Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 86-255

H. R. 7040

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 7040.....1

Digest of Public Law 86-255.....2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 7040

May 8, 1959	House Committ on Appropriations reported H. R. 7040. House Report 350. Print of bill and report.
May 11, 1959	House passed H. R. 7040 with amendments.
May 12, 1959	H. R. 7040 was referred to Senate Committee on Appropriations. Print of bill as referred.
June 22, 1959	Senate committee reported H. R. 7040 with amendments. Senate Report 423. Print of bill and report.
June 23, 1959	Senate passed H. R. 7040 as reported. Print of bill with Senate amendments numbered.
	Senate appointed conferees.
July 20, 1959	House appointed conferees.
July 22, 1959	Conferees were granted until midnight July 22 to file a report.
July 23, 1959	House received and agreed to the conference report. House Report 709. Print of report.
July 30, 1959	Senate received and agreed to the conference report and requested further conference.
	Senate appointed conferees.
Aug. 12, 1959	House appointed conferees.
	House received conference report. House Report 887. Print of report.
Aug. 14, 1959	House returned H. R. 7040 to Senate for further consideration of an amendment in disagreement.
Sept. 4, 1959	Senate agreed to conference report and receded from amendment in disagreement.
Sept. 14,1959	Approved: Public Law 86-255.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 86-255

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1960. Includes funds for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Civil Service Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, General Accounting Office, General Services Administration, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Science Foundation, Selective Service System, and Veterans Administration.

May 8, 1959

12. MONOPOLIES. A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee ordered reported with amendments S. 442, to amend the Clayton Act so as to require prior notification of corporate mergers and acquisitions, and S. 716, to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws. p. D330

A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee ordered reported without recommendation S. 11, to amend the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, with reference to equality of opportunity. p. D330

13. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 11. p. 6911

HOUSE

14. ELECTRIFICATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 3460, to amend the TVA Act of 1933 so as to provide for the issuance of revenue bonds by TVA to finance additions to its power system. pp. 6920-47

15. SMALL GRAINS. Rep. Langen urged passage of his proposed bill to provide for incremental price supports for small grain crops. Under his proposed bill, as more land is taken out of production, the higher the price support would be for barley, oats, rye, soybeans, flax, grain sorghums, and corn. pp. 6947-8

16. TOBACCO. The report of the Agriculture Committee on H. R. 5058, to modify present provisions for determining the level of price support for tobacco, states the purpose of the bill as follows:

"The purpose of this bill is to prevent the operations of the present parity formula from pushing the support prices of tobacco beyond limits which tobacco producers, warehousemen, and exporters believe to be reasonable at present general price levels. The effect of the bill will be to prevent any further increase in the level of support for tobacco until the necessity for such an increase is indicated by a substantial further increase in the parity index -- the measure of prices paid by farmers including wages, interest, and taxes. It is estimated that it will be from 3 to 5 years (depending on the increase in general price levels) before this index catches up with the present support price of tobacco." * * *

"As introduced, the bill would have retained the lower of the 1958 level of supports or modernized parity until the level based on old parity exceeded the 1958 level. Thereafter, supports would have been related solely to old parity. Under the committee amendment, after such time as the support level based on old parity exceeds the 1958 level, parity will be computed under both methods, and the support level will be 90 percent of the lower of the two levels.

"The amendment starting with the words 'Provided further' makes it clear that the current parity index, which includes the cost of farm labor, interest, and taxes, will be used in making parity computations. Section 2 is also a clarifying committee amendment making it clear that the provisions of the bill will apply also to the fire-cured, dark air-cured, and Virginia sun-cured tobacco."

17. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee was allowed until midnight, Fri., May 8, to file a report on the independent offices appropriations bill for 1960. p. 6947

18. TERRITORIES. Both houses received from the Comptroller General "a report on the review of selected activities of the government of the Virgin Islands, fiscal year 1958." pp. 6821, 6971

19. POSTAL RATES. Received from the Postmaster General a proposed bill "to adjust postal rates of certain first-class mail and airmail"; to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 6972

20. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack stated that the independent offices appropriations bill would be taken up on Monday, May 18, and that if a rule is reported on the housing bill, it would be programed next week. p. 6944

21. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 11, 1959. p. 6971

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

22. RECLAMATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Young, N. Dak., commending Interior Dept.'s "vast and far-reaching operations which have been conducted in such an admirable way ..." and inserting an article favoring the appointment of Mr. Floyd Dominy to be U. S. Commissioner on Reclamation. pp. A3823-4

23. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Sen. Jordan inserting an editorial, "Farm Support: Without It Comes Anarchy," and stating that it gives "an excellent account of the importance of price supports to not only agriculture, but the Nation's entire economy." pp. A3828-9

Extension of remarks of Sen. Jordan stating that "... North Carolina has pointed the way toward an economic revolution in the South to bring about a better balance between industry and agriculture ...," and inserting a Time magazine article on this subject. pp. A3838-9

Rep. Hiestand inserted the results of an opinion poll, including the continuation of price support programs. p. A3841

Extension of remarks of Rep. Johnson, Wis., stating that in checking over a list of the groups which the Secretary has addressed, "I am inclined to think maybe his title ought to be Secretary of Processors instead of Secretary of Agriculture," and inserting a Nat'l Farmers Union magazine article, "Benson Shuns Farmers, Talks To Processors." pp. A3871-2

24. CONSERVATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Withrow commending Soil Conservation Service programs in Wisconsin and inserting a statement on this subject. pp. A3833-5

25. SMALL BUSINESS. Rep. Evins inserted his statement: "Organization and Operation of the Small Business Administration." pp. A3849-50

26. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Nelsen inserted an article, "Stopping the 'Anti-Benson' Bill." p. A3850

Extension of remarks of Rep. Brademas criticizing the veto of the REA loan approval bill. p. A3864

Extension of remarks of Rep. Wolf expressing his approval of the veto of the REA bill. pp. A3869-70

27. TOBACCO. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dorn stating that "our American tobacco farmers will be hornswoggled and gypped out of their tobacco acreage just as were the cotton farmers of the Southeast," and inserting a USDA statement concerning U. S. imports of unmanufactured tobacco. pp. A3854-5

BILLS INTRODUCED

28. BUILDINGS. S. 1872, by Sen. Humphrey, to amend the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935, to provide a method for preserving sites, areas, buildings, and objects of nationa, regional or local historical significance which are

86TH CONGRESS, 1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT No. 350

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

MAY 8, 1959.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 7040]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The estimates considered by the Committee are contained in sections of the 1960 Budget on the Executive Office of the President, pages 68 through 72, Independent Offices, pages 103 through 240, General Services Administration, pages 241 through 277, and Housing and Home Finance Agency, pages 279 through 316.

