclusion upon me—that an important key to progress in getting action for our older people is the proposal embodied in my resolution to establish a Select Committee on Problems of the Aging. I hope there will be favorable action on this resolution in order that our millions of older people will have assurance of our deep concern for their welfare.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read.

July 12

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Land acquisition, additional Washington airport

For an additional amount for "Land acquisition, additional Washington airport," for payment of deficiency judgments rendered by United States district courts, \$2,429, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest as specified in such judgments.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS: Page 2, after line 24 insert the following center head and new paragraph:

"Contracts for services

"Hereafter no contract for services at any airport under the direct jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Administration shall be entered into without previously advertising invitations for sealed bids based on specifications sufficient to permit full and free competition in the letting of such contracts."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. BOW. I will reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to require the Civil Aeronautics Authority officials to award contracts to the high bidders. I have in mind a recent contract that was let for a concession at the National Airport. The contract was let by sealed bids. The company that bid the highest rate to the Government was not awarded the contract. The purpose of this amendment is to require the Civil Aeronautics Authority in the future to award contracts to the bidders who will return the highest rate to the Government.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Why was not the contract awarded to the highest bidder?

Mr. ANDREWS. That is what I would like to know.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Cannot the gentleman find out?

Mr. ANDREWS. We are having the General Accounting Office look into it at this time.

The contract I had in mind was the concession for ground transportation from the airport to the city of Washington. I know a man who made a bid offering the Government 21 percent of the gross receipts. That man was financially able, and able in every other way to perform the contract. Yet the Civil Aeronautics Authority awarded that contract within 24 hours of the time the old contract expired to the bidder who bid 17 percent, after raising his initial bid from 15 percent.

Based on the present amount of business that is done at the airport, it is estimated conservatively that the 21-percent contract would have returned to the Government \$30,500 a year more

than the 17-percent contract will return to the Government or, over a period of 5 years, \$152,500.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Maybe the reason they did not want to award it to the gentleman you mentioned is that they did not want any competent company to handle it. Certainly anyone who has used that facility knows the one who is handling it now is not very competent.

Mr. ANDREWS. I have heard that.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment which in substance would require that in connection with contracts under the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Administration sealed bids be required.

The amendment provides for new law; it is not a limitation on the purpose for which funds may be used, and consequently it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Director of the Washington National Airport recently awarded a contract to Airport Transport, Inc., the incumbent concessionaire for ground transportation at the Washington National Airport for a period of 5 years.

This award was made through negotiation, after invitations were offered and proposals submitted by competing firms.

I would like to offer my congratulations to the Honorable Bennett Griffin, director of the airport, and to those in the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Office of the Secretary of Commerce who were responsible for the awarding of the contract to this splendid organization.

I have personally examined letters from every major airline in the Nation addressed to the Government authorities charged with the awarding of the contract. Uniformly these letters state that ground transportation service at the Washington National Airport is a model for the rest of the Nation. These airline officials requested the director to provide a continuity of service and to treat this franchise not as an ordinary concession but as a public utility. These officials properly were concerned with this operation because it actually is an integral part of the service which they provide the air-traveling public. A safe, fine trip by air could very easily be marred by an uncomfortable trip from airport to town.

Last year 1,330,000 passengers were transported by Airport Transport by limousine and taxicab to and from the Washington National Airport.

I note that the airport director negotiated several changes in the existing contract, chief among which was the increase in the fee arrangement from a low

of 10 percent and a high of 15 percent, to a low of 15 percent with a high of 17 percent. In addition, I note that there is now a minimum guaranty of revenue to the Government of \$175,000 per contract year. Several other changes have been made in the previous contract all of which, it seems to me, inure to the benefit of the Government.

Upon further inquiry, it has come to my attention that the fees paid to the Government by Airport Transport have been and are today the highest paid by any similar operation in the Nation. It is estimated that under the new arrangement the Government will average approximately \$200,000 a year in fees received from Airport Transport, based on present volume.

The Government controls the fares paid by the public, controls the standard of service, maintains the right to audit the books of the company, and thus regulates this company similar to a public utility.

I have further noted that where local taxicab companies supply \$5,000 to \$10,000 public liability insurance, Airport Transport protects its passengers by providing \$100,000 to \$300,000 liability insurance.

This company under its present management has operated at the airport for 10 years and has increased its payments to the Government over that period of time by over 500 percent.

Upon investigation I learned that this company provides a training course and safety program for its drivers which is unique and a model in the field. The company employs 250 drivers, all of whom are members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. They are selected only after the most careful investigation and physical examination. They are then put through rigid training periods before they are permanently hired. The Driver's Manual, establishing the standards of service and operation has not only been copied and used throughout the automotive transportation industry as a model, but has also been the subject of many articles in the trade press.

Before the present company commenced its operation, the airport was serviced by taxicabs with each driver owning his own cab or renting it on a per diem basis. Normal employer-employee relationship did not exist. The system was found unsatisfactory because it proved impossible to serve the public on a 24-hour rain-or-shine basis. To correct this situation the company has invested a substantial sum in its own fleet of vehicles and garage equipment, hired its own driver employees on a guaranteed salary basis, and maintains one of the finest fleet service units in this area. The drivers get such benefits as 2 weeks vacation with pay and group life insurance. Fifty percent of them have been with the company over 5 years.

In the year 1955 these drivers covered approximately 6,500,000 miles without a chargeable accident resulting in a major personal injury to themselves or passengers. Their record in 1956 is equally as good. In the entire 10-year period during which the present management has

1956

operated the company there has been only 1 major accident resulting in injury to a passenger. During this period approximately 10 million passengers were carried over a distance of 45 million miles.

I have also seen letters from the banking institutions and the major supply houses doing business with the company, all of which attest to the financial responsibility and integrity of the company and its officers.

In conclusion, I again wish to congratulate the Government officials charged with the awarding of this contract for having been so conscious of the welfare of the airline passengers as to have rewarded the contract to Airport Transport, Inc. The additional revenue to the Government is an admirable accomplishment, particularly in the light of the fact that the outstanding service, the low fares, the excellent equipment, and the impeccable character of the personnel has not been impaired. Obviously no other bidder could have provided more revenue for the Government without impairing in some manner these qualities to which the airline officials, the Government authorities, and the riding public so sincerely attest.

The testimony given before the Subcommittee on the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies, of which I am a member, leads me to the conclusion, which I am happy to present to the House of Representatives, that in the awarding of this contract to Airport Transport the best interests of the American public have been admirably served.

MAY 22, 1956.

HON. CHARLES J. LOWEN,  
*Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, United States Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: It has come to my attention that the Department of Commerce is considering a change in the contractual specifications regarding ground transportation operation at National Airport. To be specific: A change from negotiation to bid basis. Should such a change become factual, there would be a strong possibility that a new organization, lacking experience, could be awarded a contract on the basis of a lower bid.

In view of our recent entry into Washington as a domestic on-line carrier, I feel it only fair to voice a supporting opinion in favor of Air Transport, Inc., the present operator at National Airport. I know of no other ground transportation service, anywhere, that can better the service to passengers now provided by Air Transport, Inc. The organization, from management down to the last driver, is highly trained and enjoys a well-deserved reputation as a quality service performing in the public interest.

With the acquisition of three new carriers serving Washington, the added burden on ground transportation becomes apparent. Airport Transport, Inc., has met the challenge with alacrity and has provided the very same excellent standard of service as always.

It is my sincere hope that the Government will consider the many intangible, as well as tangible, qualities of the present operator prior to rendering such service to the status of a bid operation.

Cordially yours,

STEVAN M. OLDS,  
*District Sales Manager.*

NATIONAL AIRLINES, INC.,  
 Washington, D. C., February 10, 1956.  
 Mr. MOE LERNER,  
*Airport Transport,  
 Washington National Airport,  
 Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. LERNER: I have been in the airline industry for 11 years. During that period I have flown into practically every major city in the United States. I can make the unqualified statement that the service offered by Airport Transport in Washington is the most efficiently run and passenger-pleasing operation that I have yet encountered.

The consideration for the airline passenger's needs, and the lack of waiting time, the courtesy and attitude of the employees, the excellent and well-maintained equipment, combined with reasonable fares, all are outstanding features of your service.

I feel that any efforts to interfere with the present business operation and set-up at Washington National Airport could only work to the disadvantage of our passengers. I, therefore, offer my services in any way necessary to maintain and support your organization's operation. I will be happy to so advise in writing any party or parties involved in current controversy over your franchise.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. ROE,  
*District Sales Manager.*

APRIL 20, 1956.

HON. CHARLES LOWEN,  
*Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CHUCK: I don't know whether you know it or not, but long before our time here in Washington the ground transportation service at the airport was horrible. In fact, it was so bad that the industry had to do something about it. That was how the present service headed by Moe Lerner came into being, as I understand it.

I am advised that there is a possibility that the ground service will be open for bids. I just want to say without being too presumptuous that it would be one terrific mistake to in anyway impair the excellent service we are receiving at the airport today.

Sincerely,

ALEXANDER G. HARDY,  
*Senior Vice President.*

FEBRUARY 9, 1956.

Mr. MOE LERNER,  
*President, Airport Transport, Inc.  
 Washington National Airport,  
 Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MOE: I felt I could not let another day of the new year go by without expressing to you the sincere thanks of Northwest Orient Airlines for the fine service you are providing our customers.

It is very rare that a person in my capacity can experience a full year and a half—the time I have been assigned to Washington—without hearing anything but praise from our passengers concerning the airport limousine service. To me this recommends quite an achievement on your part.

With best wishes, and again our sincere thanks to you for the admirable record you have achieved for outstanding service to our passengers.

Very truly yours,  
 NORTHWEST ORIENT AIRLINES,  
 RONALD McVICKAR,  
*District Sales Manager.*

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

HON. CHARLES LOWEN,  
*Administrator of Civil Aeronautics,  
 Washington, D. C.:*

Reference limousine service Washington National Airport strongly recommend continuance of franchise for Airport Transport

Inc. based upon the excellent past service of this company to our customers.

J. C. ROBERTSON,  
*Director of Customer Service, Northwest Airlines.*

UNITED AIR LINES,  
 March 12, 1956.

The Honorable CHARLES J. LOWEN,  
*Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: A number of days ago several of our airline group were having a discussion regarding matters of mutual interest. It came to my attention then that there is some type of action pending which conceivably could deprive our passengers of the superior service rendered by the Airport Transport, Inc.

In my capacity as district sales manager for United, I have considerable interest in the service offered by an airport ground service operator. While actual administrative responsibility in the relationship between our company and a ground service operator falls under Mr. R. K. Kearns, our district passenger service manager, I naturally must concern myself with such a service in my responsibility for developing passenger sales in this area. In developing passenger sales, we must consider as part of our commodity how much the passenger pays for ground transportation to and from the airport and the type of service he receives. The air passenger normally originates and terminates his complete trip far from the airport, so such ground service as offered is of vital concern in offering our air service to the customer. I believe that Airport Transport, Inc. charges are very reasonable and that the service rendered is of superior quality. Their drivers are courteous and efficient, their schedules are prompt and expeditious. One thing that particularly impresses me is the speedy dispatch of their limousines from the airport or downtown terminals. In so many cities our early passenger is required to wait for long periods of time until the bus fills up. This brings up the point that here in Washington we have deluxe limousine service which will even carry our passengers to or from their homes at a reasonable fare. I should imagine that this represents an extremely large capital investment on the part of Airport Transport, Inc.

I feel that the management of that company is dedicated to the service of our passenger. I know from personal experience that Mr. Moe Lerner has devoted more than is required of his time and energy to assure us of quality service to our passengers. Undoubtedly, in order to achieve the type of service we receive, he has made a substantial investment in his capital equipment and facilities. With the expansion in service that we can anticipate this year and in the next few years as we reach the jet age, he will have to make additional and substantial capital investment on which he is entitled to a fair return, but which would not be reflected without assurance of continued operation.

It has been my privilege to have served United in several cities across our system and, as well, to have traveled extensively throughout the country. I can say unequivocally that in no other city is the airport ground transportation equal to that which our passengers receive here in Washington. I am convinced that the service rendered by Airport Transport, Inc., is in the best interest of our customer.

Very cordially yours,

M. W. STEVENSON,  
*District Sales Manager.*

July 12

CAPITAL AIRLINES,

Washington, D. C., March 20, 1956.

Mr. CHARLES J. LOWEN,  
Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LOWEN: Recently a rumor reached me, although I hope isn't true, compels me to express my viewpoints. I've been told there is a possibility that the contract for limousine and taxi service at Washington National Airport may in the future be offered on a bid basis. Although I'm not entirely sure of the ramifications this presents, on the surface, it would mean to me that a new organization without experience could be awarded this contract on the basis of a lower bid.

We have considered ourselves in Washington to be in a very fortunate position having ground services designed for convenience and service to the passengers. The very fact that this is a heavily used service tells us that the majority of our passengers require public transportation to reach their home, hotel, or office. Actually, for this majority we feel that their air trip doesn't end until they reach their final destination. We have always felt that the Airport Transport, Inc., the present operator, has treated air passengers with the same degree of courtesy and service the airlines display.

If this contract is to be put on a bid basis, we feel that it would cause a great deal of insecurity within the organizational structure of any company being awarded the bid. This insecurity would of necessity restrict the company from investing in first-class equipment which, of course, would lower the standard of service. In addition, with every succeeding award the experience line would be broken. To properly operate and schedule ground transportation service is extremely involved and complicated. It requires expert personnel who cannot be trained in short periods of time.

We feel very complimentary toward the present operator's organization. The personnel, management, and equipment comprise a closely knit institution which we have every right to be proud of. In this city which is a showcase of the world this type service must be outstandingly dignified. It would be most unfortunate to see this service lowered to the level of many of the major cities in the east.

Very truly yours,

O. E. WILLMAN,  
District Sales Manager.

MARCH 13, 1956.

HON. CHARLES LOWEN,  
Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHUCK: As one of the oldest so-called Washington airline officials in the area, I feel I can drop you a personal note on a subject pertaining to the welfare of our airline passengers within range of the Washington National Airport.

Through the rumor factory, I have heard that there is some talk of opening up ground transportation facilities to bids from various operators. Such word is certainly disturbing to one who has worked so closely these many years with all concerned at the airport and particularly with our many good permanent customers. We have found that the present operator, Airport Transport, Inc., has proved to be one of the finest ground transportation companies in the United States. I make the latter statement not only as a personal observation but it is based upon the comments and observations of passengers and other airline officials over a period of several years.

Certainly Moe Lerner's outfit has demonstrated the things we all strive for in the airline category which are outstanding service, equitable fares, and good, clean, well-maintained equipment.

I certainly hope, Chuck, that nothing will happen to disturb the excellent service our Washington passengers have enjoyed ground-wise, for certainly a good ground service reflects greatly on the air service offered. Hope to see you soon.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. BROCK,  
District Sales Manager.

EASTERN AIR LINES,  
March 9, 1956.

Mr. CHARLES LOWEN,  
Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LOWEN: Eastern Air Lines has a tremendous stake in Washington National Airport and we continually review the associate facilities in relation to our own service, especially the more dominant ones such as ground transportation. With our heavy commuter services from New York and Boston the importance of ground transportation efficiency is second only to our own service and almost equally important in a passenger's decision as to whether to use Washington National Airport at all. These decisions in favor of air travel are responsible to us for almost 40,000 passengers per month.

I have, therefore, been concerned recently to learn that reconsideration might be given to the system under which this facility so successfully operates. I can state positively in my 17 years in air transportation, covering a number of cities and countries, I have never seen better standards of service than those provided by Air Transport, Inc. More particularly, having spent 12 years as Eastern's manager in Washington, I have seen two predecessor operations in action and whereas before Airport Transport arrived the ground transportation problem was a continuing and discouraging one, this has been so completely changed that our other cities now point to Washington's service as outstanding, as do our passengers.

The lengthy delays and erratic service occasioned in many other cities has been long gone in Washington and I can say unequivocally that any disruption to Airport Transport's excellent program here would be a major disservice to our passengers and to the healthy growth of Washington as an air center.

This letter is written only to emphasize my long time feeling in relation to the superiority of Air Transport, Inc., and I would be more than happy to supply any further statements you might deem necessary.

Sincerely yours,

HARRISON KNAPP,  
Traffic and Sales Manager.

DELTA-C & S. AIR LINES,  
Atlanta, Ga., April 27, 1956.

HON. CHARLES J. LOWEN,  
Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LOWEN: It has been brought to my attention that the contract of Airport Transport, Inc., at Washington National Airport will expire on June 30, 1956, and that there is thinking in some quarters that the continuation of limousine service at Washington National should be the result of competitive bidding.

Although Delta does not feel that the procedures whereby ground transportation is contracted for is a matter in which we should interject ourself, we do know that efficient, adequate, and equitably priced airport-to-city limousine service for our passengers is a matter of importance and direct concern to us.

For this reason and insofar as it may be proper for us to do so I respectfully urge upon

you the continuation of arrangements with the present operator, Airport Transport, Inc., if the same can be done without material or serious prejudice to the Government. The Air Traffic Conference has recognized that ground transportation at airports is an essential public service rather than a concession; that it can be best provided by a single operator as a result of contract negotiation rather than competitive bidding; that, other things being fairly equal, preference should be given to the incumbent operator; and that his contract should be of a continuing nature.

We know from years of experience in providing air service to other cities that these considerations work in the interest of good public service. It is not unlikely that a newcomer, lacking knowledge and experience as to the complexities, magnitude, and quality of the job to be done, might submit a lower (higher) bid, but this might well result in inadequate service, inferior vehicles, or higher charges to the public. Such would certainly not be in the public interest and hence would not be in the interest of the operator of the airport or of the airlines serving that airport.

It has been my observation, since Delta began serving Washington on February 1, 1956, that Airport Transport, Inc., has provided our customers with good, courteous, and efficient service, and I trust that you will not think it too gratuitous of me to direct your attention to these considerations.

Very truly yours,

OSGOOD P. WILLIS,  
District Sales Manager.

JUNE 15, 1956.

Col. B. H. GRIFFIN,  
Washington National Airport,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BENNY: I recently addressed a letter to Jim Pyle as Acting Administrator setting forth the policies and views of American Airlines with respect to ground transportation services and particularly the services at Washington National Airport.

American, as that letter pointed out, has found the services of Airport Transport, Inc., most satisfactory. We believe that the services of this operator have been far superior to any previously operated in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS SHIPLEY,  
Assistant Vice President.

THE RIGGS NATIONAL BANK,

May 28, 1956.

DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is written at the request of our valued client, Airport Transport, Inc., in connection with their proposal for a renewal of their contract for operation of the ground transportation service at the Washington National Airport. We have been informed by Mr. Moe Lerner, president of the company that in the qualification data to accompany the proposal there is a question concerning the proposed method of financing such operation.