A detailed tabulation is included at the end of the report reflecting the amount included for each item in the bill for 1959, the budget estimate for 1960, and the amount recommended in the bill, with appropriate comparisons. A summary of the totals follows:

Appropriation, 1959	[1] $6, 845, 542, 940
Budget estimates, 1960	6, 584, 188, 000
Recommended in bill	6, 438, 839, 800
Reduction below 1959 appropriations	—406, 703, 140
Reduction below 1960 Budget estimates (including rescission)	—252, 348, 200

[1] Includes funds contained in the Second Supplemental Appropriation bill, 1959, as passed the House.

The reduction reflected in the above tabulation includes reductions in the Budget estimates for almost every item in the bill totaling $145,348,200, and a rescission of $107,000,000 of unobligated balances of prior year funds under the raw materials stockpiling program.

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization

The Committee recommends $43,735,000 for civil defense activities in 1960. This amount will provide the same level of operation as in the current year and includes $23,285,000 for salaries and expenses. It was testified that by consolidating the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Federal Civil Defense Administration savings have resulted which will enable the OCDM to operate more efficiently and economically in 1960 than in former years when there were two separate agencies.

The Committee has approved $10,000,000 for Federal contributions to States and localities for the procurement of civil defense equipment, education, training and other technical assistance. Federal help has been given for such purposes for several years, and total grants for such assistance to date have exceeded $131,000,000. The Committee has again denied the funds requested to initiate a program of Federal contributions for jobs at various city halls. The Members have received many pressure letters, telegrams and phone calls in the last three weeks dealing with this subject. The purpose of this interest is to use Federal funds to put 4,000 more jobs in the city halls. It is a program that would cost $24,000,000 each year within the next two years and could only be wasteful. The bureaucracy it would create would be independent and divorced from responsibility to either Federal or local governments and would continually exert pressure on Members for more funding.

The Committee is recommending $6,950,000 for emergency supplies and equipment. These funds will provide for maintenance of the present stockpile of materials and for procuring a reasonable amount of additional stockpile equipment.

The bill provides $3,500,000 for research and development, including $2,500,000 for construction of prototype shelters for demonstration purposes. The funds allowed are for the first year costs of a two year program, and the Committee has received assurances that a wide-scale shelter construction program is not contemplated.

Civil Aeronautics Board

The bill provides $6,925,000 for the Board, which is an increase of $411,000 over 1959 and a reduction of $575,000 in the budget estimate. This increase will allow 58 additional employees in 1960 and brings the total number of authorized positions to 788.

It has come to the Committee's attention that the Board is delegating the responsibility for investigation of small airplane accidents to the Federal Aviation Agency. The intent and clear expression of an Act of Congress puts this responsibility in the Board and not in the FAA. The Committee wants this Board to investigate all accidents as the law directs. Since this is a lump sum appropriation, there is no restriction imposed on the use of funds by the Board for investigation purposes. The Committee believes that the recommended reduction can be made in housekeeping personnel and other less important

activities and every effort should be made to increase the safety inspection staff as the Board deems is necessary.

The bill contains $57,000,000 for subsidy payments to air carriers, primarily for local service operations. The amount recommended is a reduction of $5,618,000 in the budget estimate and provides for about the same level of subsidy as during fiscal year 1959.

Civil Service Commission

Civil Service retirement and disability fund.—This fund is defunct by over $20.6 billion and the Bureau of the Budget is certainly unsound in its position when it has not included $773,734,000 in the Budget for 1960 to pay the Government's share of retirement costs. The Civil Service Commission asked the Bureau of the Budget for $773,734,000 to finance the Government's share but its request was denied. The Budget, insofar as it attempts to reflect true Government costs for the year, is understated by such amount.

This is a studied attempt by the Bureau of the Budget to understate the public debt. In doing so it violates the principle it so strongly advocates, that Government costs be financed on a current basis, which it is not doing here.

The Committee assumes from action on the bill last year that the Budget Bureau would again urge the President to veto the bill if it provided $775,000,000 to maintain the fund this year. In view of the Administration's position the Committee has included no funds in the bill for such purpose.

Salaries and expenses.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $18,800,000 for this Commission. This is a reduction of $1,365,000 in the budget estimate, and is $891,500 less than 1959 appropriations. A request for $17,500 for the Career Executive Board which was established by Executive Order 10758 has been denied.

The cost of operating this agency is high for the work it does, especially when it is recalled that about 75 percent of all the placements are made by the Departments and not by the Commission. The Committee recommends an overhaul of the present system of recruiting and examination, job classification, and it is of the opinion that more efficiency is needed in auditing work.

Investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations.—The bill provides $400,000, a reduction of $12,000 in the budget estimate, for security investigations of U.S. citizens who are applicants for employment by international organizations. The number of investigations that will be required in 1960 cannot be determined accurately in advance.

Annuities under special acts.—The Committee has approved the $2,450,000 budget estimate for annuities to widows of employees of the Lighthouse Service and to persons who were employed on the construction of the Panama Canal as provided by law.

Administrative expenses, employees' life insurance fund.—The Committee has included in the bill a limitation of $240,000 on funds in the Employees' Life Insurance Fund that may be used for administrative expenses by the Commission. The authorization applies to all funds related to this program that the Commission uses, and the amount allowed is $18,000 less than the request.

Federal Aviation Agency

Expenses.—The Committee has approved $283,200,000 for operating costs of this new agency which was created by the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to replace the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Airways Modernization Board. The amount recommended is an increase of $26,040,800 over fiscal year 1959 and is $43,200,000 below the budget estimate. The Committee has provided approximately 500 more positions than the authorized strength for 1959, and 3,500 more than the current payroll. The entire increase is for allocation to field functions and no part is for additional staff in the District of Columbia.

Establishment of air navigation facilities.—The Committee recommends $131,200,000 for the procurement and installation of new equipment and modernization of airports, control towers and other facilities. The funds will provide for a high rate of modernization in 1960. The unobligated balance in this program of $74,000,000 is in addition to the new funding provided in the bill.

The request for $5,129,000 for the purchase of three additional jet airplanes is not included in the bill. The Committee also believes that if an effort is made a considerable portion of the equipment and facilities can be obtained for less cost than is anticipated in the estimates and has accordingly made an overall reduction of $7,000,000. This over-estimating is indicated in the request for $656,160 to provide nine three-bedroom housing units at five locations in Alaska at an average cost of $72,900 apiece. The Committee has limited the allowance for each such unit to $40,000. The request for $257,200 for garages and improved docking facilities in Alaska and at Swan Island is not allowed.

Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization).—The bill contains $47,500,000 for liquidating contract authority, under the grant-in-aid program. This is a reduction of $2,500,000 in the budget estimate.

Research and development.—The Committee has approved $47,100,000 for research and development. A comparable amount for 1959 including transfers is $33,338,000. The Committee has denied the $14,000,000 requested to construct a longer and heavier runway parallel to one the agency now has.

Washington National Airport.—The budget estimate for $2,400,000 for operation of this Airport has been approved by the Committee.

Federal Home Loan Bank Board

The Committee has approved $1,800,000 for expenses of the Board in 1960, an increase of $101,000 over the current year and a reduction of $100,000 in the budget estimate. The Board has had a sizable fund increase in the last two years and the further increase for 1960 should be entirely adequate to administer the Board's full responsibilities.

The Committee recommends $775,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. This provides $24,400 more than in 1959 and $25,000 less than the budget estimate. The Committee has noted that the size of the staff for this Corporation has increased year by year and cautions it not to get too topheavy with employees even though it is spending non-appropriated funds.

Federal Communications Commission

The bill includes $10,400,000 for this Commission in 1960, which is an increase of $657,800 over 1959 and a reduction of $600,000 in the budget estimate. The Committee has approved the addition of 15 positions as requested for the regulation of common carriers. The remainder of the increase is for 50 additional employees in the broadcast and the safety and special radio services activities.

An increase of $90,000 is included in the bill for a study by the National Bureau of Standards of the feasibility of using automatic data processing equipment to increase the efficiency of handling work of this Commission. The Committee has not allowed the request for an additional $90,000 for other research contracts for work which the Commission should be able to perform.

Federal Power Commission

The Committee recommends $7,062,000 for this Commission in 1960. This is an increase of $129,500 over the current appropriation and $363,000 less than the budget estimate. There were 75 job vacancies at the time of the hearings, and the Committee in providing for the same level of operation in the coming year is of the firm opinion that the amount recommended should be adequate.

Federal Trade Commission

The bill provides $6,745,000 for the Federal Trade Commission next year, which is an increase of $284,000 over the present appropriation and a reduction of $230,000 in the budget estimate. The recommendation will provide 32 additional positions and will bring the total authorized employment for 1960 to about 770.

General Accounting Office

The Committee has approved $41,800,000 for this Office in 1960. This is an increase of $2,779,500 over 1959 and a reduction of $69,000 in the budget estimate. The increase is primarily for additional travel funds and staff in accounting and auditing work.

General Services Administration

Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.—The bill includes $148,150,000 for the operation of public buildings and other related programs. This is an increase of $3,221,040 over the current year and $6,950,000 less than the budget estimate. The Committee has not included the $500,000 requested for leasing additional space for the use of the Library of Congress as it understands that the appropriate Committee is making an overall review of future space needs for the Library.

It has been the Committee's observation that the amount of rented space has been steadily growing each year as has the amount of Government-owned space. In 1960 the General Services Administration anticipates renting 37,100,000 square feet of space at a cost of $63,463,000. This is an increase of 500,000 square feet at a cost of $2,500,000 over 1959. Government owned space operated by the General Services Administration in 1960 will aggregate 75,500,000 square feet

of space, or 1,200,000 more square feet than in 1959. The Committee urges that the Administrator exercise vigorous effort to reduce the annual rental bill, and expects that as new Government-owned buildings are constructed the quantity of rental space will show a proportionate decrease.

Repair and improvement, federally owned buildings.—The Committee has included in the bill the budget estimate of $60,000,000 for repair and improvement projects on Federal buildings. This amount will provide $50,000,000 for regular repair and renovation work, and $10,000,000 for air conditioning projects. The Committee has deleted language proposed in the Budget to earmark $2,000,000 for construction and testing prototype fallout shelters in Federal buildings. It has also stricken out the proposed expenditure limitation on this program. For the past several years the Committee has been urging the Administration to reduce the large backlog of needed repairs to Government buildings and an expenditure limitation would serve no useful purpose and would only increase the administrative costs of the program.

Payments, public buildings purchase contracts.—The bill provides $1,675,000 for payments that will be required on 25 lease-purchase projects which are scheduled to be completed and in operation in 1960.

Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.—Although the Budget did not include funds for this purpose, the bill provides $25,000,000 for sites and planning of public buildings to enable the Administrator to continue in 1960 the program of acquiring sites for needed public buildings. An appropriation of $39,915,000 was provided in the current year.

Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service.—The bill provides $6,000,000 for this Service, including $2,230,000 of proceeds from the sale of excess personal property. The objectives of the Federal supply program have been thoroughly reviewed in the past year and the budget program for 1960 calls for emphasis on the increased utilization of excess property by the Government.

Expenses, supply distribution.—The Committee has approved $21,150,000 for operation of the stores depot system. This is a reduction of $850,000 in the budget estimate but an increase of $643,000 over the current year, of which $230,000 is for an increase in stores activities. This is related to the added business predicted for 1960. No increase has been allowed for buying, inspection, and administrative operations above the present level. The bill also includes $350,000 for an automatic data processing machine to be used in the stores system which should lead to a more efficient operation in the future.

Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service.—The Committee has approved $9,176,800 for this purpose, which is a reduction of $123,200 in the budget estimate. This will provide a total of 1,231 positions, the same number as is available at the present time.

Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service.—An appropriation of $2,000,000 is approved for this Service. This is $29,000 less than the budget estimate and continues about the same level of operation next year.

Strategic and critical materials.—During fiscal year 1960 it is expected that $140,300,000 would be available for obligation. This includes

$96,500,000 of unobligated balances at the beginning of the year, and $43,295,000 which will be received from the sale of materials under the rotation program. The total inventory of raw materials in various Government stockpiles on December 31, 1958, was $8,082,000,000, and of that amount $4,212,000,000 of material is excess to stockpile objectives.

The Committee believes the stockpile program should be reviewed annually by the Congress. It has accordingly included in the bill language to rescind the unobligated balance so that in 1961 a request for funds will be submitted to the Congress in the amount that is necessary to administer this program. The total amount of such rescission is approximately $107,000,000.