Airport Transport, Inc., has been a client of this bank for the past 15 years and during that period their relationship here has been excellent. We have made them loans on many occasions in substantial amounts, the aggregate sum of which would approach \$1 million and every obligation has been met promptly and satisfactorily.

The company has always demonstrated the highest commercial integrity and its officials the highest personal integrity, and the present management is in our opinion the finest the company has enjoyed in its long and successful career. We are confident the company is entirely capable of managing and financing the continued operation of the ground transportation service at the Wash-



ington National Airport, and I am pleased to give them our highest endorsement.

Yours very truly,

ROLAND T. CARR,  
Vice President.

ALEXANDRIA NATIONAL BANK,  
Alexandria, Va., May 28, 1956.  
DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is being written in connection with the proposal of Airport Transport, Inc., regarding a renewal of its contract for operation of the ground transportation service at the Washington National Airport. Mr. Moe Lerner, president of the Airport Transport, advises us in the qualification data to accompany this proposal there is a question concerning the financial status of the corporation.

We wish to advise you that Airport Transport, Inc., has been a most valued customer of this bank for the past 5 years, and during that time our relationship has been excellent. We consider them to be one of our best accounts; and insofar as their methods of audit and fiscal control are concerned, we believe their methods are of the finest. We have never been called upon to do any financing for them, but in analyzing their financial statements we would not hesitate to take care of any requests we would be able to handle for them.

A number of our personnel, including myself, have had occasion to use their service from time to time and we have always found the service to be most satisfactory and their employees courteous and considerate. We feel that this is a reflection of the competent management of the company and believe their operation adds immeasurably to the comfort and satisfaction of the airline traveler.

Very truly yours,

E. GUY RIDGELY,  
Vice President.

MAY 28, 1956.

DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It gives me much pleasure to tell you that Mr. Moe Lerner, president, Airport Transport, has been a customer of the B. F. Goodrich Co., 433 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., for many years.

We consider Airport Transport one of our most valued customers, and their purchases from us have averaged between \$25,000 and \$30,000 per year. Statements have always been paid promptly, and all business transactions between Airport Transport and The B. F. Goodrich Co. have been handled with the utmost dispatch. As regards their credit standing, we feel that they are in an unlimited position to finance their operations, and, from our experience with this company, there should be no problems involved.

Mr. Lerner is a man of high integrity and possesses excellent business ability.

Yours very truly,

Manager, B. F. Goodrich Co.

MAY 28, 1956.

Mr. BENNETT H. GRIFFIN,  
Director, Washington National Airport,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRIFFIN: The Airport Transport, Inc., operating a limousine service at the National Airport, has been doing business with us for a period of several years in the nature of purchasing parts, servicing their cars, and purchasing Cadillac limousines.

Their annual purchase of limousines, parts, and service has been averaging between \$90,000 and \$110,000 a year. At the purchase of the new Cadillac limousines they have paid for them at the time they were invoiced by check. Their monthly account has been paid for on or before the 10th of every month, taking advantage of discounts earned on parts purchased.

No. 118—18

The Airport Transport, Inc., enjoy one of the highest credit ratings of any organization doing business with our three companies, and we assure you it has been a most satisfactory account in every respect.

Using Cadillac equipment, naturally, has been of great concern with us, and it has been our obligation to assist them in every way to insure at all times prompt and efficient Cadillac limousine operation.

Therefore, we have no hesitancy in recommending Mr. Moe Lerner and his organization to anyone from a financial standpoint, as they have full and complete knowledge of every phase of the transportation business.

Very truly yours,

CAPITAL CADILLAC-OLDSMOBILE Co.,  
FLOYD D. AKERS, President.

MAY 29, 1956.

DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is our understanding that an inquiry has been made concerning our business dealings with the Airport Transport, Inc.

We have had the great pleasure of selling both cars and parts, amounting to approximately \$150,000 a year in gross sales, to the present management, over a period of many years, with unlimited credit. The stability, integrity, and financial standing of the organization has greatly enhanced our relations, and we are confident that the unusual resourcefulness of Mr. Lerner has greatly implemented the outstanding maintenance record of our products in the service of the company.

Again, we cannot speak too highly of the Airport Transport, Inc., and Mr. Lerner, and feel that the company's overall performance is a great asset to our city.

Very truly yours,

L. P. STEUART,  
President.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and the full Appropriations Committee for the interest shown in the very serious problem in Florida of the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly. This is of great importance, and is referred to on page 3 of the committee report under the heading of "Agricultural Research Service."

I express appreciation to the committee for its previous action in providing \$2,175,000 for the eradication of the fruitfly and, in addition, \$325,000 for the purpose of fighting the burrowing nematode, both of which principally affect the citrus industry in the State of Florida and jeopardize many other agricultural products.

But in addition to that, I want to express to the very fine chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture the fact that on page 580 of the report of the hearings of the subcommittee it was brought out that there was an area of approximately 250,000 acres which was expected to have to be fully treated under this program. I regret to have to inform the House and the chairman that this acreage has substantially increased in the few weeks since action was actually taken on this matter under the Agriculture Appropriation Act for 1957. Approximately 100,000 acres requires full treatment in my own home county of Pinellas. In addition to that, 80,000 to 90,000 acres require treatment in Lee County to the south, due to unantici-

pated additional heavy spread over that expected at the time of the original hearings. I have been in conference, along with many members of the Florida delegation, with the Department of Agriculture on this problem since that time. Since it has spread, I have been assured, and as a matter of fact I have been advised, that another \$2.5 million, and authority to transfer contingency and other funds for this fruitfly effort to assure adequate additional funds if needed, is going to be requested, in that the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Agriculture recognize that there remains even a greater need. That has been referred, I believe today, by the Bureau of the Budget to the White House for recommendation to your committee and that of the Senate. I just wish to advise you of the increased and continuing need in this particular field. I also wish to advise you of the fact that the Florida Legislature meets in special session on July 23. The governor himself and the cabinet, in effect, have committed themselves to recommend to the legislature that all Federal funds spent on this program be matched with State funds. So, we in Florida expect to do our part on this. I again want to thank the committee and Congress for the great consideration and effort put forth in this matter, recognizing that this is a very serious problem and at the same time to express appreciation for the expeditious and effective manner in which the Department of Agriculture and Bureau of the Budget, under President Eisenhower's leadership, have met this challenge. I am confident the anticipated further request will be fully considered—favorably so—for the facts merit further all-out Federal participation.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, which provides funds to meet some of the most pressing needs of our Defense Establishment, as well as other Government agencies.

One sorely needed item is the sum of \$40,219,000 for the Continental Air Command, to finance construction at airports and bases where vital reserve activities are under way.

A great job has been done in the past year in greatly stimulating and increasing the defense contribution of the Air Force Reserve, which has an increasingly important mission in the protection of the United States.

I personally believe the most productive defense dollars that we spend are invested in activities like the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard, and no activities have done more to make our people defense conscious.

In the city of Muskogee, in the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma, I have seen at first hand the operation of this Air Force Reserve program, and the almost phenomenal growth, on a virtual shoe string, of the 713th Fighter-Bomber Squadron at Davis Field.

The officers and men of this squadron, at considerable personal sacrifice and long hours of service beyond the call of

duty, have been engaged in making an outfit of which the entire Air Force is proud—and which has added much-needed muscle to our air defense, at low cost to the Government.

Maj. Gen. Bill Hall, the hard-working and able Deputy Chief of Staff in Charge of Reserve Activities, has personally paid tribute to the achievements of the Muskogee squadron, and appropriately cited it as an example of the great potential in Reserve force development.

Maj. Gen. George Finch, the energetic and forceful commander of the 14th Air Force, has played a significant role in the growth of the Muskogee squadron, and has complimented its personnel on squadron achievements.

The entire city of Muskogee, and many cities and towns in the area, have joined in magnificent support of the squadron.

Mayor Lyman Beard of Muskogee has supplied tireless and resourceful civic leadership for the activity, and Lt. Col. Claude Sledd and Maj. Ray Oatley, the squadron and base commanders, have planned and worked long hours to make an outstanding success of the undertaking.

"The Muskogee Story," as the Air Force dubbed it, is an inspiring story, and one which I predict will grow in inspiration and glory in the coming years.

I am glad to observe that this bill includes money to provide additional safety and efficiency features for Davis Field, home of the 713th, and I strongly urge its passage by the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and to speak out of order.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, on June 6, 1956, the House Committee on Government Operations adopted and the following noon made general distribution to the press—it had more than 2 weeks previously been released to some reporters—a report of its Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, which, for 18 days—beginning on July 19, and ending on October 19, 1955—held hearings concerning the power policies of the Department of the Interior.

The report as adopted and publicized carried, among others, recommendation No. 6, which will hereinafter be referred to.

July 9, members of the subcommittee received a letter reading:

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: The Public Works and Resources Subcommittee will resume public hearings into the Department of Interior's Federal power policies starting at 10:30 a. m., Monday, July 16, 1956, in room 362, Old House Office Building.

It is expected that the hearings will be conducted during morning and afternoon sessions. Officials of the Department of the Interior, as well as representatives of certain private electric utilities, will be heard at that time, in connection with recommendation No. 6 contained in the Committee on Government Operations 18th Intermediate Report, House Report 2279.

Cordially yours,

EARL CHUDOFF,  
Member of Congress, Chairman, Public Works and Resources Subcommittee.

Accused by Mr. H. Vance Austin, on leave from his employment with the Colorado State Association of REA Cooperatives, who, while directing the subcommittee investigation and hearings, was paid out of Federal funds allocated to the committee, the private power companies were tried, convicted and, from a practical standpoint, their liquidation demanded by the subcommittee. They are now apparently belatedly to be given a hearing before the sentence is carried out.

Before commenting on the report generally, let us look briefly at recommendation No. 6, which is to provide the basis of the hearing about to be held:

(6) Congress launch a full-scale joint investigation by both Houses to determine whether or not there is an organized effort of the private power companies to influence the Federal administration, the Congress, the governments of the States, and the political life of the Nation.

In spite of the fact that this investigation has not yet been made, the committee, in the report above referred to, wrote—page 9:

The announced administration policy is identical with that of the companies. It is designated to destroy the Federal power program and eliminate every vestige of opposition to the establishment of a complete private power monopoly in the United States. In carrying it out, the activities of the Interior Department and the private companies are completely coordinated in each region of the country.

The committee represented this conclusion as being based upon hearings. If so, why stage another set of hearings to find out what they already claim to have discovered? If not justified by the previous hearings, the committee is guilty of deliberate misrepresentation.

Since the committee, true to form, has already prejudged the case with regard to recommendation No. 6, the proposed hearings can be designed only to produce more political kilowatts for the campaign.

Apparently, the proposed hearings are a belated attempt to justify a judgment already handed out by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider for a moment the status of the report—the report which contains recommendation No. 6. This report was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed on June 7, 1956. To this date, Mr. Chairman, more than 1 month later, printed copies are still not available.

Why is the majority reluctant to release this report and why is the majority resuming its hearings while holding its report in abeyance?

Apparently, the suppressed printing of a report of the Committee on Government Operations, which is entitled "Effect of Department of Interior and REA Policies on Public Power Preference Customers," has not had the political effect which the majority had hoped would follow its release to the press. This lack of effectiveness may be due to the fact that not even the majority can agree on it.

So, this being an election year, the subcommittee is off on another witch hunt, although knowing full well that, as usual, during the last 2 or 3 weeks of the session, there will be no opportunity to

write legislation based on these hearings.

The hearings will, however, serve political ends by keeping Members off the floor, where from day to day important bills are up for action.

Perhaps intrigued by the example set by the Supreme Court of filing several opinions giving diverse reasons for affirming or reversing a lower court's decision, 5 members of the majority, who voted for the adoption of the report—2 of them members of the subcommittee which conducted the hearings—felt themselves compelled to file additional views which conflict with the majority report which they had just voted to adopt.

Upon one issue the majority members were unanimous. They were apparently in wholehearted accord with their Democratic colleagues who were reporting that those who are exercising authority in the Department of the Interior should be kicked out of office and that at the next election the present Republican administration and officeholders should be supplanted by Democrats.

The House committee voted 16 to 12—strictly along party lines—to file this so-called majority report. This being the case, and since 5 of the 16 Democrats actually do not agree with the report, is it in fact a majority report? Five from 16 leaves a minority of 11.

Add the 5 dissenting majority members to the 12 minority members who condemned the hearings as being unfair, and you have in effect a majority of 17 members of the committee who did not subscribe to the majority report.

The report is a baldly political document designed entirely to serve but two purposes: To discredit the Eisenhower administration and to crucify an industry vitally important to our national life and well-being.

The only valid claim that it is a majority report lies in the fact that it was adopted and reported out by the members of the political party which happens, at the moment, to have a slender voting margin in the Congress—even though five of those so voting apparently just could not swallow and deep down the obviously unfair methods followed by the subcommittee nor the conclusions set forth in the report.

Five times the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], in his additional views, calls attention to the fact that—see subsequent quotations—the basic American principle that the accused should not be convicted without a hearing, was disregarded by the subcommittee during its hearings.

The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. PORTER HARDY, JR., in his additional views, simply stated:

I am in substantial agreement with Mr. FOUNTAIN's additional views.

Another member of the committee, the Honorable JOE M. KILGORE, wrote:

I voted to adopt the committee report so that the report in its entirety might be brought to the attention of the Congress. However, I do not subscribe to all the conclusions and recommendations contained therein.

The Honorable DANTE B. FASCELL and ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN submitted additional views to emphasize certain points which they wrote "need emphasizing."

1956

They pointed out that there were, in their opinion, defects in the present law governing the Interior Department, and in addition, frankly stated that because of the present legislative situation they did "not feel it is proper to condemn and to criticize private utilities for not entering into wheeling arrangements."

These two members of the committee apparently not only realized that the authority of the subcommittee to go into the activities of the private power companies was doubtful but that the companies had been condemned without a hearing.

They also criticized the subcommittee because it charged private utilities with improper conduct without giving them an opportunity to be heard.

With one conclusion reached by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], I cannot agree. They wrote:

We do not interpret the report and we do not believe it can or should be interpreted as a document expressing a philosophy for the future development of the power resources of this country solely by the Federal Government or other public authorities. (Conversely, it is equally clear that all power development should not be undertaken exclusively by private industry, particularly with reference to those resources which are and have been in the public domain.

As I listened to the hearings, as I read the stenographic transcript, as I read the report, I could reach but one conclusion, which was that the subcommittee's sole effort was to bring about a socialization of the electrical power industry.

With the conclusion of those two gentlemen who stated that "A study of the history of the development of power, both public and private, indicates clearly that it is for the best interests of the public to have two-way development," I am in complete accord.

The very fact that the report travels under the guise of a "majority" opinion is completely in accord with the manner in which this and other investigations of this subcommittee have been handled—beginning with the hit-and-run hearings during which persons were accused of misconduct or violations of the law, then denied the right to be heard, followed by the filing of a report which prejudices a case which never had been heard and which, indeed, was not properly an issue.

The stated purpose of the investigation was to ascertain "the effect of the administrative acts and policies of the present officials of the Department of the Interior and the Rural Electrification Administration on rural electric cooperatives, public bodies, and municipal electric systems." The intermediate report supposedly dealt with the findings of that investigation.

Nowhere in the stated purpose, as quoted above from the introductory statement of the majority report, can I find any reference to the investigation embracing policies and business practices of private utilities. Yet throughout the report this important segment of our Nation's free-enterprise economic system is attacked viciously and ruth-

lessly. Not only were representatives of private power companies denied the right to be heard, but their industry was subjected to the basest sort of attack principally through innuendo and distortion.

As has just been pointed out, this was underscored by Representatives DANTE B. FASCELL, of Florida, and ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, of West Virginia, both members of the investigating subcommittee. In their additional views, Representatives FASCELL and MOLLOHAN came to the defense of private power companies and at the same time recognized the difficult position of the Federal Government in negotiating wheeling contracts. Permit me to quote from their statement:

In the case of a wheeling contract, it is necessary to bring together three parties into agreement; the Federal Government (producer), the private utility (transmission agent), and the preference customer. This must be done voluntarily. It is obviously an arms-length transaction for the private utility and the preference customer—with the Government in all cases being in the middle attempting to satisfy both parties and, at the same time, implement Federal power policy as intended by Congress. Furthermore, why should a private utility wheel public power to its competitor preference customer when the private utility is buying the public power at dump rates because it is the only available user?

Because of this situation, we do not feel it is proper to condemn and to criticize private utilities for not entering into wheeling arrangements. They are a private enterprise engaged in making a profit and while it is not unusual for a businessman to do business with his competitors, it would be ridiculous to assume that he would not try to get the best possible deal for himself. This is a duty that private management of a utility has to itself and its stockholders. They have no responsibility under the law for implementing Federal power policy and they have no responsibility under the law for assisting the preference customers who are in most cases their competitors or potential competitors for business. In fact, we are surprised under conditions as they exist, that any wheeling contracts have been entered into by private utility companies. Obviously, they have only been entered into where the company felt the economic benefit and advantages to the company far outweighed any assistance which they might be giving to their competitor, the preference customers.

Mr. Chairman, I interrupt the quotation to call particular attention to the following paragraph written by Representatives FASCELL and MOLLOHAN. I resume quoting:

Since the extensive hearings held by this subcommittee deal with the effect of present administrative action and policies of the Department of the Interior and the Rural Electric Administration on the implementation of Federal power policy as it may affect preference customers, we feel that any reference as to the unwillingness of private utilities to wheel or the strong terms sought by them in their negotiations for wheeling contracts, should be considered in these hearings only in the light of pointing out the position that the private utilities take under existing law and administration, and the difficulties that exist under these circumstances of the implementation of Federal power policy; but should not be considered in the light of condemnation, if their actions and performances are that of an ordinary

businessman acting in a reasonable and prudent manner in the operation of his business.

The report presupposes the interest and the desire of the private-utility companies to change Federal power policy. Obviously they have some feeling on the matter and take every opportunity, manner, and means to express their feelings and thoughts on the subject. What efforts, individually or in concert, private power companies are exerting in attempting to change through administrative means the Federal power policy as expressed by Congress, is not in my opinion a subject matter of even indirect consideration in the present report, and therefore, we disagree with any references to that effect which may be in the present report. We believe that the subject matter of the influence and interest that private-utility companies have on the administration of Federal power policy is certainly a proper one for congressional interest. We further believe that private utilities should be given every opportunity to be heard and to present their views on the subject, and we are hopeful that the Congress will see fit at an early date to undertake the consideration and study of the part private-utility companies have played and are playing in the implementation of public power policy under the present administration.

A study of the history of the development of power, both public and private, indicates clearly that it is for the best interests of the public to have two-way development.

Permit me to call your attention to this latter statement. It is a definitive—though simplified—enunciation of the basis for the partnership concept of the Eisenhower administration. The Eisenhower administration certainly believes that it is in the best public interest to have two-way development. Never, to the best of my knowledge, have any administration spokesmen argued otherwise.

President Eisenhower himself, in his first state of the Union message, said:

The best natural resource program will not result from exclusive dependence on Federal bureaucracy. It will involve a partnership of the States and local communities, private citizens, and the Federal Government, all working together.

The statement of Mr. FASCELL, with which Mr. MOLLOHAN agreed, is a frank admission that the policies pursued by the Department of the Interior under Secretary McKay and Under Secretary Davis are sound, and should be followed. It is a repudiation of the report itself.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN] speaking of the majority report, said he does not "necessarily fully subscribe to all of its language, conclusions, and recommendations."

That, permit me to comment, represents a classic in understatement. Representative FOUNTAIN does not merely decline to subscribe to the terms of the so-called majority report. If my understanding is correct, he takes rather violent exception to it, as reflected by his separate views in which the gentleman from North Carolina noted the report's context, and declared:

I seriously doubt the wisdom and the fairness, however, of those conclusions and recommendations in the report which amount to a blanket criticism of all private power companies without any power company having had an opportunity to be heard. Since

private power companies were not being investigated at this time, and since they were denied an opportunity to be heard, I believe it is only fair play that the report should not have contained such sweeping conclusions regarding them.

For example, recommendation No. 6 of the subcommittee was that "Congress launch a full-scale joint investigation by both Houses to determine whether or not there is an organized effort of the private power companies to influence the Federal administration, the Congress, the governments of the States, and the political life of the Nation." And yet, in conclusion No. 8 on page 9 of the report the subcommittee said:

"The announced administration policy is identical with that of the companies. It is designed to destroy the Federal power program, and eliminate every vestige of opposition to the establishment of a complete private power monopoly in the United States. In carrying it out, the activities of the Interior Department and the private companies are completely coordinated in each region of the country."

Since the investigation recommended has not been made, it seems to me that conclusion No. 8 and other blanket denunciations of all power companies before the companies have had a chance to be heard, should not have been in this report.

The report indicates that two companies in my own State were denied the privilege of testifying during the hearings.

Let me pause here, Mr. Chairman, to emphasize what the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative FOUNTAIN, recognized when he chose to quote those portions of his colleagues' report.

It is incredible that a congressional group would recommend undertaking an investigation and, before the investigation had been held, announce its conclusions which, by no stretch of the imagination, could be arrived at before the completion of the investigation of the nature they had just recommended.

In the concluding paragraph of his additional views, Representative FOUNTAIN took note of the position of the private power industry in the Nation's economic fabric. He concluded:

I have frequently disagreed with policies and activities of some of the power companies and I have not hesitated to publicly express my disagreement. However, they are an integral, necessary, essential, and significant segment of our economy and private enterprise system in America. Both private and public utilities are essential to our way of life and in the best interests of the general public. Nevertheless, whether or not we agree with the policies and or activities of private utilities, if their policies and activities are to be investigated, before they are judged, they should be afforded the opportunity to be heard and to present their views, regardless of whether or not their testimony would change the views of the committee. They should receive a fair hearing and careful consideration should be given to the evidence they present. After that is done, let the chips fall where they may.

The Republican members of the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources on the House side filed a minority report which should be read if the real purpose of the hearings is to be learned.

The minority report, signed by all minority members of the subcommittee and concurred in by all the minority members of the full committee, calls attention to grievous mishandling of the whole subject at issue, as reflected by the majority report and the conduct of the hearings.

They cite chapter and verse from both the majority report and the 1,686 pages of printed hearings in support of their position.

An extremely sober note is sounded by the minority members when they say:

The majority report, which is purported to be based on hearings, is more than just a pamphlet of political bias; it is an attack of calculated insidiousness upon the American system of free enterprise.

The venom with which the author of the report attacks private enterprise and the administration alike seems symptomatic of something more baneful than political partisanship.

The undersigned (minority members) would be derelict in their responsibility to the American people if they failed to expose this advocacy of nationalization by those who, in the guise of defenders of the rural electrification program, have managed to have their manifesto cloaked with the authority of a congressional committee.

To the extent that the majority report attacks economic freedom, it attacks an integral part of our liberty and independence.

At other points in the minority report, the Republican members of the House group completely disassociated themselves from the unjust criticism heaped upon the Department of the Interior and the REA, and, in fact, take the position that officials of those agencies should be commended rather than condemned.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to this view. Officials of the Department of the Interior and the REA in the present administration in these matters have acted in accordance with both the letter and the spirit of the law as they found it. They have surmounted great obstacles and successfully resolved difficult situations in many instances.

Like other Members of both House of Congress, I recognize the value of maintaining congressional security of executive branch activities. It is one of our duties to keep a watchful eye on their planning and spending and doing—an integral part of the governmental system of checks and balances envisioned by our Nation's Founding Fathers.

In discharging this duty, however, it behooves us to approach the task fairly and seriously, and—may I add—with courtesy, common sense, and having always in mind the Golden Rule. We do not hold a mandate to stage a political circus. Nor are we authorized nor does common decency permit us to institute and carry on an inquisition or a persecution of those with whom we disagree.

In my opinion, based upon what has been learned of the investigations, upon what I know of the manner in which the hearings were conducted, the lack of orderly procedure which characterized the hearings, and the absence of evidence to sustain the findings, and the political philosophy which apparently motivated the conclusions expressed in the report, it is obvious that the purpose was to discredit private enterprise and the administration, lend support to the political ambitions of certain candidates, defeat the reelection of others.

The record is replete with facts indicating the witnesses were recruited with but one purpose in mind. They were biased. The record shows that the subcommittee refused to hear representatives of the executive agencies whose

procedure was attacked, who were charged with violations of Federal law, until long after the charges were aired.

Private companies were pilloried, denied a hearing, an opportunity for rebuttal; unwarranted attacks were made upon individuals to whom credit—not discredit—is due.

The same subcommittee, on another occasion when holding joint hearings on timber with a Senate subcommittee, disclosed its determination to discourage those charged with improper conduct from presenting a defense and even from hearing firsthand the charges made against them. On one occasion, at Eugene, Oreg., officials and employees of the Department of the Interior were required to stand—be counted—and were then charged with a neglect of duty because they were attending hearings where they were numbered among the defendants, castigated, misused, and abused because they were not out in the field attending to their duties, but were listening, waiting an opportunity to be heard.

All but 1 of the 13 employees who were at the hearing were interested as individuals, as American citizens, as employees who were being criticized and who were on duty in the vicinity. The only one from Washington who was present was a representative sent out by the Department to assist in ascertaining the facts.

Mr. Chairman, the investigation, the hearings, the report are a shameful exhibition of misdirected congressional investigative activities—a reflection upon the intelligence, the fairness of the Congress. It is an insult to the intelligence and sense of fair play of the American people.

The investigations and the hearings held by this subcommittee show a studied, deliberate effort to lend substance to a groundless political attack upon Secretary of the Interior McKay, upon Under Secretary Davis, and back of that, upon the administration's policy of protecting enterprise, of checkmating nationalization of the power industry.

That the whole proceeding from its inception a year ago last February down to the present date was an attempt to create political propaganda, is shown by the fact that when Secretary Seaton was appointed by the President as Secretary of the Interior, his appointment was loudly praised by two Members of the other body—Senator MORSE, who is a candidate for office; the other Senator NEUBERGER, one of the arch opponents of Secretary McKay—this, notwithstanding the fact, and it is a fact, that both the President and Secretary Seaton have frankly stated that the policy which guided former Secretary McKay and Under Secretary Davis, insofar as it affects hydroelectric power, will be continued and carried out.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to announce to you that the delicious peaches now in

the cloakroom were sent with the compliments of L. D. Holmes & Sons, of Stately Oaks Plantation, near Johnston, S. C. These peaches were on the tree at noon Tuesday. They were gathered by Mr. Holmes and sent directly to the United States Congress.

Mr. Holmes and sons are owners of one of the most modern and up-to-date peach orchards in South Carolina. It is located in the heart of the famous sand ridge section. Mr. Holmes has been one of the outstanding pioneer and diversified farmers in the history of the Southeast. He was named Master Farmer of South Carolina some years ago and is looked upon by many of us as the dean emeritus of South Carolina agriculture. Mr. Holmes has two fine sons who are also tremendously interested in agriculture and are following in the footsteps of their father.

Mr. Holmes is not only noted for his success in growing peaches but has been successful in the raising of cattle, cotton, truck, and corn. For a number of years he has urged the South to keep its fields green in the wintertime and not to depend on one crop.

Johnston is located in historic old Edgefield County. Edgefield County for a century and a half has been noted for its governors, senators, generals, and statesmen. Edgefield County now ranks high in the production of peaches, cattle, and pine trees, and I might add, Mr. Chairman, is still producing great Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to add that L. D. Holmes is a strong believer in our American form of representative government. He is a States righter and for a number of years has opposed socialism and centralization of government in Washington. I hope all of you will enjoy these fine peaches sent to you by a great American who is proud of his Congress and proud of his country. If any of you are visiting South Carolina, Mr. Holmes would be happy to have you drop by and see his beautiful home and splendid farm.

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

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. It is not necessary to sign a Southern manifesto in order to get one, is it?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. There is no partisanship involved in this at all. This is from a great American to the Congress of the United States. However, I would like to see the gentleman from Iowa sign the manifesto.

(Mr. DORN of South Carolina asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, to answer the gentleman's question about signing the Southern manifesto, I think it would help a lot in the distribution of Mr. Dorn's peaches, but as the gentleman

from South Carolina has said, it is not necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I rose because apparently something I said on yesterday offended my good friend, the very genial and lovable minority leader, whom I would not offend for the world, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARTIN). He made a statement on the floor that I want to ask him to correct, and I am sure he will. He said, "While we are talking about inaccuracies, I want to say that the gentleman from Georgia made a false statement when he said that Robert Montgomery was training me or anyone else."

I did not make that statement. The gentleman was not on the floor, and I am sure he was misinformed about what I said. What I said was that I had heard that he had been under the tutelage of Robert Montgomery, and I thought maybe that accounted for the blooper he made on Monday, when he referred to General Motors.

I have stricken my entire statement about him from the Record, and upon mature consideration I am sure that the rumor was not true, and that the gentleman has not had any training in public speaking by Mr. Robert Montgomery, "or anyone else" as he says.

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

Mr. Chairman, although my district is not directly affected, we who represent the great State of Florida are jointly concerned with the gravity of the threat of the Mediterranean fruitfly. We are seeking jointly to insure adequate funds from Federal appropriations to match State funds with which to carry on the struggle for eradication. This is indeed a serious matter which no person should take lightly. I now yield to one whose district is very directly affected, and who with the other members of our delegation has been active in seeking adequate funds.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I will be glad to yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The Florida delegation wishes to express to the Appropriations Committee and in particular the Agricultural Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, its profound gratitude and thanks from the people of Florida for its considerate understanding and help in setting up a program for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in Florida. When this emergency was brought to the attention of the Agricultural Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, hearings which had been closed were again opened so that we might present necessary testimony to show the need for an appropriation to start a quick eradication program. The Appropriations Committee was sympathetic and as a result funds were appropriated in the amount of \$2,500,000 of which \$2,175,000 was allocated for the Mediterranean fruitfly and the remainder for the fight on spreading decline.

Since this action of the Congress in approving the money, the Mediterranean fruitfly has spread from the first

areas located until it is now in many parts of Florida, including the heart of the citrus industry. At the time we presented our problem to the Appropriations Committee we stated that if there was a spread of the Mediterranean fruitfly that more funds would be needed. The Department of Agriculture in recognition of this statement and under the conditions that now exist in Florida is requesting an additional \$2,500,000 which is being approved by the Bureau of the Budget to be submitted to the Congress to carry on this very important program. It has been stated by Senator HOLLAND that he is making a request for the inclusion of this additional amount in the Senate bill and we are hopeful and urging that the Members of the House will approve the appropriation of these funds until the program has been successful in eradicating the Mediterranean fruitfly. I am sure that the Members of the House know that the entire southern one-third of the United States could be infested with this insect and cause untold damage.

The Florida delegation thanks the Appropriations Committee and the Members of this House for the fine help we have received and in closing would like to urge that you help us to bring this fight to a proper conclusion. Governor Collins advised me only yesterday that the State will do its share in matching these funds on a 50-50 basis.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that a long distance call from Philadelphia made it necessary for me to be called off the floor when the gentleman from Michigan started to tear apart the majority of the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations in his usual manner. He has done it on numerous occasions during the session. I have no quarrel with him for it, because he has not agreed with the majority since we started out on the investigations during the past 2 years. However, I walked into the tail end of the complaint made by the gentleman from Michigan. So far as I could ascertain he was complaining bitterly that private power companies had not had an opportunity to be heard.

For the benefit of the Members of the House, although I do not know that they will have time to attend our hearings, let me say that on Monday we are going to give the private power companies of the Rocky Mountain States a chance to tell everything to the subcommittee, to tell us how they tried to influence and have influenced the Interior Department to wipe out the previous public power policy of the Government of the United States; and we are going to show by

competent evidence and testimony that they did just that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to say that we have before us today a rather important appropriation measure, and much as I dislike to do so, I shall have to object to any further requests to speak out of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS  
*Jones Point Bridge*

For expenses necessary for the construction of a bridge over the Potomac River pursuant to the provisions of the act of August 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 983, 984), as amended, \$14,325,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, is hereby merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the final consummation of agreements for the maintenance and operation of the bridge and approaches by the States of Virginia and Maryland.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 4, strike out all of lines 1 through 13.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would stop the construction of a free bridge across the Potomac River from Alexandria, Va., to Maryland at the expense of \$15 million to all the taxpayers of the country. I repeat that what is proposed here is to build a bridge from Alexandria, Va., to an unspecified point in Maryland, with the taxpayers of the country paying for it.

A few days ago enabling legislation passed the House of Representatives to construct a bridge from Constitution Avenue across into Virginia. That will entail the expenditure of \$22 million to \$24 million. I did not oppose that legislation because that will directly relieve traffic congestion, or I hope it will relieve congestion, in the District of Columbia.

This Alexandria bridge has nothing but an indirect connection with traffic in the District of Columbia. Let me read to you what the official report of the Appropriations Committee says in connection with it:

Insofar as the committee is advised, this is the first time Federal funds have been appropriated to cover the full cost of constructing a bridge between two States with neither end touching the District of Columbia.

It goes on to say it does not feel that approval of this appropriation establishes any precedent. Certainly it will establish a precedent if this appropriation is approved. It will be an open invitation to every Member of Congress to seek an interstate bridge, with the taxpayers of the entire country paying the freight.

To those who contend it will relieve the traffic congestion in the District of

Columbia by building a bridge at Jones Point at Alexandria, Va., across over into Maryland, I ask how long it will be before someone comes in and seeks to justify the building of a bridge, at the expense of all the taxpayers of this country, somewhere along Route 301 that runs from Baltimore south to Richmond, or west of Norfolk crossing the Potomac River somewhere in between. Why should these people come in and ask the taxpayers of the entire country to build free bridges across other streams on that route in order to allegedly relieve the traffic congestion in the District of Columbia?

Mr. Chairman, only a few weeks ago a bridge was completed across the river on Highway 30 between Illinois and Iowa. That bridge was built out of private funds. When I go back to Iowa I will pay a toll to cross that bridge. I do not get across the Mississippi River into Iowa without paying a toll. A short time ago the bridge across the Mississippi River near Muscatine, Iowa, collapsed and my colleague from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGL) obtained legislative authorization for the construction of a new toll bridge with private money, mind you. I suggested to him at that time that he probably ought to wait until this bill came to the House floor, then he could probably justify asking for a free bridge, the cost of which would be saddled on all the taxpayers. I labor under no delusion about the support this will undoubtedly have on the floor of the House this afternoon, and so I wish my colleague from Iowa (Mr. SCHWENGL) had waited until this appropriation passed so that he could offer a bill and then see if you are willing to underwrite the cost of bridges all over the Nation.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. There is a lot of congestion on Route 40 at Wheeling, W. Va. If they are going to hand out these free bridges I would like to put in a bid for one over there.

Mr. GROSS. I think the members should also know that the State of Maryland is not even building the approach to the bridge on that side of the river. You are being called upon to spend a half million dollars for the Maryland approach to this bridge. These two States of Virginia and Maryland can build this bridge. Make it a toll bridge if you like. There are automatic devices today for the collection of tolls.

We have heard a great deal recently about private enterprise. It will be interesting to see how some members vote, for this is certainly a clear-cut issue as between private enterprise and a \$15 million gravy train of Federal paternalism.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debates on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this subject has been thoroughly debated in this Congress and in the preceding Congresses. In fact for the last 4 years or more. The bridge was authorized in the 83d Congress. Then we came back during this Congress and amended the Bridge Authorization Act to improve the original legislation. It was considered, I believe, on two previous occasions by the Appropriations Committee. That committee delayed appropriations until we could get this perfecting legislation through the Congress.

Last year the Congress appropriated \$600,000 to start planning of the bridge. Those plans are pretty well under way at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, this bridge is primarily for the benefit of the Nation's Capital. We have the greatest amount of river crossing here in the metropolitan area of Washington across the Potomac River than in any other section of the entire world, and this includes the Hudson River between New York and New Jersey. The construction of this bridge at Jones Point is to relieve some of this intolerable congestion of traffic here in the center of Washington. It is to pull the traffic around and get the majority of the truck traffic and some of this through traffic to by-pass the congested streets of Washington. Many of the Members of this body who live in Virginia have to use the 14th Street and the Memorial Bridges, and they know what I am talking about. And, I guess all the Members know about the congestion on Independence Avenue, 40 percent of which we can eliminate if we can get the construction of this bridge to by-pass Washington. As far as it not being in the District is concerned, it is technically a matter of feet. The bridge actually crosses the District in the Potomac River. If it was shifted 150 feet upstream, it would begin in Virginia and come into the District of Columbia, the same as the Central area bridge which was approved the other day.

Mr. Chairman, I hope there will be no further delay in the approval of these funds so that we can go on and proceed with construction. It is urgently needed. Any further delay will just further aggravate an already intolerable situation in the Nation's Capital. This is a metropolitan area problem, a National Capital problem, and not a situation to suit the people of Virginia or Maryland. The taxpayers of Virginia and Maryland are spending millions of dollars for the approaches to this bridge, so it is not that the Federal Government is paying 100 percent of it, except just the cost of the bridge itself. And, the States of Virginia and Maryland are going to share in the maintenance of the bridge.