The Committee has allowed $33,000,000 for operating expenses in connection with this program during 1960. This recommendation allows for elements of cost as set forth in the following table, but the Committee has allowed no funds for the repurchase of rotated materials. The General Services Administration indicated during its testimony before the Committee that all the funds requested in the budget estimate for the National industrial equipment reserve would not be used under the currently planned program for stockpiling machine tools in 1960, and this is the basis for the Committee's reduction in that item.

	Budget, 1960	Recommended in bill	Reduction
1. Acquisition of new materials	$6,527,000	$6,527,000	
Upgrading materials	2,676,000	2,676,000	
2. Purchase of new rotated materials	49,431,000	0	−$49,431,000
Storage of materials	14,553,000	14,116,000	−437,000
Inventorying materials	4,531,000	4,531,000	
3. National industrial equipment reserve	4,512,000	2,000,000	−2,512,000
4. Operating expenses	3,310,000	3,150,000	−160,000
Total	85,540,000	33,000,000	−52,540,000

Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator.—The budget estimate of $225,000 for the Administrator's office has been approved.

Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents.—The Committee included in the bill the budget estimate of $200,000 for allowances and office facilities for former Presidents.

Administrative operations fund.—The bill includes a limitation of $12,500,000 on the amount that may be used for administrative operations. This is a reduction of $500,000 in the budget estimate and an increase of $133,100 over the current year. Expenses for overhead operations have been increasing each year and the Committee will not look with favor upon any further increases.

Administrative expenses, abaca fiber program.—This program is now being liquidated and it will be completed during fiscal year 1960. The bill provides $47,000 for administrative expenses related to the program.

Administrative expenses, Federal Facilities Corporation.—A limitation of $20,000 is included in the bill on funds for administrative expenses of the Federal Facilities Corporation. The only remaining functions of this Corporation are administration of sales contracts for the disposal of synthetic rubber facilities and a tin smelter.

Administrative expenses, Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation fund.—The bill includes $40,000 for administrative costs related to a few remaining functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This is a reduction of $13,960 below 1959 and a reduction of $4,000 in the budget estimate.

In the general provisions for the General Services Administration the Committee has included necessary language to permit the purchase of a special purpose building in Portland, Oregon, where in so doing, the Government will save substantial rental costs. The Committee has also included a provision authorizing certain necessary changes in project costs within the total program for the construction of public buildings.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Office of the Administrator.—The bill contains $8,702,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Administrator. This item includes funds for general agency supervision, consolidated compliance activities, administrative costs for public works planning advances, and administrative expenses for the urban renewal program. Administrative expenses for college housing, public facility loans, and certain other programs are provided for separately in this bill. The amount allowed will provide an increase of 25 field personnel in the urban renewal program activities.

Urban planning grants.—The bill provides the budget estimate of $975,000 for matching grants to states and local planning agencies for urban renewal plans in small cities and metropolitan or regional areas. This is $2,275,000 less than the amount provided for 1959 and is the balance of the authorized program.

Capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $90,000,000 for capital grants under this program. Contract authority totaling $1.35 billion has been authorized by the Congress to date, and proposals to increase this authority are pending in other legislative measures. The amount provided in the bill is expected to be adequate for the liquidation of obligations for projects during 1960.

Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund).—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $6,000,000 to increase the capital of this revolving fund. The capital in the fund including the amount recommended in the bill is $30,000,000. It provides interest-free advances to State and local public agencies for the planning of public works. When a project is started the advance is repaid to the Government.

Administrative expenses, college housing loans.—The bill authorizes $1,723,000 for administrative expenses related to the college housing loan program. This continues the present level of employment for another year and is a reduction of $57,000 in the budget estimate.

The college housing loan fund is another example where the Bureau of the Budget is forcing an agency to take action of questionable merit for the purpose of indirectly reducing the budget expenditures. The plan is to trade $50,000,000 in sound college housing bonds for low-interest rate non-marketable Treasury bonds maturing beyond 1975, thus allowing the Treasury to issue more funds for college housing loans without increasing the public debt by the amount of bonds so traded.

Administrative expenses, public facility loans.—The bill authorizes $500,000 for administrative expenses related to loans to local governments for planning essential public works or facilities. This is an increase of $67,600 over the 1959 authorization and is a reduction of $50,000 in the budget estimate.

Administrative expenses, revolving fund (liquidating programs).—The Committee has approved $653,000 for administrative expenses related to eight programs in the process of liquidation. This will continue in 1960 the same level of employment as in the current year.

Federal National Mortgage Association.—The Committee recommends $6,050,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal National Mortgage Association. This is an increase of $1,165,000 over 1959 and is a reduction of $50,000 in the budget estimate. The increase will provide additional staff for the increasing activity in this agency. The Association finances its operations with revenues from its operations and appears to be one of the best operated agencies in Government even though the Committee does not agree with all its policies. Mr. Baughman is one of the most able administrators and is well versed in his responsibilities.

The Committee is again calling attention to what the Bureau of the Budget is requiring the agency to do in order to hold down budget expenditures and the public debt. It is insisting that the Corporation trade from its portfolio $335,000,000 in seasoned mortgages bearing 4 percent interest for long term non-marketable Treasury bonds bearing a 2¾ percent rate which do not mature until 1975. The Committee doubts the wisdom of such an exchange which could result in an unnecessary increase in cost to the Government.

Federal Housing Administration.—The Committee has allowed $8,100,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration instead of $8,200,000 as proposed in the budget estimates. It has also approved $48,000,000 for non-administrative expenses related to program activities. This is a total increase of $2,268,500 over 1959 and will continue to provide the additional staff necessary to handle the high level of activity in the various programs of this agency.

Public Housing Administration.—The Committee recommends $120,000,000 for payment of annual contributions to local housing authorities under the public housing program. This is a reduction of $4,000,000 in the budget estimate and an increase of $12,500,000 over the contributions in 1959. The bill also provides an appropriation of $12,660,000 for administrative expenses of the program in 1960. It was testified that when the 538,000 units presently authorized are constructed and occupied an annual contribution in the vicinity of $180,000,000 for a period of 30 years will be required.

Interstate Commerce Commission

The Committee has approved $19,400,000 for salaries and expenses of this Commission in 1960. This amount will give the Commission 50 additional employees of the 139 requested in its budget, and will provide for a staff of 2,400. This is almost a 25 percent increase in staff since 1954 when the Commission had 1,954 employees and an appropriation of $11,284,000.

In recent years this agency has undertaken a reorganization of its functions which was intended to achieve greater efficiency in its operations. To date the reorganization has been expensive and has resulted primarily in requests for more staff. The Committee will

expect to see more definite evidence of the improved management in the budget next year.