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

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how many millions of dollars the taxpayers have paid for the bridges that

1956

span the Potomac and now serve his district?

Mr. BROYHILL. Do you mean in the metropolitan area?

Mr. GROSS. Jones Point is not in the metropolitan area.

Mr. BROYHILL. It most certainly is. In fact, every major plan for a solution of the traffic problem here in Washington calls for a circumferential belt boulevard around Washington, D. C., in order to alleviate the traffic right here in the Nation's Capital. It is not for the benefit of the people of Maryland and Virginia alone but also for all the people of the country that travel to the Nation's Capital.

I urge that this amendment be defeated.

(Mr. BROYHILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and I want to point out to you some things that I think you might be overlooking. A good many Members of this House reside temporarily in northern Virginia, and I submit to you if there is any place in the United States that takes more away from the people and gives them less than that area, I would like to know where it is.

Now, this is a realistic proposition, and if we tax the taxpayers of the United States to build a bridge primarily to benefit this area of northern Virginia, it only means that the government down at Richmond would milk the taxpayers over in northern Virginia even more to build things down in southern Virginia. It is a known fact that they do not take care of northern Virginia. It is a known fact that the Federal Government has gone over there and built highways. If you want to get any highways out through those counties, the Federal Government has to build them. The States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New Jersey have built turnpikes, and they are channeling traffic into the city of Chicago by thousands and thousands of cars. Is the city of Chicago coming in and asking the Federal Government to do something about it? No. They are going to spend \$80 million of their own money to provide exits from these turnpikes. I think it is high time that we call on the States of Virginia and Maryland to meet their obligations and build this bridge. There is just as much justification for building a bridge across the Potomac from Virginia to Maryland as there is for building a bridge in every State of the Union where a river is the State boundary line. If the taxpayers build this bridge across from Maryland to Virginia, I do not see any reason why they should not build one between New York and New Jersey across the Hudson or between West Virginia and Ohio across the Ohio and so on and on. I can see building a bridge from the District of Columbia into Virginia, and I voted for that, and I will continue to vote for it, but, members of the committee, you are setting a dangerous precedent when you put the Federal Government in the business of building bridges between States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX] for 3 minutes.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment principally to set the record straight. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] in offering his amendment suggested that perhaps this would lead to building a bridge over the lower Potomac connecting Maryland and Virginia on Route 301. I am happy to announce to the House that we do have a bridge over the river at route 301. So far as giving something to the State of Maryland is concerned, to set the record straight, actually the whole of the District of Columbia, as it now stands, was given to the Federal Government by the State of Maryland.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD] for 3 minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a little misunderstanding about the Jones Point Bridge. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] spoke of the benefits to the State of Maryland and the State of Virginia. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] spoke primarily of benefiting northern Virginia. I cannot speak for the State of Virginia, but I can speak for my own State, the State of Maryland. We are happy to cooperate with the District of Columbia in building a bridge across the Potomac to relieve the traffic congestion in the District of Columbia. We will derive no appreciable benefit from the Jones Point Bridge other than that the citizens of Maryland will not have to cross the already crowded bridges across the Potomac in this area.

Concerning the fact that the bridge is not in the District of Columbia, I think if the gentleman from Iowa were to go up and down the Potomac River he would find that the shoreline of the District of Columbia is limited and that you can get only just so many bridges across. They had to go to the next best place to put it, since it could not be in the District of Columbia. So they put it between Jones Point and Alexandria.

This bridge is designed to take truck traffic through the Capital, off the streets of the Federal city of Washington and benefit all the millions of people who visit our Capital every year.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. If my information is correct, I believe the officials of the District of Columbia protested underwriting any of the maintenance costs of the bridge because they contended that it would not materially aid in the traffic problem of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANKFORD. I am not familiar with that, I might say to the gentleman, but I do know that the States of Maryland and Virginia will take care of the maintenance costs.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL. I will like to say in answer to the gentleman from Cali-

fornia [Mr. Moss] that the District officials have always supported the construction of this bridge and have always pleaded for the construction of the bridge because it was necessary to alleviate the traffic congestion in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further at that point?

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. My statement was not that they have opposed the bridge but that they oppose underwriting any of the cost of maintaining it because of lack of benefit to the District.

Mr. BROYHILL. The District Commissioners oppose sharing the cost of maintenance. The highway department agreed to share the cost of maintenance, not because it did not help the District of Columbia but under the same technicality on which the gentleman from Iowa is opposing the construction of the bridge.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] to close debate.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct my opening remarks to the gentleman from Iowa who propounded a question to me a few moments ago. At that time the answer I gave the gentleman was that there were several hundred thousand dollars unobligated with which this appropriation would be merged. I want to correct that. I have had a check made on that. The figure the gentleman used is correct. Five hundred thousand dollars is correct. While the money is not obligated, it is programed as planning money. So I want to get the record straight about the answer I gave the gentleman.

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

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That makes the bridge then, approximately \$15 million for the taxpayers to pay for.

Mr. PRESTON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield for one more observation, I am not opposing this bill on the basis of a technicality, as the gentleman from Virginia said. I am opposed to the bridge, period.

Mr. PRESTON. May I say this as to the attitude of the subcommittee: The House has worked its will on this item twice before. We took the position that that was sufficient evidence of the sentiment of the House and approved the item in the bill.

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

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 36, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE  
Military construction, Air Force

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force as authorized by the act of September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783) by section 505 of the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155), the act of July

July 12

14, 1952 (Public Law 534), the act of August 7, 1953 (Public Law 209), the act of April 1, 1954 (Public Law 325), the act of July 27, 1954 (Public Law 534), the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 765), the act of July 15, 1955 (Public Law 161), and of the Act of —, 1956 (Public Law —), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734. Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, to remain available until expended, \$1,228,000,000.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHENCK: On page 7, line 16, after the sum "\$1,228,000,000" strike out the period and insert a semicolon and add "Provided, however, That no part of the appropriation contained herein may be used to construct a new building at Andrews Air Force Base for use as the headquarters building of the Air Research and Development Command."

(Mr. SCHENCK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is, I believe, of great importance from many points of view.

It is practically impossible to overemphasize the importance of Research and Development, because this work determines the kind and effectiveness of our United States Air Force now and in the future.

The Air Research and Development Command has a twofold responsibility. It must carry on all the scientific research, development, and testing. It must also manage these projects so that they are properly put into production and use at the earliest practicable date. Hence, the saving of time in getting weapon systems into actual production and use is of very vital concern to every man, woman, and child in this Nation. If we are to believe all we hear about the great strides in developing and producing great new aircraft by our potential enemies then the work, responsibilities, and expeditious handling of these vital matters by the Air Research and Development Command become of prime importance to the safety and welfare of this Nation.

The actual scientific research, development, and testing of our air weapons is done by 10 Air Research and Development Command posts located a various sections of our country, each under a commanding general, who has been selected, with special care, and they are doing a superb job for all of us. The administrative and management functions, correlating all this work and cooperating closely with the Air Materiel Command to place the plans into production and use is the responsibility of the Air Research and Development Command Headquarters which is now located in Baltimore in inadequate rented quarters.

Lieutenant General Power, Commander of ARDC, former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, the Hon. Trevor Gardner, and others testified last year unequivocally and at considerable length in extensive hearings before a special subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations and the Committee on

Armed Services as to the most efficient and best location for this command headquarters. They pointed out that there is only one best location and that after the most thorough and careful consideration of a board of officers including the 10 commanding generals of the various posts, that their unanimous decision was to locate the ARDC Headquarters on Wright Patterson Air Force Base near Dayton, Ohio. All of these recommendations were further urged and approved by the R. A. Lasley Corp. of New York. This well known firm of industrial engineers made an extensive study of this problem over a long period of time. If anything need be said as to the qualifications of Lieutenant General Power, permit me to point out that he was personally selected by General Twining as one of the very small group of officers who recently visited Russia.

The House Committee on Armed Services, following a careful study of all this testimony, unanimously recommended that a new building be constructed for the ARDC headquarters on WPAFB, and the House approved their recommendations by the overwhelming rollcall vote of 316 to 2.

Permit me to say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that while I am very proud and happy with that action, I am most firmly convinced that this headquarters must be located at that one Air Force base which is in the best interest of the Air Force, the national defense, and the public interest, and that any special economic advantage which might be of benefit to a local community should receive no consideration of any kind.

The other body, for reasons best known to its Members, struck out the words, "Wright Patterson Air Force Base" and inserted "at a location to be determined."

Secretary of the Air Force, Donald Quarles, announced on May 17 of this year, that he had decided to move this headquarters to Andrews Air Force Base just outside the city of Washington. I was deeply shocked by this completely unwarranted action and told him so over the telephone. I told Secretary Quarles I felt he was completely wrong—that he had completely disregarded the testimony of his own officers who were best able to testify expertly on this matter—that he had also completely disregarded the action taken by the House Committee on Armed Services and by the Members of this House. Secretary Quarles gave me reasons which cannot be sustained by good judgment and said that his action was based on the approval of his air staff. I asked him if Lieutenant General Power, the man most directly responsible and concerned and the one who knows most about this problem, was a member of his air staff and joined in this approval, and he said "No."

Mr. Chairman, that this great Subcommittee on Appropriations recognizes the wrongness of this decision is amply shown in their report. I quote from page 34 of their report. "The committee still has some doubt that the immediate vicinity of the Nation's Capital is the best location for command headquarters of this type. The committee would have

preferred that another location had been selected. However, since the decision was obviously made after considerable study had been given to the problem, the project has been approved somewhat reluctantly." Since the Committee on Appropriations feels this way, Mr. Chairman, they should accept my amendment.

Permit me to say further, Mr. Chairman, that I am reliably informed that the senior commanders of organizations charged with a major portion of the Air Force mission, such as TAC, SAC, ADC, ARDC, or AMC, have frequently expressed opposition to being located near Washington. They feel the farther away they are the better they are for the very simple reason that being located near here creates confusion rather than coordination. The personnel of the air staff are inclined to enter with the operating functions of the separate commands and the management of these separate commands are inclined to take over part of the responsibilities of the air staff.

I am also told, Mr. Chairman, that moving ARDC headquarters to Andrews will set off an unusual chain of events that will cost many more millions. I am told that a majority of the present training command will be transferred from Scott to Randolph; that headquarters of the training command will be transferred to Scott Field; that MATS headquarters will be moved from Andrews to Scott Field; and that ARDC headquarters will be moved into the present MATS headquarters until another new building can be constructed.

The net effect of this series of proposals is the increase in the number of organizations into the Washington area. Many of us believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is undesirable from the standpoint of vulnerability, concentration of more people and functions in this area, and the added millions of cost.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, for all these and many other reasons which will occur to you, I urge the adoption of my amendment. I also urge that Secretary Quarles be required to personally appear before the Committee on Armed Services—justify any recommendations he may want to make to the satisfaction of the committee and obtain their approval before any appropriation is made for the moving of ARDC headquarters or for the construction of a new building at any location for their use.

Mr. Chairman, the point has been made that perhaps the matter of timing is important. General Power testified to that at some length on this phase of this matter and said that the matter of timing in the creation and development of a new headquarters building was of great importance. However, because of the situation which has developed, this has been unavoidably delayed. It will not help this situation now to move our research and development command headquarters to Andrews Air Force Base. If, however, the Secretary of the Air Force is required to appear before the Committee on Armed Services, and if he is able to prove to them that the location he selects is the proper location, and if he can gain the approval of the Com-



1956

mittee on Armed Services, I will support such decision whether or not that location is in the district I have the honor to represent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to seek an agreement limiting the time.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes, and that I be permitted to have the concluding 4 minutes to speak.

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

Mr. BOW. Reserving the right to object, how much time will that allow?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I modify the request to make it 15 minutes.

Mr. BOW. That is only 3 minutes to discuss a very important amendment. I object.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman agree to 18 minutes?

Mr. BOW. Make it 20, and I will agree to it.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 to be assigned to me.

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 Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

(Mr. DEVEREUX asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, this, of course, has been a very controversial subject. The gentleman from Ohio, I think, would like to have the Air Research and Development Command located at Dayton. We of Maryland fought for having it remain in its present location in the city of Baltimore. Last year, however, when the matter was under consideration this body agreed to having the Air Research and Development Command moved out to Ohio. The other body disagreed. We then agreed in this body to the action taken by the other body that there would be further study made of the entire subject.

Further study has been made, made by people who came in with a fresh look, and the recommendation has been made that the Air Research and Development Command would not remain in Baltimore where I had desired it to remain but would be removed to Andrews Air Force Base.

So far as costs are concerned I must agree that the cost of establishing the Air Research and Development Command at Andrews would be much less than it would be to create an entirely new establishment in the city of Baltimore or close thereto.

One thing we must remember very thoroughly so far as the moving of this huge command is concerned is that if we move it just a short distance away, from Baltimore to Andrews, we will have

those civilian employees following their employment. If we move it any great distance away there is no doubt in my mind whatsoever that we will lose many of those very highly skilled personnel who operate the Air Research and Development Command.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman indicate the number of employees involved?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I do not have the number of employees at my fingertips.

Mr. SCHENCK. I think it is about 1,800.

Mr. DEVEREUX. 1,800 key people, I am certain.

The gentleman from Ohio has suggested that if the present Secretary of the Air Force can come back to the Armed Services Committee and justify his location that then it would be agreeable to him; I will go along with him on that; I will support that position. But that position is in direct opposition to the one the gentleman from Ohio is now taking which simply precludes location of the Air Research and Development Command at Andrews Air Force Base.

If the gentleman will withdraw his amendment and offer an amendment carrying out his latest proposition I will then go along with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] is recognized.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to ask permission to speak out of order on another matter, but it occurred to me in the course of debate on this amendment that perhaps I ought to point out the inconsistency of the gentleman who just preceded me, who was down here a few moments ago asking the taxpayers to spend a considerable sum of money to relieve congestion in the Washington metropolitan area while he is now down here trying to get you to move a facility in here which will increase the congestion. Then, of course, if they get enough of those in here in this prime target area they will be asking for more money to build bridges to relieve the congestion here and you will have a vicious circle.

I would support the position of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK]. It means nothing to me personally, it means nothing to my district because my district is almost as far away from Dayton, Ohio, as it is from Washington, D. C. There is not too much difference in the distance. So I have no personal interest in the matter.

Mr. Chairman, if there is any logical place in the United States for the location of this particular operation it certainly is at Wright Field, in Dayton, Ohio, because that is where all of the best brains on matters pertaining to air research, are located. They have a tremendous investment there. It runs into the millions of dollars, I daresay into the billions. I believe this facility could be fitted in out there without too much trouble and it would be that much farther from the east coast which is a prime target area. You read the newspapers about dispersing industry and other things. As a matter of fact in this bill there is some money to take one of these

facilities away from Washington. Now, to show how inconsistent we can get, they put money in the bill to bring another one back into Washington. It just does not make much sense to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, this particular item illustrates the unfortunate situation that comes up in connection with some of these supplemental bills where we are considering nearly a billion and a half dollars in one chapter involving hundreds of projects all over the world which have required long hours of study by the committees concerned. It is unfortunate that time is limited on so many of these matters that are of really outstanding importance.

Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say briefly with respect to this particular item that there is no question in anyone's mind but what air research and development is one of the most urgent programs before us. Only recently in other legislation hundreds of millions of dollars were allocated and there was much discussion of the urgency of keeping abreast and ahead in the field of research and development, particularly as it affects airpower.

Any further delay after this matter has finally been determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, it would seem to me, is kicking the ball around. Local interests should not be considered, in my opinion, in a matter of such national importance. While I come from Maryland, it would have no impact whatever on my district. I am speaking merely as a member of the subcommittee that has formulated this particular chapter.

There is no more dedicated, no more able and qualified member of our Cabinet than Secretary Quarles. I am sure he is not influenced by sectional interests. He is only concerned in getting ahead with the job and doing it according to the best judgment of himself and his advisers.

It would be a very great mistake to amend this section of the bill at this time. We have enough criticism as it is from Members of this body of attempts to legislate in appropriation bills. We have a situation where a decision has been made. Let us go on with the work. It is important to our national defense. The gentleman from Ohio spoke about so many brains in Ohio. To add to them might make it a more vulnerable target. Perhaps it might put too many brains in one basket and that may be a good reason for keeping some of those brains nearby.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated, the House at one time did work its will and say that this facility should be located at Dayton, Ohio, which is the headquarters of the Materiel Command. All of the purchases of materiel for the Air Force are worked out at Dayton, at

Wright-Patterson Field. This facility of air development works out the development of materiel. It would seem logical and proper that it should be located at the headquarters of the Materiel Command at Wright-Patterson, which is some miles away from my area and from my district in Ohio. However, may I also point out that by this act the \$6 million going into the Andrews Air Force Field here in Washington is a further foreclosure against the possibility of the use of Andrews Air Force Base for another airport or for civilian use in the city of Washington. We have discussed the Burke airport and other airports. It would seem to me much wiser that we should move on to the Andrews Field, perhaps, the aircraft that are now flying out of Bolling Field, those that are now flying out of the airports here in Washington. You have a lot of military aircraft using these fields right adjacent to the National Airport and creating thereby a dangerous and crowded situation. Now, if we move the military onto Andrews Field, and these facilities where they would be close to the Air Materiel Command, it would seem to me it would make more sense. As I say, if we build this \$6 million building at Andrews Field, we will be further foreclosing the possibility of the use of the field for which it was built. Therefore, I suggest that it is very important that this amendment be adopted and further consideration be given as to whether or not we will later on build this type of installation at Andrews Field.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I would like to quote from General Powers' testimony last year before the Committee on Armed Services. He said, in specific reference to Andrews Air Force Base:

Although Andrews is close to the major sources of policy and programming guidance, it does not permit, as Wright-Patterson does, the close supervision of the weapons systems and engineering standard functions that desire close cooperation with the Air Materiel Command nor a reduction in the communication and travel requirements.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman. I submit to you that air research should be with the Materiel Command at Wright-Patterson Field in Ohio, and to accomplish that, that this amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to announce that Andrews Air Force Base is in my district. I also want to make it perfectly clear that while I suggested Andrews to the Secretary, I was led to believe that it would not be considered. No one could have been more surprised than I when Secretary Quarles announced that ARDC was to be moved to Andrews Field.

Now, ARDC is a peculiar sort of air command. It may be true, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] said, that the best military brains are at Wright-Patterson Field, but ARDC deals in a great measure with civilian scientists,

and it has been brought out time and again that the civilian scientists prefer to be in this area so that they can work with the universities in this area and with the laboratories in this area. Now, ARDC is dependent a great deal on these civilian scientists, and I believe they would have difficulty in transporting them from here to Ohio. There were at least four studies taken as to where ARDC should be located, and each time they came up with a slightly different answer. It is true that Wright-Patterson was recommended, but for some reason or other the recommendation was never actively pursued. However, when Secretary Quarles announced his final decision that ARDC was to be based at Andrews Air Force Base, I heard no criticism of it at all until the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] offered his amendment today. Certainly, the Secretary has had the benefit of these studies. He has had the benefit of expert advice of his staff and he made up his mind, taking all things into consideration, that Andrews Air Force Base was the place to locate ARDC. I feel that now is the time to settle the issue once and for all. Let us put it at Andrews and get it over with.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. May I say to the gentleman from Maryland that the Secretary of the Air Force, Donald Quarles, knew exactly how I felt about it when he told me he was going to move this Air Research and Development Command headquarters to Andrews Air Force Base. I told him that his decision was completely wrong, because it completely disregarded the testimony of his own expert witnesses who know the most about this matter and it disregarded the action taken by the Committee on Armed Services of this House and the Members of the House.

I feel, Mr. Chairman, that for these reasons the decision of Secretary Quarles is completely and entirely wrong and that the Secretary should be required to obtain the approval of the Committee on Armed Services before the final action is taken.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, may I remind the gentleman that what I said was that I heard no criticism of it. It may be perfectly true that the gentleman voiced his objection to the Secretary of the Air Force; but I heard no criticism of his final decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] for 5 minutes, on behalf of the committee, to close debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the Members have the hearings before them, they can turn to pages 331 and 332 and read the letter which Secretary Quarles wrote on May 17 to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, stating the reasons why he felt that this research and development headquarters should be at Andrews Field. Andrews Field was rejected at one time because it was so close to the Washington area and an attempt was being made not to

bring additional important facilities into the Washington area. But the Secretary of Defense considered this matter of such vital importance that an exception was made and Andrews Field was recommended.

A quick look at the picture reveals that in the 82d Congress we authorized the Headquarters for the Baltimore area. We thought at that time that it would be at Friendship. But negotiations broke down and the personnel went into a series of rented buildings where they have not been able to do a sufficiently effective job. Research and Development is the most important activity, in many ways, of the Air Force. It is a very sensitive activity and yet officials of the Air Force do not have the physical setup in Baltimore to enable them to do the job that ought to be done.

At one time the Armed Services Committee recommended Wright-Patterson in Dayton, Ohio. The bill went to the Senate and apparently the Committee on Armed Services decided to take a neutral attitude. There were two sides to this picture. So it was suggested that funds be made available but that no site be specifically named, that it be left to the Department of the Air Force to select a site. That is what has happened.

I do not think any Member of Congress from Ohio or from Maryland has had the slightest effect on the decision reached by the Department of the Air Force. I do not believe that Secretary Quarles, the very able Secretary of the Air Force, has been motivated by any political considerations in making this determination. I think he made a good determination when he selected the location at Andrews.

These people do not have vast laboratories and machines. This is a headquarters. In this headquarters they coordinate the research and development activities all over the country, down at Patrick Field in Florida, the guided missile testing area, the facility up in Rome, N. Y., and the work at Wright-Patterson Field in Ohio, at Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico, and at Edwards Air Force Base at Muroc, Calif. In the bill we provide for the headquarters at Andrews Field \$6 million. That is the amount they requested.

I might agree if Wright-Patterson Field had been neglected and did not have adequate facilities and it was just a matter of going one place or the other, with no special difference, you might say, "Well, let's give Dayton some sort of facility," but that is not the case at all. The Government has at Wright-Patterson Field in facilities an investment of nearly a quarter of a billion dollars. In addition we have in this bill \$21 million for Wright-Patterson Field. It has nothing to do with this research center. We already have that in the bill. We have a payroll at Wright-Patterson Field of in excess of \$130 million a year. It is a prime atom bomb target. Certainly it almost ranks with the Capital as an atom bomb target. But there is no disposition on the part of anyone to sell Wright-Patterson Field short. At Andrews Air Force Base we have a \$63-million investment, and we have all the necessary support activities at both places.

The proposed amendment would prevent building this headquarters facility at Andrews, and delay further the accomplishment of something that everyone has agreed is necessary. I urge rejection of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHENCK) there were—ayes 38, noes 45.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 309. No funds appropriated for military construction shall be made available to the respective military departments in a manner so as to restrict the application of funds to any specific project or installation.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: On page 10, line 7, after the word "installation", insert "Provided, That no reserve military appropriations herein shall be used for purposes other than for reserve purposes."

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is simply to require the funds which the committee has generously provided for reserve purposes to be used for those purposes. I think this committee has done an excellent job. I have nothing but praise for the work that they have done. I have talked with them individually, and they have treated the matter of the reserve activity seriously and earnestly and have done a grand job. I compliment everybody from the chairman, my good and distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas, to the other Members from California, Florida, and the other States on this side of the aisle for the work they have done. But here is the situation, Mr. Chairman. We have had hearings on the reserve activities. Last year in the Air Force, for instance, this committee provided \$32 million in funds for the construction of reserve installations. I see my good friend the gentleman from Maryland, who is a member of the Reserve Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. He recalls the testimony. That money instead of being spent for reserve installations was spent for other purposes due to the pressure for funds from the Air Force. As a result of that, instead of the Air Force Reserve installations receiving \$32 million last year in funds, the reserve installations of the Air Force only received \$6 million in construction funds. That is putting our construction program far behind what it should be. Mr. Chairman, next year, beginning next August, the men coming out of the armed services are required by law to engage in active Reserve training. Unless we have facilities for them to train, we are going to have men coming out by the tens of thousands with no installations in which they can train. I am told that the Air Force is under pressure for funds, for combat funds, but we are going to wreck our Reserve program unless the money which this committee generously pro-

vided for Reserve is used for that activity.

I yield to my distinguished friend from the State of Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I am looking at pages 31 and 32 of the report and observe there that the committee provided in this bill for the Continental Air Command Reserve the sum of \$40,219,000. The committee, in approving that money, expected it to be used for the Air Force Reserve program and for no other purpose. The committee feels that the Reserve program should not be neglected and that these funds should not be applied to other purposes even though they are integrated with other funds. While I cannot speak for the committee, the gentleman's amendment would tend to accomplish precisely what the committee understands will be done and should be done with these funds. As I understand it, you are merely saying that the funds we provided for the Reserve of the Air Force shall be used for that purpose and for no other purpose.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. Our difficulties are largely in the Air Force. We want Reserve money used for Reserve purposes.

Mr. MAHON. I have no objection to that although, as I say, I cannot speak for the committee.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for his valuable contribution to this discussion.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has discussed this matter with me and with members of the committee. I have discussed it with some of the officials of the Department of Defense. I see no reason why it should not be adopted. It merely clarifies the intent of the Congress.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It will not hurt a soul, but it will clarify the situation and it will guarantee that this money will be used the way it was intended to be used.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment is very commendable, I think, and whether or not it is necessary as our distinguished chairman has said, I am not sure, but there is certainly no objection to the amendment on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I can assure the gentleman that those who believe the Reserve activities should continue will feel much better if it is placed in the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I agree with the gentleman. I think it spells it out.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Thank you kindly.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I think my distinguished friend from Louisiana is to be commended for his zeal in this matter. He has always been keenly interested in the Reserve program and has contributed a great deal toward a sound Reserve program. What the gentleman is attempting to do is to make doubly sure, in fact,

to insure that the intent of the committee is to be carried out.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is exactly right. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield. Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I have been honored to serve on the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Louisiana. I must say that we are pretty intimately and well informed on the Reserve program. I think the amendment the gentleman has offered is very, very worthwhile, and I recommend its adoption.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this subject applies equally to the operation and maintenance funds as to the capital outlay funds, under discussion. Particularly at reserve air bases where the upkeep of the equipment has a direct bearing, not only upon the safety of the Reserves, the weekend fliers, but upon the safety of the people whose homes are in the vicinity of these bases.

I hope the Department of the Air Force will continue its caution along on the operation and maintenance problem, as well as the commendable capital outlay problem which the gentleman's amendment seeks to solve.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 10, line 7, strike out the period, insert a semicolon "Provided further, That nothing herein shall be so construed as to prohibit withholding or withdrawing funds for specific projects or installations when such projects or installations can be eliminated or deferred without adverse effect on the national interest."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to follow the language and the word "installation" on line 7. I have offered it because, although it is not as good as what I had in mind myself, it would permit the armed services to stop the use of funds upon projects that had gone sour or had been dropped because they were not needed any longer.

The way the language in section 309 reads they would not have the power to do that. No one else would have the power to do it, and it would be a menace to our whole military situation.

I am in hopes that the gentleman on the other side of the aisle will agree to accept this amendment. It is in the nature of a compromise. Frankly, it can be drawn so that it will not in the slightest degree be subject to a point of order, but I thought perhaps those who misconstrue the language that they have brought in here might be willing to accept this. I do not think it would be

safe for us to pass this kind of a provision. For that reason I have offered this amendment and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, due to the fact that as far as I know the only complaint comes from Assistant Secretary McNeil and not from either of the three services, I insist upon my point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this is subject to a point of order. It does not call for additional duties. It is simply a limitation upon a restriction that is set up in the language. It is clearly germane to the language.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I merely wish to call the Chair's attention to the fact that it imposes additional duties and that it also is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has offered an amendment to which the gentleman from California has interposed the point of order that the amendment imposes additional duties and is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York does impose an additional burden upon the person administering the funds, and, therefore, constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 10, line 7, before the period insert ", but this proviso shall not deprive the Department of Defense or its Comptroller or the Bureau of the Budget of any authority which they now have."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will accomplish the same thing as the one I first offered. It will leave the proviso in such shape that the Department of Defense will not be helpless in its effort to stop the waste of money on projects that are not needed or that have gone sour because of situations outside of the country or which because of some change or some new invention have become entirely obsolete.

The language presently in the bill would require the Department of Defense to go right down the line and continue with a project that was not needed and was not desirable.

I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. My friend knows I have great respect for him, but would he not tell me if his amendment does not completely nullify the section so as to leave it meaningless?

Mr. TABER. No, it does not, if the statements that are made by the members of the committee are true that it does not mean anything at all and if they are trying to bring about the situation I have described and which the

committee report said you wanted to accomplish, this would carry out just exactly that.

Also the gentleman from Texas when I had the floor previously indicated that he did not want to fix it so that such things as this could not be corrected.

If you want to have things in such shape that there is no control and no chance to save anything anywhere, you would object to the language I have suggested.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is very rare that I find myself holding a viewpoint opposite from that of the gentleman from New York, but in this instance I have not been advised by Mr. McNeil to the degree that some other members of the committee appear to have been. However, I can say that no member of the three services I am referring to has expressed any objection to section 309.

The complaints of Assistant Secretary McNeil as to the effect of section 309 of the supplemental appropriation bill take two forms as set forth in his letter of July 7, 1956. In one instance, he says that this section would "appear to take away from the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget every vestige of a possibility of controlling the manner in which the vast sums made available to the Department for military construction could be used." Secondly, he cites in an example, "when it is determined by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense that a proposed project is no longer required due to changes in the program, that most assuredly the committee does not want such funds to be wasted, and moreover, the Department should have the tools to prevent such waste when circumstances indicate that definite direct controls are necessary. The apportionment procedures as authorized by law have provided this tool in the past."

Let us examine these two complaints. First of all, as to the taking away of every vestige of possibility of controlling the manner in which the vast sums made available for military construction can be used. Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes provides the apportionment and authority for the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense. The particular section relating to apportionment is incorporated in section 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951. This section provides merely that "all appropriation of funds not limited to a definite period of time and all authorizations to create obligations by contract in advance of appropriations shall be so apportioned as to achieve the most effective and economical use thereof." The section provides that apportionment shall be distributed as the apportioning officers shall see fit, and shall be reviewed at least four times each year. As evidenced by the committee in its report, section 309 does not obviate this review authority. The committee states "that it is firmly convinced that the recommendations contained in both the bill and this report will result in substantial

savings without in any way diminishing the needed administrative controls." These so-called needed administrative controls are the review authority which the Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget have and which the committee does not disturb in any way with section 309. Section 309 is primarily negatory legislation. It provides merely that in making apportionments to the several services, no apportionment can be made so as to limit the use of funds to a single project or installation. The committee has stated this quite clearly in the report, where it states "The committee believes that a proper and sensible approach to this matter would be a lump-sum apportionment for each service. Under this procedure, the individual services would prepare a specific list of items of construction which would be limited to projects authorized by law, approved for funding by the Congress, and determined by that military service to be currently valid requirements. A provision effectuating the procedure above outlined is included in the accompanying bill as section 309." In other words, Congress is merely asking that the Department of Defense make available funds to the several military services for their construction program in the same manner in which the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget and the President request appropriations and program approvals of the Congress. Section 309 does not jeopardize or change in any way the review authority contained in section 3679 of the Revised Statutes.

The Secretary of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget have complete authority to deny the apportionment of funds to any project or installation as they see fit or to withdraw funds from any project for which they have previously apportioned funds as they might deem necessary. Section 309 merely effectuates the implementation of the construction program of the several services in exactly the same manner as these programs are recommended to the Congress.

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

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

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Has the gentleman read the language in section 309, which states:

No funds appropriated for military construction shall be made available to the respective military departments in a manner so as to restrict the application of funds to any specific project or installation.

That would completely wipe out those provisions.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have said to the gentleman, for whom I have a great deal of admiration, that his interpretation has not always been along the same lines that he is expressing here today. However, that is his privilege.

I would like to add this. Insofar as one member of the Committee on Appropria-

tions is concerned, I am sick and tired of having a presidential message come up and gentlemen representing the Department of Defense make presentations to the Committee on Appropriations for specific requirements in support thereof, and then within 30 days changing their minds. That sort of operation is quite odoriferous, and I want no part of it.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. There seems to be doubt in the mind of the gentleman from New York, but is there any doubt in the gentleman's mind that in the course of carrying out the functions in regard to one of the items here the Secretary of a department could withhold funds from any project that becomes obsolete or undesirable?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not under the act I refer to; certainly not.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Or under the language in 309?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. And that was the intent of the committee when it approved the language?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was, and it was unanimous on the part of the committee for its approval.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. When you pass language subsequent to that, the other sections to which you refer, you wipe out the provisions of that section, provided they are different from the ones that existed before, and this language would control, and you would absolutely destroy the powers that exist.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am very sorry I do not agree with the gentleman. I certainly have not taken this completely unto myself. I have faith in the wisdom of those with whom I discussed this matter and on some of whom the gentleman has relied for a good many years.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the members of the committee that the effort of the Committee on Appropriations is to protect the integrity and the dignity of the Congress. We are in a very delicate situation, particularly with respect to the first amendment which was offered by the gentleman from New York, Mr. TABER. So far as I know, he is the only member of the Committee on Appropriations who shares the view which he has expressed. He makes an interpretation that is not the same as the interpretation made, insofar as I know, by other members of the committee.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Well, how can the language of section 309 mean anything except that when an item is apportioned to a certain project it stays there? It must stay there. The previous laws would all be wiped out by this provision.

Mr. MAHON. Well, if Congress wants to preserve its integrity with respect to the judicial and executive branches, it must treat very lightly when it comes to this business of saying to the executive branch we appropriate money, we pass laws, but you ignore them if you wish.

We have provided additional funds for B-52 bombers and other Air Force purposes above the President's budget in our regular military appropriation bill. Well the President may withhold those funds, he may not expend them, but that is a highly controversial point. But, I will not vote for an amendment surrendering the appropriations authority of the Congress and say, "we appropriate the money, but if you decide differently, why, just do not use it or use it for other purposes."

Now, here is what we are getting at, if you will read the report. It makes it clearer than I probably will make it here. What the Defense Department has been doing has been unfair to the Congress, and we are trying to improve the situation and make both the Congress and the executive more effective. Officials come up here with their budget and they say "Gentlemen of the Committee on Appropriations, gentlemen of the Congress, we desperately need this money; we need it now; we need it forthwith." That is what they say. And, they supposedly know what they are talking about. But, we find that perhaps there has been a tongue-in-cheek operation, because after we give them this money which they say they so desperately need, they at times go back and review these same projects for months, maybe a year, before they take action, and they delay the program. The whole point is this, and what we are trying to compel them to do is this: Do not come up to Congress and ask us for any more money unless you need it, unless you know how you are going to spend it, unless you have sifted and re-sifted, considered and reconsidered it, unless you know that you need the project. Then present it. But they have not been doing that with us. They have come up here and said, "We want this blank check." They have not said that to us exactly that way, but that is what they have said in effect. Then they go back to the departments, and delay interminably. They delay the defense program. Then maybe Congress gets the blame for the delay when officials sit on these projects and do not use the funds which they have requested and which they said needed immediate action and about which they are doing nothing.

This provision I think will put them on the spot where they deserve to be. If they ask for the money and say they need it, they should use it unless the circumstances are very exceptional. They do not have to ask for it, if they do not want it. But they come in and tell us they want it. Then if we give it to them, let them move expeditiously and do what should be done. Of course, if the executive in his wisdom does not spend the money, that is up to him. But I do not want to put my approval or the approval of Congress on a process of agreeing that we surrender the appropriation power to the Executive.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I have no objection to having accomplished what the committee in the report says it wants to accomplish. But I am satisfied that this provision goes way beyond that and absolutely destroys the control which we have for our protection.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is satisfied with his own view, but I do not think his view is shared by others on either side of the aisle.

Mr. TABER. I am inclined to think it would be by anyone who would study the language, read it carefully. The language is just as plain as it can be. It represents an absolute restriction. The money cannot be withdrawn; it must be spent.

Mr. MAHON. This does not repeal authority given in other acts.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes, it does.

Mr. MAHON. It says that when they get the money for a project it shall be turned over to the service for expenditure on a lump sum basis. It does not say it in those words, but that is the intent.

Mr. TABER. It cannot be that way under any circumstances. That is not the interpretation you can put on the language. If we are not going to pay attention to what the language means, then I cannot do anything about it.

Mr. MAHON. If the members of the executive branch of the Government do not want to spend money on a project, they will not do it. That has been demonstrated before in both Democratic and Republican administrations.

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

Mr. Chairman, apparently more confusion exists about this section than I had thought would exist. I thought I understood what we were trying to do when the language for section 309 was written.

As much as I dislike to make this suggestion, in view of the high regard I have for the gentleman from New York, [Mr. TABER], I would suggest that his amendment be rejected and that the present language in 309 remain as it is, with an admonition to the conferees that between now and the time we confer with the representatives of the other body, we rewrite section 309 so it will mean exactly what we intended it to mean.