National Capital Housing Authority

The bill contains $40,000 for operation and maintenance of properties in the District of Columbia under Title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act. This is a reduction of $5,000 in the budget estimate and is an increase of $2,000 over the current year.

National Science Foundation

The Committee considered a budget estimate of $160,300,000 for the National Science Foundation and has approved $143,273,000, an increase of $9,273,000 over the 1959 appropriation.

The amount recommended includes $60,450,000 for grants and contracts for basic research in support of science. This is an increase of $11,450,000, or about 25 percent, for this program in 1960.

In the facilities program the Committee has included $5,300,000 for the continued support of various research facilities projects and programs that were initiated in prior years, $2,000,000 to start a new program to modernize graduate level laboratories, and $2,000,000 for an oceanographic vessel. The request for $800,000 for a Southern Hemisphere astrograph which was denied last year, $500,000 for a site survey for a national atmospheric research institute, and $2,000,000 to undertake a separate major program of weather modification under the basic research grants and contracts program have not been allowed. Last year funds for university nuclear research equipment were provided by the Atomic Energy Commission, and if they are deemed necessary in 1960 they should be provided in the same way.

For several years the Committee has been very interested in the programs for the supplementary education of high school science and mathematics teachers and on several occasions has provided funds in excess of the budget estimate for their expansion. Their value is now well established and the bill contains $33,050,000 as recommended in the budget estimates for continuing the present high level of these programs in 1960.

The following table sets forth the major programs of the National Science Foundation and the amounts recommended in the bill:

	1959 appropriation	1960 budget	Recommended in bill
Support of science:			
Basic research	$48,999,000	$71,900,000	$60,450,000
Facilities	13,995,000	12,600,000	9,300,000
Surveys and reports	290,000	355,000	290,000
Dissemination of scientific information	3,620,000	5,100,000	3,620,000
Program development and evaluation	1,780,000	2,365,000	1,780,000
Allocations to other Government agencies	1,091,145		
Total, support of science	69,775,145	92,320,000	75,440,000
Support of Scientific Manpower:			
Fellowships	12,400,000	12,700,000	12,700,000
Institutes	33,050,000	33,050,000	33,050,000
Clearinghouse of scientific information	860,000	1,000,000	860,000
Projects in science education	11,593,000	11,600,000	11,593,000
Course content program	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Program development and evaluation	2,270,000	2,249,000	2,249,000
	66,173,000	66,599,000	66,452,000
Executive Direction	1,381,000	1,381,000	1,381,000
Total	[1] 137,329,145	160,300,000	143,273,000

[1] Includes $2,000,000 by transfer from the Atomic Energy Commission and $1,329,145 of prior year funds.

Renegotiation Board

An appropriation of $2,700,000 is recommended for this Board in the coming year, a reduction of $325,500 below 1959 and $300,000 less than the budget estimate. The workload for this agency has been reduced greatly by changes in the Renegotiation Act in recent years and the Committee believes the staff to handle the workload can be reduced to the extent it is recommending in the bill.

Securities and Exchange Commission

The Committee has approved $7,800,000 for salaries and expenses of this Commission. This is an increase of $127,000 over the current year and a reduction of $475,000 in the budget estimate.

The Committee provided a sizable increase of 68 employees last year and for 1960 it is providing an additional 10. The Committee believes that the most effective use for such personnel is in the field offices, which are the eyes and ears of enforcement. The entire increase provided in this bill is for strengthening such offices and the Committee further recommends that a number of positions should be transferred to the field from the Washington office.

Selective Service System

The bill contains $29,000,000 for the Selective Service System. This is a reduction of $448,500 below 1959 and $1,650,000 less than the budget estimate. Included in the total amount is $50,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board and $19,000 for the National Advisory Committee on Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists. While the Committee has not earmarked the funds in the bill for local draft boards, the Director is admonished not to slight the needs of the local boards or the funds will be earmarked next year.

Veterans Administration

General operating expenses.—The Committee has approved $160,000,000 for the costs of the general administration, insurance, and veterans benefits programs in 1960. The amount provided is $4,680,000 less than the amount appropriated for 1959, and is $3,373,000 less than the budget estimate. Inasmuch as the workload has not developed as anticipated, the Committee believes the amount recommended will be adequate.

The Committee would like to note at this time the remarkable improvement that has been achieved in the insurance program since 1946. The workload is about the same but the use of mechanized processes, better trained people, and other improvements, has made it possible to reduce employment from 21,000 in 1946 to 4,312 in 1959, and the cost of operation has correspondingly been reduced with an improvement in service.

Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.—The bill provides $27,349,000 for administrative expenses of the medical program. This is an increase of $622,700 over the current year and an increase of $4,344,000 in the budget estimate. The Committee has approved and earmarked in the bill $15,344,000 for medical research, the same amount as in 1959. The Budget proposed reducing the amount to $11,000,000 but the Committee is strongly of the

opinion that the level provided for is the correct emphasis for such research in 1960.

Inpatient care.—An appropriation of $777,500,000 is recommended for hospital care in 1960. This is $9,378,000 more than the appropriation in 1959. It has come to the Committee's attention that there is need for more funds to eliminate a backlog of maintenance and repair items in the hospitals. The bill provides $6,000,000, an increase of $2,900,000 over the budget request, for such purposes.

Outpatient care.—The bill provides $83,000,000 for furnishing outpatient care to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration. This is an increase of $667,000 over 1959 and $866,000 less than the budget estimate. It is believed that the increase provided over the current year will be adequate to handle the anticipated workload.

Maintenance and operation of supply depots.—The bill contains $2,218,000 for operating the supply system for the Veterans Administration. This is a reduction of $85,000 in the budget estimate and provides for the same level of operation as in the current year.

Compensation and pensions.—The bill includes $3,300,000,000 for payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities and other allowances to veterans as provided by law. This is $7,000,000 below the budget estimate and an increase of $47,500,000 over 1959.

Readjustment benefits.—The Committee has included in the bill $585,000,000 for this item. This is $115,000,000 less than the amount appropriated in 1959 for this purpose and is $3,000,000 less than the budget estimate. The amount proposed for 1960 is based on a fewer number of recipients and the program is now declining as eligible veterans exhaust their entitlements. There is no reduction in any benefit.

Veterans insurance and indemnities.—The bill includes the budget estimate of $53,000,000 for payments of claims under the insurance programs. This is an increase of $1,900,000 over the amount for 1959.

Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.—The bill contains $2,000,000 as proposed in the Budget for payment to the Republic of the Philippines for the medical care and treatment of eligible Philippine veterans as authorized by law.

Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.—The Committee has approved $30,159,000 for hospital construction, which is an increase of $10,000,000 over the budget estimate. The Committee for several years has urged the Veterans Administration to accelerate its modernization and replacement program and the increase approved in the bill will enable the Veterans Administration to move significantly ahead. It will also provide for projects for major alterations for hospitals which were included in the original agency estimate and for which a request for funds was denied by the Bureau of the Budget.

Limitations and Legislative Provisions

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 4, line 11, in connection with the Civil Aeronautics Board:

> *Provided, That the Chairman is authorized without regard to any other provision of law, to place five General Schedule positions in the following grades: one in grade GS–18, one in grade GS–17, and three in grade GS–16, and such positions shall be in addition to positions previously allocated to this agency.*

On page 5, line 19, in connection with the Civil Service Commission:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended.

On page 8, line 3, in connection with the Civil Service Commission:

Provided, That this limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 85–377 (5 U.S.C. 2094(c)).

On page 9, line 4, in connection with the Federal Aviation Agency:

(at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $40,000 per housing unit in Alaska);

On page 14, line 10, in connection with the General Services Administration:

, and this amount shall be expended for projects at such additional locations as may be selected by the Administrator of General Services and in amounts he deems necessary.

On page 16, line 14, in connection with the General Services Administration:

, but total obligations of funds available for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act during the current fiscal year shall not exceed $33,000,000

On page 16, line 25, in connection with the General Services Administration:

: Provided further, That unobligated balances of funds in excess of $33,000,000 as of July 1, 1959, together with any receipts from sales or otherwise, during the fiscal year 1960, are hereby rescinded and shall be promptly deposited into the Treasury.

On page 19, line 5, in connection with the General Services Administration:

Not to exceed $2,000,000 granted in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the appropriation for "Construction, Federal Office Building Numbered Six, Washington, District of Columbia", may be transferred to "Construction, Public Buildings projects": Provided, That the latter appropriation shall be available for acquisition of a building in Portland, Oregon: Provided further, That the limits of cost applicable to projects authorized under said appropriation may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected on other projects.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitations on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Authorizations, 1959 [1]	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended in bill for 1960	Bill compared with—	
				1959 authorizations	1960 estimates
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	$1, 699, 000	$1, 900, 000	$1, 800, 000	+$101, 000	−$100, 000
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	750, 600	800, 000	775, 000	+24, 400	−25, 000
General Services Administration:					
Abaca fiber program	51, 950	52, 500	47, 000	−4, 950	−5, 500
Federal Facilities Corporation	26, 620	24, 000	20, 000	−6, 620	−4, 000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation fund	53, 960	44, 000	40, 000	−13, 960	−4, 000
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
College housing loans	1, 718, 200	1, 780, 000	1, 723, 000	+4, 800	−57, 000
Public facility loans	432, 400	550, 000	500, 000	+67, 600	−50, 000
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)	647, 700	755, 000	653, 000	+5, 300	−102, 000
Federal National Mortgage Association	4, 885, 000	6, 100, 000	6, 050, 000	+1, 165, 000	−50, 000
Federal Housing Administration	7, 813, 000	8, 200, 000	8, 100, 000	+287, 000	−100, 000
Public Housing Administration	12, 574, 000	13, 000, 000	12, 660, 000	+86, 000	−340, 000
Total, administrative expenses	30, 652, 430	33, 205, 500	32, 368, 000	+1, 715, 570	−837, 500

[1] Includes funds contained in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1959, as passed the House.

PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION

Object	Appropriations, 1959	Budget estimates, 1960	Increase (+) or decrease (−), estimates compared with appropriations
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act	$59,000	$53,000	−$6,000
General Services Administration: Expenses, disposal of surplus real and related personal property	900,000	1,000,000	+100,000
Total, permanent and indefinite appropriations	959,000	1,053,000	+94,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1959, AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1960

Item	Appropriations, 1959 [1]	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended in bill for 1960	Bill compared with—	
				1959 appropriation	1960 estimate
TITLE I					
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION					
Salaries and expenses	$23, 285, 000	$28, 800, 000	$23, 285, 000	----------	−$5, 515, 000
Federal contributions	0	25, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	+$10, 000, 000	−15, 000, 000
Emergency supplies and equipment	20, 000, 000	13, 900, 000	6, 950, 000	−13, 050, 000	−6, 950, 000
Research and development	2, 000, 000	7, 270, 000	3, 500, 000	+1, 500, 000	−3, 770, 000
Total, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	45, 285, 000	74, 970, 000	43, 735, 000	−1, 550, 000	−31, 235, 000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	6, 514, 000	7, 500, 000	6, 925, 000	+411, 000	−575, 000
Payments to air carriers	52, 750, 000	62, 618, 000	57, 000, 000	+4, 250, 000	−5, 618, 000
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board	59, 264, 000	70, 118, 000	63, 925, 000	+4, 661, 000	−6, 193, 000
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	19, 691, 500	20, 165, 000	18, 800, 000	−891, 500	−1, 365, 000

Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations	450, 000	412, 000	400, 000	−50, 000	−12, 000
Annuities under special acts	2, 570, 000	2, 450, 000	2, 450, 000	−120, 000	----------
Administrative expenses, employees' life insurance fund	*(123, 800)*	*(70, 000)*	*(240, 000)*	*(+116, 200)*	*(+170, 000)*
Total, Civil Service Commission	22, 711, 500	23, 027, 000	21, 650, 000	−1, 061, 500	−1, 377, 000
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY					
Expenses	257, 159, 200	326, 400, 000	283, 200, 000	+26, 040, 800	−43, 200, 000
Establishment of air navigation facilities	158, 500, 000	145, 000, 000	131, 200, 000	−27, 300, 000	−13, 800, 000
Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization)	30, 000, 000	50, 000, 000	47, 500, 000	+17, 500, 000	−2, 500, 000
Research and development	297, 000	63, 600, 000	47, 100, 000	+46, 803, 000	−16, 500, 000
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport	2, 490, 000	2, 400, 000	2, 400, 000	−90, 000	----------
Construction and development, additional Washington Airport	50, 000, 000	0	----------	−50, 000, 000	----------
Operation and maintenance of public airports, Territory of Alaska	1, 075, 650	0	----------	−1, 075, 650	----------
Airways Modernization Board	31, 500, 000	0	----------	−31, 500, 000	----------
Total, Federal Aviation Agency	531, 021, 850	587, 400, 000	511, 400, 000	−19, 621, 850	−76, 000, 000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	9, 742, 200	11, 000, 000	10, 400, 000	+657, 800	−600, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 23.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1959, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1960—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1959[1]	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended in bill for 1960	Bill compared with—	
				1959 appropriation	1960 estimate
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	$6, 932, 500	$7, 425, 000	$7, 062, 000	+$129, 500	−$363, 000
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	6, 461, 000	6, 975, 000	6, 745, 000	+284, 000	−230, 000
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses	39, 020, 500	41, 869, 000	41, 800, 000	+2, 779, 500	−69, 000
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	144, 928, 960	155, 100, 000	148, 150, 000	+3, 221, 040	−6, 950, 000
Repair and improvement, federally owned buildings	75, 000, 000	60, 000, 000	60, 000, 000	−15, 000, 000	
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	310, 900	1, 675, 000	1, 675, 000	+1, 364, 100	
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	39, 915, 000	0	25, 000, 000	−14, 915, 000	+25, 000, 000
Construction, public buildings projects	152, 810, 000	0		−152, 810, 000	
Construction, Federal Office Building No. 6, Washington, D.C.	14, 000, 000	0		−14, 000, 000	