Let us assume that the Department of Defense comes to us for military construction funds relating to Air Force Base X. On their justification sheets which they started to prepare perhaps 18 months before they finally get to us, they set out a list of items, and the estimated cost, providing, perhaps for a chapel, some barracks, maintenance shops, for a fueling system—any number of things which we refer to as line items. It is quite true that later on, after a period of 12 or 15 or 18 months, the need is changed; perhaps the mission of the base has been changed, so that the line items first asked for are no longer needed or some item is needed more urgently. So Air Force, for ex-

ample will very properly say, "The line items we requested during the hearings are no longer needed and instead of those line items we did ask you for, we would like to provide some other items."

The big objection we found was that there was waste of time and money involved in some of the procedure. Before coming to us the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments have justified to the Department of Defense that they have need of certain line items, the Defense Department has justified before the Bureau certain line items, and the Bureau of the Budget has approved them, then these items come up to us for appropriations. These items have been previously cleared through the Committees on Armed Services. After they clear our committee, they are screened again in the Senate. Then we find that before the Bureau of the Budget and the Defense Department will release the construction funds for the Army, Navy, and Air Force they must again justify each one of these line items which have already been previously justified many times. We feel that that is too time-consuming and too much money is wasted in that. We felt that if the original screening had been properly done before presentation to Congress, these items should not need so much further screening. We felt that some of those steps should be eliminated and that once these items had been approved by the Department of Defense, and the committees of Congress, the money should be allocated to the Army, Navy, and Air Force in quarterly lump sums and then they should proceed from there with their construction without the above-mentioned repeated postcongressional reviews.

I have explained this subject, at least as I see it, and as indicated by the language in the report on page 12; therefore, I would suggest, much as I regret to do so, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York be defeated, and that the language be rewritten and returned to us in conference.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a limitation of time on this amendment?

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I went before the Rules Committee. This provision in S. 309 unquestionably was subject to a point of order. Upon the agreement of the gentleman from Texas before the committee it was understood that he and I were to get together and we would try to work out some language that might be acceptable. We tried to do that. I contacted the clerk of the committee, I contacted the gentleman from Texas, and I have been unable to get any satisfaction whatever. For that reason I have offered this amendment

as I drew it myself. I feel that the only thing we can do at this time is just to try to protect the Treasury as far as we can from language that I regard as a very serious menace.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman, feeling as he does, I certainly believe that it is his bounden duty to offer the amendment. I feel that way about it. I think the gentleman will agree that he and I worked together in an effort to come to some meeting of the minds. Various suggestions were submitted but we were not able to come to an agreement with members of the subcommittee and the full committee. It was just one of those things where the gentleman's interpretation is contrary to the interpretation of everyone else on the committee.

Mr. TABER. I hope the committee will adopt this amendment I have offered, because I feel it will protect the country and protect the appropriations we are making here. For that reason, I ask that the committee approve my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the recommendation of the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SCRIVNER) be followed, and that the amendment be voted down at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. TABER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 36, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY  
*Salaries and expenses*

For expenses necessary for the Commission on Government Security, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purpose of this appropriation, \$600,000.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Alabama: On page 15, after line 18, insert: "PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PRESIDENTIAL OFFICE SPACE"

*"Salaries and expenses*

"For expenses necessary for the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space, \$50,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 12025, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in order to cure a point of order which would occur in the bill H. R. 12025 now pending in the Committee on Public Works, which would provide for a President's Advisory Commission on the Presidential Office Space. This commission would be financed out of the President's appropriated fund. It would not increase the appropriation item. It simply authorizes the President to use from existing appropriated funds money for an activity

which does not exist under present statute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, to what page does the gentleman's amendment apply?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Page 15, on line 18.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, that is the purpose of the amendment as I have explained it.

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

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman from Alabama has discussed this amendment with me and with other members of our committee, and I understand with the ranking Republican members, and we have agreed to accept his amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM  
COMMISSION

*Salaries and expenses*

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the act of July 1, 1955 (Public Law 128), as amended by the act of April 27, 1956 (Public Law 491), to be available from October 25, 1955, and to be expended on the authority or approval of the Chairman of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, \$150,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 19, line 9, strike out "\$150,000."

(Mr. GROSS asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike out \$150,000 for the planning of an auditorium in the District of Columbia.

A few days ago the Committee on the District of Columbia brought in a bill, which I opposed, providing a foot-in-the-door for construction of an athletic stadium, also in the District of Columbia. I have no doubt, and I imagine most of the Members of the House will agree, that in the end the Federal Government, in other words the taxpayers of the Nation, will build both the stadium and auditorium. It seems to me we must draw the line somewhere. I am not going to belabor this amendment, for I have no doubt as to what will happen to the amendment, but am convinced there is enough private capital in the District of Columbia to finance the building of both a stadium and an auditorium. I am opposed to the taxpayers of the country being called upon to build this auditorium. I know of no auditorium being built with funds from the Federal Treasury in any other municipality in this country. Let this one be built as are others in Iowa and elsewhere through bond issues or other means of local financing.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I shall not take the 5 min-

1956

utes, but I rise in opposition to this amendment as a Member appointed by the Speaker to the Auditorium Commission. The other Members of this House are the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]. Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President, and others appointed by the President. The Commission has proceeded and has accomplished a prodigious amount of work. We have had the services of the finest architectural firms in the United States, on a voluntary basis except for their actual costs only. This is not designed to be an auditorium for the District of Columbia. It is to be a national auditorium for the people of the United States. If this our Capital is to be the center of the free world, I think, and quite properly I feel, it should be the cultural center of the world.

This is not a new idea. It goes back to the days of President Grant. It has been a long and difficult fight to convince the Members of Congress of the need for recognition of the great culture which this Nation has. I feel it is of extreme importance. It is supported by both the majority and minority Members on the hill. By the President, by former President Truman, and so many other people that I would not impose on your time to name them all.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This request is for \$150,000 for planning an auditorium in this city. In the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1956, there was a request for \$25,000 to cover expenses to date which was turned down. The people on the Commission apologized to the Congress at that time for spending money they never had to spend. The reason it was turned down was that they bypassed the House last year and went to the Senate. When they were informed that such proceedings started in the House, they were sorry they did it. The project authorization has been amended and they have submitted a new estimate based on a good plan.

We spent about \$2,500,000 to get plans for the new Smithsonian Building. This auditorium is going to cost practically the same amount as the new Smithsonian, but the people connected with this auditorium are contributing their services free and the planning will cost us only \$150,000.

I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

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

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Grants for hospital construction*

Funds appropriated under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955,

and all appropriation acts prior thereto, remaining unobligated on June 30, 1956, are hereby rescinded and ordered to be covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this act; funds appropriated under this head in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1956, remaining unobligated on June 30, 1957, are hereby rescinded and ordered to be covered into the Treasury as of that date; and funds appropriated in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1957, remaining unobligated on June 30, 1958, are hereby rescinded and ordered to be covered into the Treasury as of that date.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: On page 21, at the end of line 6, add a new paragraph as follows:

"PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

"For necessary expenses of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, including services authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of the Committee; and actual transportation expenses and an allowance of not to exceed \$12 per diem in lieu of subsistence while away from their homes or regular places of business, for persons attending conferences called by the Committee: \$300,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to add to the bill the \$300,000 which the President requested for his Committee on Education Beyond the High School. When he submitted his request our subcommittee found at the hearings on June 6 that the President had appointed his Committee last March, had allocated \$50,000 from his emergency fund to initiate the work, but that no legislation had even been requested or submitted to authorize the appropriation of funds for its continuance. Without indicating that legislation was needed or desired, the President said in his message to Congress on the 12th of last January:

Our vision would be limited if we failed at this time to give special thought to education beyond the high school. Certain problems exist now in this field, and already we can foresee other needs and problems shaping up in the future. Higher education is and must remain the responsibility of the States, localities, and private groups and institutions.

But to lay before us all the problems of education beyond high school, and to encourage active and systematic attack on them, I shall appoint a distinguished group of educators and citizens to develop this year, through studies and conferences, proposals in this educational field.

Through the leadership and counsel of this group, beneficial results can be expected to flow to education and to the Nation in the years ahead.

In his very excellent message the President was echoing the concern of the entire country for the dearth of college graduates in science, engineering, and other skilled professions, and this concern about the problem is continuing and increasing to this date. On April 12 the New York Times said in a news item:

Recently, a subcommittee of the Congressional Joint Atomic Energy Committee reported it had found that the Soviet Union already had more scientists and engineers available than the United States. Moreover, Russia was graduating more than twice as many additional ones each year as the United States, the report said.

For a considerable time now many magazine articles have appeared by eminent writers deploring the situation and emphasizing the need for action. The Commissioner of Education, Dr. Brownell, presented a good case for this appropriation of \$300,000 for the work of the President's Committee in fiscal 1957.

Unfortunately our committee was confronted with the fact that there was no authorizing legislation.

I think the administration in all this time has been derelict in failing to send to the Congress legislation to authorize the appropriation for this committee which as I say was appointed since last March. Perhaps the Congress has been derelict, but I for one assumed that, when he announced in his message to Congress that he would appoint such a committee, the President had the necessary authority to provide the funds for it, or to have them provided. Certainly the Bureau of the Budget, which passes on these requests for appropriation before they are submitted, should have realized the predicament this situation puts us in. Frankly, I do not know who is to blame.

The fact remains there is no authorizing legislation and consequently our committee could not put that item in the bill.

While we were interrogating witnesses in the committee, the committee made inquiry as to whether or not this appropriation could be made under the general law setting up the Office of Education, and whether then the funds could be used in connection with this committee of eminent citizens which the President has appointed. It was found, however, that no matter how we put the language in the bill it would still be subject to a point of order. This is particularly so because we found on inquiry that an old statute enacted back in 1909 and still on the statute books prohibits the use of any funds for the payment of any such commission unless authorization is made therefor. That statute reads as follows:

No part of the public moneys, or of any appropriation made by Congress, shall be used for the payment of compensation or expenses of any commission, council, board, or other similar body, or any members thereof, or for expenses in connection with any work or the results of any work or action of any commission, council, board, or other similar body, unless the creation of the same shall be or shall have been authorized by law; nor shall there be employed by detail, hereafter or heretofore made, or otherwise personal services from any executive department or other Government establishment in connection with any such commission, council, board, or other similar body. (Mar. 4, 1909, ch. 299, sec. 9, 35 Stat. 1027.)

Mr. Chairman, I think I express the feeling of the members of the subcommittee when I say that we regretted there was no way by which we could put in this appropriation without its being leg-

July 12

islation on an appropriation bill; we regretted we could not honor this request by the President. It is unfortunate and, as I say, there has been dereliction in not presenting to the proper committee and to Congress for consideration legislation which would authorize this item.

I hope sincerely that the gentleman from Rhode Island will withdraw his point of order, and that other gentlemen in the House will not make the point of order, so that we can have this appropriation included in the pending bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order that this is not authorized by law and that the gentleman's amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has made the point of order that this appropriation is not authorized.

The gentleman from New Mexico in his remarks on his amendment stated that authorization had not been had, and that it was not authorized by law. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

**EXTENSION AND REMODELING, STATE DEPARTMENT BUILDING**

For expenses necessary for planning, and the extension and remodeling, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, of the State Department Building, Washington, D. C., and for expenses necessary for providing temporary office space, including payment of rent in the District of Columbia, alterations, purchase, and installation of air-conditioning equipment, to remain available until expended, \$44,920,000, to be transferred to the General Services Administration.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the second item in chapter IX of this bill for the Department of State, International Fisheries Commission, appropriates the amount \$620,000, the full amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget, to continue and expand on a joint international basis with Canada, the sea lamprey control and research activities conducted since 1947 by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior.

Over the past several years the parasitic sea lamprey has all but destroyed the trout population in Lake Huron and Lake Michigan, while the trout population is presently falling off rapidly in Lake Superior due to the spread of this lamprey eel. The loss to the United States and Canada in trout and other valuable fish is presently estimated to be \$5 million annually. The committee unanimously felt that ample justification was made for the allowance of this \$620,000.

Included under chapter IX, at page 22 of this bill is an item of \$964,000 for claims of the Vatican City, to be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment as authorized by recent law. These claims are for damages to properties of the Vatican City which occurred during World War II.

The final item at line 5, page 22 is entitled, "Funds Appropriated to the Presi-

dent, President's Special International Program." This request was in the amount by \$9 million. The committee reduced this amount by \$4,312,600. The amount allowed will continue the President's Special International Program of artistic and athletic presentations abroad and participation in international trade fairs. The amount contained in this bill \$4,687,400 is the same amount as appropriated for fiscal year 1955 and also for fiscal year 1956, less the amount requested for the United States Information Agency. The committee was told that from \$1,240,000 to \$1,700,000 of previously appropriated funds for this program would be unexpended as of June 30, 1956.

The sum of \$312,600 was requested for the United States Information Agency, principally for promoting and publicizing this program. The committee is of the opinion that this Agency should be able to carry on its work within its regular annual appropriation which is in the amount of \$113 million for the fiscal year 1957, and therefore, directs that no part of the funds recommended herein be allocated to the United States Information Agency.

The testimony before the committee reveals that of the \$229,738 available to the United States Information Agency from this fund for fiscal year 1956, the sum of \$120,615, or over 52 percent, was expended for entertainment. Large amounts of the USIA funds were used for the purchase of tickets which were given away to people to attend the performances. If the performers or companies sent abroad were of such consequence that free tickets had to be given away at Government expense for them to have an audience they should not have been sent in the first place. For example, the Agency expended \$3,000 of the taxpayers' money to purchase tickets to present to people free of charge to listen to the Los Angeles Symphony Orchestra in Tokyo.

It is inconceivable that a Government agency would even consider a payment of \$23,000 for royalties in connection with a touring play, in addition to all the other costs of an overseas tour. Nevertheless, such is the case, as an examination of the hearings will disclose.

The committee expects that all agencies in any way connected with this program will correct the loose financial operations pointed out in the report of the General Accounting Office and the investigative report of this committee, and take the necessary action to prevent their recurrence in the future.

It might be appropriate if the attention of the House were called to certain parts of the printed hearings with regard to how this program has been functioning under President Eisenhower. The following are excerpts from the hearings before the subcommittee:

**PAYMENT OF ROYALTIES FOR TEAHOUSE OF THE AUGUST MOON**

Mr. ROONEY. What was the figure you gave a while ago with regard to Teahouse of the August Moon for royalties?

Mr. BATSON. This is an estimate. The only information which I have is contained on this little piece of paper which I have here, which is simply a memorandum to help

me here, and it shows an item of royalties of \$23,000. If I am not mistaken, that item has subsequently been taken out of the cost.

Mr. ROONEY. I should hope so.

Mr. BATSON. I was reading to you in the budget figures that were presented here originally. Actually, I do not believe the cost items that we have received on this show any payment for royalties.

Mr. ROONEY. Did anyone in the Department of State agree at one time to pay \$23,000 of Government money for royalties in connection with these performances in South America?

Mr. BATSON. No, sir; we did not.

Mr. ROONEY. How did it get on this sheet?

Mr. BATSON. In this particular case, no, sir, but it would have in others. It is possible we would include that in our budget. You see, we are underwriting the losses of the productions that are going abroad. We have to take that into account in deciding how much support they will get from the Government, and we take into account all of their expenses.

Mr. ROONEY. In connection with that, did you approve paying at least a share of the \$23,000 for royalties?

Mr. BATSON. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Then how did that figure get on your sheet?

Mr. BATSON. We assume in figuring up the total cost of the project in order for us to determine how much underwriting we will give that we will have to take into account all of the expenses no matter what they are of this group so we will know how much we would put in it.

**DIFFICULTY IN GETTING FACTS**

Mr. ROONEY. Before the company started for South America, you had to have an approval of the Department; did you not?

Mr. BATSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. In arriving at this approval, was there submitted to you an item of \$23,000 for royalties?

Mr. BATSON. There certainly was, yes; but we did not agree to pay it.

Mr. ROONEY. You did not agree to pay that? To pay exactly \$23,000? Do I understand you correctly?

Mr. BATSON. The point is that the figures which I read to you were those on which we based our original approval of a certain amount of money to underwrite the losses.

Mr. ROONEY. How much did you approve?

Mr. BATSON. We have not approved—

Mr. ROONEY. Just a minute, now. How much did you approve insofar as ANTA was concerned?

Mr. BATSON. I do not understand.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, there must have been an approval because the company is on the road now.

Mr. BATSON. We approved \$151,000 to get the project started.

Mr. ROONEY. What was the total cost? Will you please repeat that figure?

Mr. BATSON. \$268,000.

Mr. ROONEY. In arriving at the total cost of \$268,000 there was included \$23,000 for royalties?

Mr. BATSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. You certainly can play with words.

Mr. BATSON. However, sir, the estimates coming in and the amounts going to it do not include items for royalties. As I understand it, the royalty payment has been waived, but I will find out about that, and submit a statement for the record on it.

(The statement referred to follows:)

"In estimating the total costs for this project, an item covering royalties was included in figures considered. The author claims 10 percent of the box office receipts. On the basis of anticipated income for the tour, it was estimated that total royalties would amount to approximately \$23,000. Royalties



1956

actually due from box office receipts amount to \$1,805.91 for the first 6 weeks of this tour."

FUNDS REQUESTED FOR ORCHESTRAS

Mr. ROONEY. There is not much sense in talking about a budget presentation such as is outlined at page 8 of the justifications, where we find such buckshot approaches as for "orchestras" in the amount of \$421,000. Are you not able to tell us the breakdown of that figure?

Mr. BATSON. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Wait a minute. I believe that figure was for 1955. Let us get to 1957. Let us change the amount to \$546,000. You cannot give us any breakdown of that?

Mr. BATSON. No, sir, because we do not know what orchestras would be willing and able to undertake overseas tours next year.

Mr. ROONEY. How did you arrive at the figure of \$546,000? Why is it not \$545,000?

Mr. BATSON. We simply try, based upon the best information we have at hand, to estimate in a general way what we would like to do, and I cannot say that the cost will be exactly this figure. It probably will not be. It may be probably a little more or less or may be considerably more or less, depending upon what we are able to get.

As an example of orchestras, we sent the New Orleans Symphony Orchestra on a tour of Latin America. There were several orchestras under consideration for that tour that would have liked to have made the trip, but the New Orleans Orchestra, however, came up with a budget which showed that the citizens of New Orleans were putting \$20,000 into this tour. So, this made it much more financially feasible to use them, and we selected them at a considerable savings.

DRAMA AND MUSICAL COMEDY GROUPS

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to the \$609,000 for the drama and musical comedy groups, do you have any breakdown as to that?

Mr. BATSON. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. How many groups are involved?

Mr. BATSON. We do not know, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. You do not know anything about the size of the companies?

Mr. BATSON. No, sir; we do not know what will be available and what the cost will be.

Mr. ROONEY. You do not know how much the impresarios would get out of it?

Mr. BATSON. We certainly do not; no, sir; we could not predict that at this time.

Mr. ROONEY. You do not know how much the royalties would be?

Mr. BATSON. No, sir; it would vary.

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to "musical groups" in the amount of \$558,000, the same answer would apply?

Mr. BATSON. Yes, sir.

DANCE GROUPS

Mr. ROONEY. And as to the \$444,800 for "dance groups" would the same answer apply?

Mr. BATSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. That amount intrigues me. Why is it not \$444,700 instead of \$444,800?

Mr. BATSON. I cannot answer that, sir.

INDIVIDUAL ARTISTS

Mr. ROONEY. For individual artists you have the figure of \$202,200. Does the same answer apply to that request?

Mr. BATSON. Yes, sir.

SPORTS ACTIVITIES

Mr. ROONEY. For the sports activities you have a nicely rounded figure of \$200,000. Would the same answer apply?

Mr. BATSON. Yes, sir.

AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure you will pardon my cultural ignorance, but exactly who is "Tom Two Arrows" on whom you would spend \$1,800 in entertainment money?

Mr. SEEBACH. He is an Indian who with his wife puts on demonstrations of the American Indian culture, dances, songs, legends, stories, history, religion, and all the rest of it. He has been enormously successful. He has drawn huge crowds at comparatively little cost and in an area where the missions are practically nonexistent.

Also, because of the nature of his act and his personality, he has been able to go out into the smaller cities and even in some cases villages to entertain and bring an entirely different picture to these people in the relationship of the American people and Indians.

Mr. ROONEY. Have you seen his act?

Mr. SEEBACH. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Have you seen it?

Mr. STREIBERT. I have read post reports on it and they are very enthusiastic about the act. As you know, there is a great interest abroad in the American Indian.

Mr. ROONEY. Is this one act?

Mr. STREIBERT. He is a whole show.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it a sight act? Do you understand what I mean? Does anybody here know what a sight act is?

Mr. SEEBACH. You mean it has to be seen? He does that, too.

Mr. ROONEY. I thought that was a common term in the theatrical business.

Mr. SEEBACH. It is.

Mr. ROONEY. It appeared you had never heard it before.

Mr. SEEBACH. I have heard it before, yes, but I didn't quite understand what you meant by it. A sight act generally speaking in the vaudeville sense can be one which is even a dumb act as far as that is concerned.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, they are performers who can work in any country in the world.

Mr. SEEBACH. That is right. He is not, in that sense, because he sings. A lot of it is sight—dancing, and, of course, music goes along with this, too.

Mr. ROONEY. Does he speak any language other than English, do you know?

Mr. SEEBACH. I don't know.

Mr. ROONEY. Where did you have him performing?

Mr. SEEBACH. All over India and Pakistan.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the percentage of the people who speak or understand English in India?

Mr. STREIBERT. It is the principal language. Mr. ROONEY. English is the principal language in India?

Mr. STREIBERT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. It would appear that Tom Two Arrows performed in New Delhi, Karachi, and Rangoon according to the allocation chart; is that correct?

Mr. STREIBERT. Yes, sir.

Mr. SIVARD. And many other places.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE IN INDIA

Mr. ROONEY. I am surprised to your answer, Mr. Strelbert, in regard to English being the principal language in India. I had occasion recently to request some research from the Library of Congress. The latest population figure they have for India is 377 million. They refer me—when I say "they" I mean the Library of Congress—to an article in the New York Times of, September 24, 1955, entitled "English Tongue Declines in India."

The article states:

"English has always been the language of the tiny elite group in India. Only about 2 percent of the people understand it."

Mr. STREIBERT. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. I am at a loss to jibe your previous statement with the New York Times quotation.

Mr. STREIBERT. Well, the 2 percent are those who can pay admission prices, and who are in positions of authority. They say the tiny elite is 2 percent, and that sounds like a tiny percentage, but when applied to 360

million people, it represents a large number of people to reach.

FUNDS SPENT IN INDIA FOR ENGLISH-LANGUAGE BROADCASTS AND ENGLISH MEDIUMS

Mr. ROONEY. How much is the USIA expending in taxpayers' funds in India for English-language broadcasts and English mediums?

Mr. STREIBERT. There are no English-language broadcasts directed at India.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not unusual, if most of the people understand or speak English, that you would not have broadcasts directed there?

Mr. STREIBERT. I did not say that most of them were. You just testified yourself that only 2 percent spoke it.

Mr. ROONEY. What did you say?

Mr. STREIBERT. I said they were the important people, but I did not say they were the most of the people.

Mr. ROONEY. What was your original statement?

Mr. STREIBERT. I said it was the leading language there. It is the language of the government. They are trying to substitute another language and they are having some riots, I believe, in Bombay as a result of imposing another language on the public.

Mr. ROONEY. Do you have the answer to that, Mr. Posner?

Mr. POSNER. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Will you insert that information at this point in the record?

Mr. POSNER. Yes, sir.

(The matter referred to may be found on p. 739.)

COSTS OF PROPAGANDA, IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, IN CERTAIN COUNTRIES

Mr. ROONEY. At the same time, you might insert a statement with regard to the extent in dollar costs of propaganda, including broadcasts, if any, in the English language, and all the other phases of the program in English, directed to Egypt, Iran, Pakistan, and India.

We shall insert it at this point with regard to these four countries rather than at the point where I referred to India particularly.

Mr. POSNER. Yes, sir.

(The matter referred to follows:)

"Estimated costs of media products prepared in the English language for certain countries—Estimated obligations, fiscal year 1956

"Egypt:	
"Produced in the country.....	\$10,034
"Radio broadcasts (VOA).....	4,700
"Supplied from Washington or regional press centers.....	68,932
"Total.....	83,666

"Iran:	
"Produced in the country.....	3,185
"Radio broadcasts (VOA).....	2,798
"Supplied from Washington or regional press centers.....	25,394
"Total.....	31,377

"Pakistan:	
"Produced in the country.....	51,215
"Radio broadcasts (VOA).....	918
"Supplied from Washington or regional press centers.....	91,228
"Total.....	143,361

"India:	
"Produced in the country.....	118,673
"Radio broadcasts (VOA).....	8,659
"Supplied from Washington or regional press centers.....	328,941
"Total.....	456,273

"COMMITTEE NOTE.—The Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service reported

estimate of percentage of population understanding the English language: Egypt, 3 percent of the population; Iran, less than 1 percent of the population; Pakistan, 2 percent of the population; and India, 2 percent of the population."

ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES, JOSE LIMON TROUPE

Mr. ROONEY. How much did you expend in connection with entertainment for the Jose Limon Troupe on a visit to South America?

Mr. STREIBERT. \$84.28.

Mr. ROONEY. Go ahead. What is that figure down in the right-hand corner?

Mr. STREIBERT. \$2,084.71.

Mr. ROONEY. What was that for?

Mr. STREIBERT. There was \$2,000.43 for free tickets in 3 cities. This was the first project out of the President's funds, occurring in November 1954, when it was sent down to two cities in South America where the International Conference was going on at the time, and I assume that that large sum for free tickets was in connection with the delegates to the International Conference, which was one of the main reasons for sending the troop down there.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question or two concerning this appropriation of almost \$45 million for the State Department. What are you proposing to do, recondition the old building?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman's question, I should say that it is the committee's intention to extend the present building at 21st Street and Virginia Avenue so as to complete a full block.

Mr. GROSS. This has nothing to do with reconditioning the old building?

Mr. ROONEY. No. The State Department at the present time is located in 29 different places and buildings in the District of Columbia. This would bring that Department and the International Cooperation Administration all together under one roof and should result in substantial savings to the taxpayer, not only with regard to rents which they are now required to pay, but also in maintenance and efficiency.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me how many of the new offices will be equipped with \$27 waste baskets?

Mr. ROONEY. We have not gotten to that point. I may say to the gentleman I raised that question myself during the course of the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. I know the gentleman did.

Mr. ROONEY. Money for furnishings is not included in the instant appropriation at page 21 of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Can we hope then that the wastepaper baskets will only cost perhaps 5 or 10 dollars?

Mr. ROONEY. I would hesitate to venture an opinion at this time. I would like to see what sort of wastepaper basket they will claim they need, then appraise the request as of that moment, and base the allowance on the then current purchase price.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman, as chairman of the subcommittee, would ask the State Department to bring one over to the hearings, I would appreciate it.

Mr. ROONEY. I may have one brought to the gentleman's office. He may have great need for it over there. They might be able to make him a present of it.

Mr. GROSS. I would very much appreciate it if the gentleman would let me know when he has one on display, because I would like to see one.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the plans of the new State Department building that the architects consider somewhat the sense of the American people in that the building be not designed to look like an office building such as we have in several places; that it contain a little of the conventional and less of the monolithic type of structures that have been put up in the world during the thirties.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT  
BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS  
Salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$82,000.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIKES: On page 22, line 23, insert a new paragraph:

"BUREAU OF THE MINT  
Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, \$3,500: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of House Joint Resolution 569, 84th Congress, or similar legislation."

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I think a very few minutes will suffice to explain the purpose and the propriety of this amendment.

As my colleagues well know, 95 years ago this great land of ours was split asunder by a terrible conflict. That conflict raged for 4 years and left much of our country ravaged and destroyed.

But, from the bitterness which brought on that conflict and from the ashes of its destruction, we have built together a new, united, and powerful nation; a nation in which we all stand together and face resolutely forward; a nation which is the pride and the hope of the world. Of the hundreds of thousands of men who fought in that great conflict, only four are alive today. Time is running out and in a little while they, too, will be gone. Then the stillness of that once mighty but tragic conflict will be complete.

I believe that you my colleagues join me in a heartfelt desire to accord some measure of recognition to these valiant few. I recall to your attention the fact that House Joint Resolution 569, which passed the House several weeks ago, would provide for a medal to be struck and presented to each surviving veteran of the War Between the States. I am advised that it has just been passed unanimously by the Senate. However, no further action can be taken toward carrying out the provisions of House

Joint Resolution 569, which I introduced, unless funds are provided.

I have here a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable David W. Kendall, which states this:

The Treasury Department would have no difficulty in carrying out the provisions of this bill if the necessary appropriations were provided for that purpose. It is estimated that the dies for a suitable medal could be manufactured for \$1,500, and that the gold and manufacturing charges on each medal manufactured would be \$500, based upon a weight of approximately 12 troy ounces.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Therefore, I have submitted my amendment to provide the funds which are required. I am assured by the Bureau of the Mint that action will speedily be taken to provide the medals for presentation if it is adopted.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that it would be in the orderly procedure to submit this matter at a later date; but, Mr. Chairman, we may not have time to wait. The youngest of these 4 veterans is 108. If we intend to honor these fine old gentlemen who survived that great struggle, let us do it now.

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

Mr. Chairman, I heartily endorse the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Division of  
Disbursement

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$175,000.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE  
Salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," \$750,000.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Illinois: Page 23, after line 10, insert the following:

"STRIKING OF GOLD MEDAL FOR GUSTAF E.  
LAMBERT

"For striking a gold medal for Gustaf E. Lambert in recognition of his service in the interest of humanity and science in connection with the yellow fever investigations in Cuba, as authorized by the act of February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1459), as amended by the act of July 2, 1956 (Public Law 644), not to exceed \$350."

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is a small item in the measure of money, but it is rich in sentiment. It seems appropriate that it should be taken up at the time when we have given consideration and adoption to an amendment according recognition of our affection to the surviving veterans of the War Between the States.

It was the Spanish-American War that brought together as servitors in the Army of our country again the North and the South.

In the Spanish-American War, again fighting together under the Stars and

1956

Stripes, were veterans of the Armies of the Union and of the Confederacy.

The uniform that the Spanish War veterans wore after the war—and we were proud of it—combines in its colors the blue and the gray.

In the Spanish-American War period down in Cuba Maj. Walter Reed was experimenting with the dread disease of yellow fever. They were volunteers, inoculated, who took the risk of death in order that yellow fever, as a plague, might be crushed out. The experiments were successful, and one of the most dreadful of contagious diseases was conquered by the science of medicine.

In 1929 the Congress passed a law honoring Maj. Walter Reed and those who had been associated with him in those experiments, providing that they should be placed on the honor roll and should be given gold medals and should receive a pension of \$125 a month.

But one name was omitted, the name of Gustaf Lambert. A soldier nurse, Gustaf Lambert had volunteered. He was not inoculated because of Reed's insistence that Lambert's services as a nurse were indispensable to the success of the experiments. Not a single patient under Lambert's care died from yellow fever. He took a tremendously perilous risk. He performed an outstanding service. He was a hero in every sense of the word.

Col. James Hamilton Lewis, himself a veteran of the Spanish-American War, and then a Member of the other body from Illinois, introduced a bill to put Gustaf Lambert's name on the honor roll. It passed the other body, but reached the House at a time similar to now, when adjournment was near at hand, and so was lost in the scramble.

For 27 years Gustaf Lambert carried on his fight for recognition. But time was marching on, there was so much in the present to demand attention, and the records of the Spanish War period were few and scattered. Lambert did a prodigious amount of work in gathering the records. In the early months of 1956 he was stricken with a serious illness. He was 82, frail, and at the time desperately ill. I want to thank, from the bottom of my heart, the members of the Committees on Armed Services of both bodies who cooperated so magnificently in bringing out H. R. 5590 and engineering its enactment into law. H. R. 5590, which on July 2, 1956 became Public Law 644, at long last placed the name of Gustaf Lambert on the honor roll where it should have been when the law of 1929 was enacted. I wish especially to thank the great American now presiding as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. KILDAY, who was chairman of the subcommittee having H. R. 5590 under consideration, also John Blandford of the professional staff, and Maj. Vernon McKenzie, of the Office of the Surgeon General of the Army.

Under Public Law 644 Lambert was to receive the special gold medal voted in 1929. I had contacted the mint and had been informed that the old die for the medal had been located. But to make the medal 7 ounces of gold were required, and there was no appropriation. Gold

is worth \$35 an ounce. There will be some small expense, I imagine, for work. The amendment I have offered appropriates not to exceed \$350. The actual expense I am sure, will be less.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the gentleman's amendment is very timely and very meritorious. I believe it quite appropriate that it be proposed by the only gentleman in this body who served in our Armed Forces in the War with Spain.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. He has been a friend indeed.

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

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I concur in the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman and very greatly appreciate the fine lift he has given to the effort to make possible this long-delayed recognition of one of the real heroes of our country in a day now long past.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

ARE WE INDESTRUCTIBLE?—IS THE FUTURE OF OUR NATION SECURE?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In the hope that facts which would assist me to vote more intelligently might be obtained, on February 7, 1955, I introduced a privileged resolution seeking information.

The resolution went to the Armed Services Committee which reported unfavorably thereon but quoted a letter from Richard A. Buddeke, director of legislative programs, Department of Defense.

The questions asked and the answers from the Department read as follows:

1. (a) Approximately how many military installations employing five or more individuals who receive compensation or maintenance from Federal funds are now maintained by the Department of Defense outside the continental limits of the United States of America?

1. (a) Approximately 950 military installations.

1. (b) (1) Approximately how many individuals are employed in such installations and (2) at approximately what cost?

1. (b) (1) Approximately 167,000 civilian employees outside the United States, plus approximately 218,000 civilians who are employees of foreign governments engaged under contracts with the United States. The 218,000 does not include 124,000 Germans paid from deutschemarks.

1. (b) (2) Approximately \$601,699,000 per annum.

2. (a) Approximately how many individuals eligible to be assigned to combat service and who are compensated from Federal funds are in the service outside of the continental limits of the United States of America?

2. (a) Approximately 1,370,000 military personnel. This figure excludes female military personnel.

2. (b) Approximately how many individuals eligible to be assigned to combat service

and who are compensated from Federal funds are in the service within the continental limits of the United States of America?

2. (b) Approximately 1,602,000 military personnel. This figure excludes trainees with less than 4 months' service, seriously hospitalized personnel, female military personnel, and conscientious objectors.

3. What is the approximate cost of the civilian employees who are supporting those named under section 2 (a) and (b)?

3. Approximately \$4,530,276,000 per annum. This figure excludes costs for an average of approximately 25,000 employees of the Corps of Engineers and excludes costs in relation to the 124,000 Germans referred to in 1 (b) (1) above who are paid from deutschemarks.

4. What is the approximate (a) volume in long tons and (b) value in dollars of the supplies, both military and nonmilitary, needed per year to maintain those named in section 1 (a) and (b) and in section 2 (a) and (b)?

4. (a) Approximately 4,100,000 long tons.  
 4. (b) Approximately \$3,300,000,000.

The foregoing, of course, is in addition to our foreign aid program into which we have already poured over \$50 billion. Presumably future expenditures for the purposes indicated in the above answers may be included in the thirty-odd-billion dollar defense bill.

Sure, we are a rich, great, and powerful Nation. But is it not just possible that we are overextending ourselves? That we will, by our attempt to police and educate the whole world, lose our freedom and our prosperity just as effectively as we might by armed conflict?

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

(Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, when the Treasury Department-Post Office Department appropriations bill was before the House on February 7, last, I made the following statement with reference to the Federal Bureau of Narcotics:

I desire now to say a few words about a small bureau in the Treasury Department currently operating under an annual appropriation of about \$3 million and doing an heroic job to prevent the flow into our country of illicit narcotics and to stamp out with the cooperation of State and local authorities drug addiction in the United States which unfortunately is now increasing monthly.

The Federal Bureau of Narcotics has approximately 250 enforcement agents. A report recently filed by Senator DANIEL on behalf of a Senate committee states that New York City alone has more full-time narcotics agents than the Federal Government. This report holds that a minimum of 50 additional agents should be provided at the earliest possible moment.

Two years ago I called to my office here on Capitol Hill, Mr. Chapman Rose, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, having jurisdiction over this Bureau, for a discussion of the national narcotics problem and I then suggested that he take up with the President the formation of an interdepartmental committee to review all phases. This was done. While our committee has allowed in this bill all the funds requested by the Bureau of Narcotics for the new fiscal year, we did not have before us during the hearings or at the time of our markup, the first report of this interdepartmental committee. This report was publicized only yesterday.

The committee, consisting of members of the President's Cabinet, recommends stiffer prison terms, more enforcement agents, and a greater coordination of Federal-State drives to combat illicit traffic in narcotics. In releasing the report, President Eisenhower urged early and effective action on all fronts to stamp out this awful menace.

Commissioner Harry Anslinger, who heads the Federal Bureau of Narcotics, and who, all students of the problem agree, is the world's greatest authority on narcotics addiction, has oftentimes told our committee, and he did so again this year, that there are too many courts prone to mete out low sentences. He emphasizes that where stiff sentences are imposed the traffic usually moves to areas where sentences are not so severe. The Commissioner feels that it is definitely the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics to help foreign police break up international gangs sending this stuff to our shores and to do everything possible to prevent its entry, also to get the interstate trafficker, leaving local enforcement to State and municipal authorities. Our committee has said repeatedly in its reports that unless there is real honest-to-goodness enforcement on the State and local level we are never going to win this important battle.