Construction, United States Court of Claims and Federal Office Building, Washington, D.C.	1, 200, 000	0	----------	−1, 200, 000	----------
Construction, United States Mission Building, New York, N.Y.	3, 750, 000	0	----------	−3, 750, 000	----------
Construction, public buildings	323, 000	0	----------	−323, 000	----------
Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia	1, 020, 000	0	----------	−1, 020, 000	----------
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	[2] 3, 715, 690	[3] 3, 970, 000	[3] 3, 770, 000	+54, 310	−200, 000
Expenses, supply distribution	20, 507, 000	22, 000, 000	21, 150, 000	+643, 000	−850, 000
General supply fund	16, 250, 000	0	----------	−16, 250, 000	----------
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	8, 050, 600	9, 300, 000	9, 176, 800	+1, 126, 200	−123, 200
Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Services	1, 995, 800	2, 029, 000	2, 000, 000	+4, 200	−29, 000
Strategic and critical materials	3, 000, 000	0	([4])	−3, 000, 000	----------
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	372, 240	225, 000	225, 000	−147, 240	----------
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents	----------	200, 000	200, 000	+200, 000	----------
Administrative operations fund (limitation)	*(12, 366, 900)*	*(13, 000, 000)*	*(12, 500, 000)*	*(+133, 100)*	*(−500, 000)*
Total, General Services Administration	487, 149, 190	254, 499, 000	271, 346, 800	−215, 802, 390	+16, 847, 800

See footnotes at end of table, p. 23.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1959, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1960—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1959[1]	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended in bill for 1960	Bill compared with—	
				1959 appropriation	1960 estimate
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY					
Office of the Administrator:					
Salaries and expenses	$8, 648, 000	$10, 025, 000	$8, 702, 000	+$54, 000	−$1, 323, 000
Urban planning grants	3, 250, 000	975, 000	975, 000	−2, 275, 000	----------
Capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal	50, 000, 000	100, 000, 000	90, 000, 000	+40, 000, 000	−10, 000, 000
Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund)	7, 000, 000	7, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	−1, 000, 000	−1, 000, 000
Total, Office of the Administrator	68, 898, 000	118, 000, 000	105, 677, 000	+36, 779, 000	−12, 323, 000
Public Housing Administration:					
Annual contributions	107, 500, 000	124, 000, 000	120, 000, 000	+12, 500, 000	−4, 000, 000
Administrative expenses	12, 574, 000	13, 000, 000	12, 660, 000	+86, 000	−340, 000
Total, Public Housing Administration	120, 074, 000	137, 000, 000	132, 660, 000	+12, 586, 000	−4, 340, 000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	188, 972, 000	255, 000, 000	238, 337, 000	+49, 365, 000	−16, 663, 000

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	18, 671, 600	20, 150, 000	19, 400, 000	+728, 400	−750, 000
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses	86, 118, 600	0	----------	−86, 118, 600	----------
Research and development	50, 000, 000	0	----------	−50, 000, 000	----------
Construction and equipment	48, 000, 000	0	----------	−48, 000, 000	----------
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration	184, 118, 600	0	----------	−184, 118, 600	----------
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY					
Operation and maintenance of properties	38, 000	45, 000	40, 000	+2, 000	−5, 000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION					
Salaries and expenses	134, 000, 000	160, 300, 000	143, 273, 000	+9, 273, 000	−17, 027, 000
International geophysical year	2, 500, 000	0	----------	−2, 500, 000	----------
Total, National Science Foundation	136, 500, 000	160, 300, 000	143, 273, 000	+6, 773, 000	−17, 027, 000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses	3, 025, 500	3, 000, 000	2, 700, 000	−325, 500	−300, 000
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	7, 673, 000	8, 275, 000	7, 800, 000	+127, 000	−475, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 23.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1959, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1960—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1959[1]	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended in bill for 1960	Bill compared with—	
				1959 appropriation	1960 estimate
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM					
Salaries and expenses	$29, 448, 500	$30, 650, 000	$29, 000, 000	−$448, 500	−$1, 650, 000
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION					
General operating expenses	164, 680, 000	163, 373, 000	160, 000, 000	−4, 680, 000	−3, 373, 000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	26, 726, 300	23, 005, 000	27, 349, 000	+622, 700	+4, 344, 000
Inpatient care	768, 122, 000	786, 779, 000	777, 500, 000	+9, 378, 000	−9, 279, 000
Outpatient care	82, 333, 000	83, 866, 000	83, 000, 000	+667, 000	−866, 000
Maintenance and operation of supply depots	2, 201, 700	2, 303, 000	2, 218, 000	+16, 300	−85, 000
Compensation and pensions	3, 252, 500, 000	3, 307, 000, 000	3, 300, 000, 000	+47, 500, 000	−7, 000, 000
Readjustment benefits	700, 000, 000	588, 000, 000	585, 000, 000	−115, 000, 000	−3, 000, 000
Veterans insurance and indemnities	51, 100, 000	53, 000, 000	53, 000, 000	+1, 900, 000	----------
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	1, 250, 000	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	+750, 000	----------
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	19, 295, 000	20, 159, 000	30, 159, 000	+10, 864, 000	+10, 000, 000

Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief	1, 300, 000	0		−1, 300, 000	
Total, Veterans' Administration	5, 069, 508, 000	5, 029, 485, 000	5, 020, 226, 000	−49, 282, 000	−9, 259, 000
Total, title I	6, 845, 542, 940	6, 584, 188, 000	6, 438, 839, 800	−406, 703, 140	−145, 348, 200

[1] Includes funds contained in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1959, as passed the House.