In the 32 years I have been living and working in the Nation's Capital City, I have never been shocked more than when it was developed about 2 years ago that the officer in charge of the Metropolitan Police Department's narcotics squad was charged with being part and parcel of a dope racket. It pleases me now to hear of the dedication of the present chief of police and his officers and men to meet this challenge and do a good job. It pleases me also that the courts of the District of Columbia have in recent years taken a more realistic approach and are handing out stiffer sentences.

It is my hope that on the basis of the recommendations made by the President's Interdepartmental Committee and the Daniel's committee in the Senate the Treasury Department will without delay make recommendations to the Congress for stiffer prison terms for violators of the narcotics laws and will come before our committee with a request for funds for an increased number of enforcement agents. Meanwhile, Federal authorities should exercise the proper leadership in obtaining stronger Federal-State and local cooperation. Commissioner Anslinger tells us that he is receiving reports of 1,000 additional addicts each month. That is 1,000 too many, and the Congress must do its part in meeting this challenge.

Mr. Chairman, since I made that statement, the Congress has passed and sent to the President a bill providing improved enforcement procedures and more severe penalties. Furthermore, the Boggs Subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee has received the unanimous approval of the full committee of its recommendation that there be a buildup in the Federal Bureau of Narcotics of 75 additional agents during the new fiscal year and 75 additional agents thereafter. The distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, Chairman COOPER of the full committee, has directed a letter to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Chairman CANNON, of the Appropriations Committee, urging that necessary funds be provided. A like letter was forwarded by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], ranking member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

I have discussed the situation with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia,

Chairman GARY, of our subcommittee on appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and he indicated his immediate readiness to hold hearings on any supplemental request from the Treasury Department for such personnel. He emphasized that the full budgeted request of the Department for fiscal year, 1957, was allowed and repeated assurances given in the past that any new request, properly documented, would receive our subcommittee's favorable consideration.

Because of the Interdepartmental Committee's own appraisal of the situation and its finding that more agents are necessary, I find myself at a loss to understand why the Department, with the support of the Bureau of the Budget, has not submitted a request to the House Appropriations Committee for these needed agents and as one member of the committee extremely anxious that our country step up its fight against illicit narcotics and reduce drug addiction, I trust that these executive agencies of our Government will not delay further appropriate action on their part.

It has disturbed me no end to learn from budget sources in recent days that the efforts of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics to obtain 50 additional agents for fiscal year, 1957, were rebuffed and the final request for appropriate funds permitted additional employment of only 16 men.

One of the first approaches to the problem of illicit supply is the ferreting out and jailing of foreign gangs operating in Europe and the Near East. Currently, for this purpose, the Bureau under existing appropriations finds itself able only to send 4 men abroad to cooperate with foreign police, 2 in the Near East and 2 in Europe, while the number could easily be many times this figure.

The narcotics situation in the New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Texas areas now requires additional agents and I believe it is time for the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget to send to the Senate the proper request for additional funds which can be inserted in the second supplemental appropriation bill now before us. If such is done, I am sure that the Gary committee of which I am privileged to be the ranking minority member will do its part in conference with the Senate.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments 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. KILDAY, 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. 12138) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back

to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments there to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were 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.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the bill H. R. 12138 be recommitted to the House Committee on Appropriations with instructions to the committee that the appropriation of \$14,325,000 for the Jones Point Bridge be stricken out and the bill be reported back to the House forthwith.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 24, nays 370, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—24

Budge	Jones, Mo.	Echerer
Coudert	Kilburn	Scrivner
Dies	LeCompte	Short
Gross	McVey	Smith, Wis.
Halcy	Mason	Taber
Hays, Ohio	O'Konski	Taylor
Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.	Westland
Jonas	Schenck	Williams, N. Y.

NAYS—370

Abbitt	Ayres	Bolling
Abermethyl	Bailey	Bolton
Adair	Baker	Frances P.
Addonizio	Baldwin	Bolton
Albert	Barrett	Oliver P.
Alexander	Bass, N. H.	Bonner
Alger	Bates	Bosch
Allen, Calif.	Baumhart	Bow
Allen, Ill.	Peamer	Bowler
Andersen	Becker	Boykin
H. Carl	Belcher	Boyle
Andresen	Bennett, Fla.	Bray
August H.	Bennett, Mich.	Brooks, La.
Andrews	Bentley	Brown, Ga.
Arends	Berry	Brown, Ohio
Ashley	Betts	Brownson
Ashmore	Blatnik	Broyhill
Aspinall	Blitch	Burdick
Auchincloss	Bones	Burnside
Avery	Boland	Bush

1956

Byrd	Healey	Patterson
Byrne, Pa.	Hébert	Pelly
Byrnes, Wis.	Henderson	Perkins
Canfield	Herlong	Pfost
Cannon	Heseltun	Phillbin
Carlyle	Hess	Phillips
Carrigg	Hiestand	Pilcher
Cederberg	Hill	Pillion
Celler	Hillings	Poage
Chase	Hinshaw	Poff
Chatham	Hoeven	Polk
Chelf	Hollifield	Powell
Chenoweth	Holland	Preston
Chiperfield	Holmes	Price
Christopher	Holt	Prouty
Chudoff	Holtzman	Quigley
Church	Hope	Rabaut
Clark	Horan	Radwan
Clevenger	Hosmer	Rains
Cole	Huddleston	Ray
Colmer	Hull	Reece, Tenn.
Cooley	Hyde	Reed, N. Y.
Coon	Ikard	Rees, Kans.
Cooper	Jackson	Reuss
Corbett	James	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cramer	Jarman	Rhodes, Pa.
Crumpacker	Jenkins	Richards
Cunningham	Jennings	Riehman
Curtis, Mass.	Jensen	Riley
Curtis, Mo.	Johansen	Rivers
Dague	Johnson, Calif.	Roberts
Davidson	Johnson, Wis.	Robeson, Va.
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Ala.	Robison, Ky.
Dawson, Ill.	Jones, N. C.	Rodino
Dawson, Utah	Judd	Rogers, Colo.
Deane	Karsten	Rogers, Fla.
Delaney	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Dempsey	Kearns	Rooney
Denton	Keating	Roosevelt
Deroulan	Kee	Rutherford
Devereux	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadlak
Diggs	Kilday	St. George
Dixon	Kilgore	Saylor
Dodd	King, Calif.	Schwengel
Dollinger	King, Pa.	Scott
Dondero	Kirwan	Seely-Brown
Donohue	Klein	Selden
Donovan	Knox	Sheehan
Dorn, N. Y.	Knutson	Shelley
Dorn, S. C.	Krueger	Sheppard
Dowdy	Laird	Shuford
Doyle	Landrum	Sieminski
Durham	Lanham	Sikes
Edmondson	Lankford	Siler
Elliott	Latham	Simpson, Ill.
Ellsworth	Lesinski	Sisk
Evins	Lipscomb	Smith, Kans.
Fallon	Long	Smith, Miss.
Fascell	McCarthy	Smith, Va.
Feighan	McCormack	Spence
Fenton	McCulloch	Springer
Fernandez	McDonough	Staggers
Fino	McDowell	Steed
Fisher	McGregor	Sullivan
Fjare	McIntire	Talle
Flood	McMillan	Teague, Calif.
Flynt	Macdonald	Teague, Tex.
Fogarty	Machrowicz	Thomas
Forand	Mack, Ill.	Thompson,
Ford	Mack, Wash.	Mich.
Forrester	Madden	Thompson,
Fountain	Magnuson	N. J.
Frazier	Mahon	Thompson, Tex.
Frelinghuysen	Mailliard	Thomson, Wyo.
Friedel	Marshall	Tollefson
Fulton	Martin	Trimble
Gamble	Matthews	Tuck
Garmatz	Meador	Tumulty
Gary	Merrow	Udall
Gathings	Metcalf	Utt
Gavin	Miller, Calif.	Vanik
Gentry	Miller, Md.	Van Pelt
George	Miller, Nebr.	Van Zandt
Gordon	Miller, N. Y.	Vinson
Grant	Mills	Vorys
Gray	Minshall	Vursell
Green, Oreg.	Molohan	Wainwright
Green, Pa.	Morano	Watts
Gregory	Morrison	Weaver
Griffiths	Moss	Whitten
Gubser	Moulder	Widnall
Gwinn	Multer	Wier
Hagen	Mumma	Wigglesworth
Hale	Murray, Ill.	Williams, Miss.
Halleck	Natcher	Williams, N. J.
Hand	Nicholson	Willis
Harden	Norblad	Wilson, Calif.
Hardy	Norrell	Wilson, Ind.
Harris	O'Brien, Ill.	Winstead
Harrison, Nebr.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Withrow
Harrison, Va.	O'Hara, Ill.	Wolcott
Harvey	O'Neill	Wolverton
Hays, Ark.	Osmer	Wright
Hayworth	Ostertag	Yates

Young	Zablocki	Zelenko
Younger		
	NOT VOTING—38	
Anfuso	Eberharter	O'Hara, Minn.
Barden	Engle	Passman
Bass, Tenn.	Hoffman, Ill.	Patman
Bell	Kearney	Priest
Brooks, Tex.	Kelley, Pa.	Scudder
Buckley	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Burleson	Kluczynski	Thompson, La.
Carnahan	Lane	Thornberry
Cretella	Lovre	Velde
Davis, Tenn.	McConnell	Walter
Davis, Wis.	Morgan	Wharton
Dingell	Murray, Tenn.	Wickersham
Dolliver	Nelson	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:  
 Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Until further notice:  
 Mr. Walter with Mr. Kearney.  
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Lovre.  
 Mr. Anfuso with Mr. McConnell.  
 Mr. Morgan with Mr. Nelson.  
 Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Scudder.  
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Velde.  
 Mr. Priest with Mr. Wharton.  
 Mr. Engle with Mr. Cretella.  
 Mr. Barden with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.  
 Mr. Bell with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. BONNER, Mr. MACK of Illinois, Mr. ABERNETHY, and Mr. CANFIELD changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.  
 The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.  
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**INCREASING RATES OF COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES**

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 12038) to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) all monthly wartime rates of compensation payable under public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for disability less than total (not including special awards and allowances, dependency allowances, or subsistence allowances), are hereby increased by 10 percent.

(b) All rates of compensation increased by subsection (a) shall be further adjusted upward or downward to the nearest dollar, counting 50 cents and over as a whole dollar.

(c) In adjusting the rates of peacetime disability compensation under part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) because of the increases provided in subsection (a) and the adjustments provided in subsection (b), such rates shall be further adjusted upward or downward to the nearest dollar, counting 50 cents and over as a whole dollar.

(d) Paragraph II (j) of part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(j) If and while the disability is rated as total the monthly compensation shall be \$225."

(e) The maximum rates of compensation set forth in paragraph II (k), II (o), and II (p) of such part I are increased to \$450 per month.

(f) The rate of compensation payable under paragraph II (l) of such part I is increased to \$309.

(g) The rate of compensation payable under paragraph II (m) of such part I is increased to \$359.

(h) The rate of compensation payable under paragraph II (n) of such part I is increased to \$401.

Sec. 2. (a) The basic rate of compensation provided by section 202 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for any disability rated as total is hereby increased to \$225 per month.

(b) The rate of compensation payable under section 202 (3) of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, for the loss of the use of both eyes is hereby increased to \$309; the rate payable under that section for the loss of use of both eyes and one or more limbs is hereby increased to \$401; the rate payable under that section for double total permanent disability is hereby increased to \$401: *Provided*, That in no event shall the rate of compensation received hereunder plus the amounts payable under any other provision of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, exceed \$450 per month in any case.

Sec. 3. (a) The act entitled "An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents", approved July 2, 1948 (Public Law 877, 80th Cong.), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 6. All rates of additional compensation established by this act are hereby increased by 10 percent."

(b) Such act is further amended by striking out "60 percent" wherever it occurs and inserting "50 percent."

Sec. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of its enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill which we are considering today relates entirely and exclusively to compensation for service-connected disabled veterans. It is, in effect, the substitute which was ruled out on a point of order at the conclusion of the debate on H. R. 7886 on June 27.

The bill generally increases all rates of compensation below 100 percent by 10 percent, rounded to the nearest dollar. For example, the present 10 percent disability is paid at the rate of \$17 per month. The bill would increase this to \$19.

In the case of a man totally disabled, the rate is increased from \$181 to \$225.

This was done because the Bradley Commission found that the men totally disabled constituted the one group which was not receiving as much compensation as they should be receiving based on the amount other veterans, suffering from service-connected disabilities, were receiving. The bill also increases the rates for the more severely disabled by \$30 in each different category to make the ceiling on all disability compensation \$450 a month rather than \$420 as exists today.

The so-called statutory award rate of \$47, which are in addition to the rates of percentage disability, are not increased, nor is the minimum rate for arrested tuberculosis of \$67. All those veterans receiving a percentage disability payment today would receive an increase under this bill.

Section 2 of the bill applies this same sort of increase to World War I veterans who are rated on the 1925 schedule for rating disability and involve so-called protected award cases. This is a limited group of veterans who are unable to meet the criteria set forth in the 1945 rating schedule.

Section 3 increases the rates provided in Public Law 877 of the 80th Congress, which authorized additional compensation for veterans 50 percent or more disabled and who have dependents. For example, a veteran today rated 100 percent disabled receives \$181 monthly. If he has a wife, she would receive \$21 additional. Under this bill that amount would be increased by 10 percent to make it \$23.10. If the veteran is rated 50 percent disabled, for example, he would receive 50 percent of \$23.10. This provision does not apply to those rated less than 50 percent disabled.

The first year's cost of this bill is estimated to be \$172,750,000 and would decrease slightly in the fifth year to \$170,325,000. Unlike the pension estimates, compensation cost generally will decrease as the years advance.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is there any provision in this bill for widows of Spanish-American War veterans?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There is no provision for a widow of a Spanish-American War veteran. The reason that no widows or children are considered in this bill is that last year the House passed the bill H. R. 7089, which has also passed the Senate and is now in conference, and which gives widows and children of service-connected disabled a very substantial raise. For example, the widow of a Spanish-American War veteran with service-connected disability would get an increase from \$87 to \$122.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Was that just for Spanish-American War widows, or all?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No; the widows of service-connected disabled veterans of all wars.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there will not be a vote cast against this bill, I am sure. It was a tragedy that this compensation bill was

stricken from the pension bill on a point of order 2 weeks ago.

My understanding is that service-connected Spanish-American War widows will come in for an increase, as will the widows of all service-connected disabled veterans. Unfortunately non-service-connected widows will not receive anything.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I think I explained that all widows of service-connected disabled veterans are covered in H. R. 7039.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was not sure that the gentleman asking the question understood that.

The following is a description of the bill:

**INCREASING RATES OF SERVICE-CONNECTED COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS**  
H. R. 12038

Title: To provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Introduced and referred June 28, 1956.

Analysis:

*Rates of compensation for wartime service-connected disabilities under Public Law 2, 73d Cong., as amended, and Veterans Regulations*

	War service-connected rates, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, pt. I	H. R. 12038
(a) 10 percent disability	\$17.00	\$19.00
(b) 20 percent disability	33.00	38.00
(c) 30 percent disability	50.00	58.00
(d) 40 percent disability	66.00	73.00
(e) 50 percent disability	81.00	100.00
(f) 60 percent disability	100.00	120.00
(g) 70 percent disability	127.00	140.00
(h) 80 percent disability	145.00	160.00
(i) 90 percent disability	163.00	179.00
(j) Total disability	181.00	225.00
(k) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, rates (a) to (i) increased monthly by	47.00	47.00

*Rates of compensation for wartime service-connected disabilities under Public Law 2, 73d Cong., as amended, and Veterans Regulations—Continued*

	War service-connected rates, Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended, pt. I	H. R. 12038
Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or blindness of 1 eye having only light perception. In addition to requirement for any of rates in (l) to (n), rate increased monthly for each loss or loss of use by	\$47.00	\$47.00
(l) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or 1 hand and 1 foot, or blind both eyes with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation	279.00	309.00
(m) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of 2 extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation	329.00	359.00
(n) Anatomical loss of 2 extremities so near shoulder or hip as to prevent use of prosthetic appliance, or suffered anatomical loss of both eyes, monthly compensation	371.00	401.00
(o) Suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to 2 or more rates in (l) to (n), no condition being considered twice, or suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, monthly compensation	420.00	450.00
(p) In event disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed requirements for any of rates prescribed, Administrator, in his discretion, may allow next higher rate, or intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of	420.00	450.00
(q) Minimum rate for arrested tuberculosis	67.00	67.00

<sup>1</sup> But in no event to exceed \$450.

*Additional disability compensation because of dependents<sup>1</sup>*

	Wife, no child	Wife, 1 child	Wife, 2 children	Wife, 3 or more children	No wife, 1 child	No wife, 2 children	No wife, 3 or more children	Dependent parent or parents
Service on or after June 27, 1945								
World War II								
World War I								
Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, Boxer Rebellion	\$21.00	\$35.00	\$45.50	\$56.00	\$14.00	\$24.50	\$35.00	\$17.50 (1)
Civil War	23.10	38.50	50.08	61.60	15.40	26.94	38.50	19.25
Indian wars								35.00 (2)
Peacetime service (under combat or extrahazardous conditions)								38.50
Regular peacetime service	16.50	28.00	36.40	44.80	11.20	19.60	28.00	14.00 (1)
	18.48	30.80	40.04	49.28	12.52	21.56	28.60	15.40
								23.00 (2)
								25.30

<sup>1</sup> Above rates are for 100-percent disability. If and while rated partially disabled, but not less than 50 percent, additional compensation is authorized in an amount having the same ratio to the amount specified in the applicable table, above, as the degree of disability bears to the total disability, e. g., war service-connected disability of 50 percent, compensation rate, \$100. If veteran has a wife, his compensation is increased as follows \$100 + \$11.56 = \$111.56.

NOTE.—Rates in Italics are as reported in H. R. 12038.

Digest of report (Veterans' Administration): "The general purpose of the bill is to provide an increase in the rates of compensation payable to veterans for service-connected disabilities and in the rates of additional allowances for dependents which are payable to veterans whose disabilities are rated 50 percent or more. \* \* \*

"All of the disability compensation basic and statutory rates for which increases are proposed under the bill were last increased 5 percent by Public Law 695, 83d Congress, August 28, 1954. As you are aware, the Veterans' Administration submitted a report to your committee under date of May 31, 1956, on H. R. 11510, 84th Congress, which