[2] And $1,999,010 from proceeds of surplus personal property disposal.

[3] And $2,230,000 from proceeds of surplus personal property disposal.

[4] Rescission of prior year funds estimated at $107,000,000.

O

Union Calendar No. 128

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7040

[Report No. 350]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 8, 1959

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

A BILL

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, namely:

1 TITLE I

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3 OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE

4 MOBILIZATION

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and De-
7 fense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section
8 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; reimburse-
9 ment of the General Services Administration for security
10 guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials
11 and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense
12 functions; not to exceed $8,500 for the purchase of news-
13 papers, periodicals and teletype news services; not to exceed
14 $1,000,000 for expenses of travel; and not to exceed $6,000
15 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended
16 under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he
17 deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final
18 and conclusive: $23,285,000, of which $185,000 shall be
19 available for the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Com-
20 mittee: *Provided,* That contracts for not to exceed eight
21 persons under this appropriation for temporary or inter-
22 mittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
23 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annually.

1 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

2 For financial contributions to the States for civil defense
3 purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,
4 as amended, to be equally matched with State funds,
5 $10,000,000.

6 EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

7 For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing,
8 distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense
9 materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of
10 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,
11 $6,950,000.

12 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

13 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
14 studies and research to develop measures and plans for evacu-
15 ation, shelter, and the protection of life and property, as au-
16 thorized by section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act
17 of 1950, as amended, including services as authorized by
18 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
19 $3,500,000, to remain available until expended.

20 No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be avail-
21 able for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of
22 warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed
23 specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense
24 Mobilization.

1 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

2 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board,
5 including contract stenographic reporting services; employ-
6 ment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; hire,
7 operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of pas-
8 senger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section
9 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates
10 for individuals not to exceed $50 per diem; $6,925,000:
11 *Provided,* That the Chairman is authorized without regard
12 to any other provision of law, to place five General Schedule
13 positions in the following grades: one in grade GS–18, one
14 in grade GS–17, and three in grade GS–16, and such posi-
15 tions shall be in addition to positions previously allocated to
16 this agency.

17 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

18 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensa-
19 tion fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board
20 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72
21 Stat. 763–765), as is payable by the Board, $57,000,000,
22 to remain available until expended.

1 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $22,000
4 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
5 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; not to exceed $10,000 for medical
6 examinations performed for veterans by private physicians
7 on a fee basis; not to exceed $100 for the purchase of
8 newspapers and periodicals (excluding scientific, technical,
9 trade or traffic periodicals, for official use) ; payment in ad-
10 vance for library membership in societies whose publications
11 are available to members only or to members at a price lower
12 than to the general public; not to exceed $77,000 for per-
13 forming the duties imposed upon the Commission by the
14 Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767) ; reimbursement of
15 the General Services Administration for security guard serv-
16 ices for protection of confidential files; not to exceed $472,-
17 000 for expenses of travel; and not to exceed $5,000 for
18 actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709,
19 Revised Statutes, as amended; $18,800,000: *Provided,* That
20 no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career

1 Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758
2 of March 4, 1958, as amended.
3 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
4 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
5 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and
6 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established
7 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

8 INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR
9 EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

10 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
11 Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended,
12 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary
13 General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of
14 other international organizations, certain information con-
15 cerning United States citizens employed, or being con-
16 sidered for employment by such organizations, including
17 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
18 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $400,000: *Provided,* That this
19 appropriation shall be available for advances or reimburse-
20 ments to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil
21 Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation
22 for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive
23 order: *Provided further,* That members of the International
24 Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual

1 transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence
2 authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended,
3 while traveling on official business away from their homes or
4 regular places of business, including periods while en route
5 to and from and at the place where their services are to be
6 performed: *Provided further,* That nothing in sections 281
7 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of
8 the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply
9 to any person because of appointment for part-time or inter-
10 mittent service as a member of the International Organiza-
11 tions Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Com-
12 mission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated
13 January 9, 1953, as amended.

14 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

15 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May
16 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of
17 August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771–775),
18 $2,450,000.

19 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES'
20 LIFE INSURANCE FUND

21 Not to exceed $240,000 of the funds in the "Employees'
22 Life Insurance Fund" shall be available for reimbursement
23 to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses
24 incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in

1 the administration of the Federal Employees' Group Life
2 Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091–2103):
3 *Provided,* That this limitation shall include expenses in-
4 curred under section 10 of the Act, notwithstanding the pro-
5 visions of section 1 of Public Law 85–377 (5 U.S.C.
6 2094(c)).

7 FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

8 EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency,
10 not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses
11 for research and development and for establishment of air
12 navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the
13 Federal Airport Act; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle
14 at not to exceed $3,500; not to exceed $12,950,000 for
15 expenses of travel; and purchase and repair of skis and snow-
16 shoes; $283,200,000: *Provided,* That there may be credited
17 to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties,
18 municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources,
19 for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of
20 air navigation facilities.

21 ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

22 For an additional amount for the acquisition, establish-
23 ment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire
24 of air navigation facilities, including the initial acquisition
25 of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and

1 furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers
2 and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed
3 at remote localities not on foreign soil where such accom-
4 modations are not available (at a total cost of construction
5 of not to exceed $40,000 per housing unit in Alaska) ; and
6 the initial flight checking of air navigation facilities and the
7 transportation by air to and from and within Alaska and
8 the Territories of the United States of materials and equip-
9 ment secured under this appropriation; $131,200,000, to
10 remain available until expended: *Provided,* That there may
11 be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States,
12 counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private
13 sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air
14 navigation facilities.

15 GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF
16 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

17 For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority
18 granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to
19 enter into contracts, $47,500,000, to remain available until
20 expended.

21 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

22 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
23 research, development, and service testing, including con-
24 struction of experimental facilities and acquisition of neces-

1 sary sites by lease or grant; and purchase of not to exceed
2 two passenger motor vehicles; $47,100,000, to remain avail-
3 able until expended.

4 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL
5 AIRPORT

6 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-
7 nance, improvement and protection of the Washington Na-
8 tional Airport, including purchase of one passenger motor
9 vehicle for replacement only; purchase, cleaning, and repair
10 of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $2,400,000.

11 GENERAL PROVISIONS

12 During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations
13 to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the
14 activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949, as
15 amended (5 U.S.C. 596a), to the extent and in the manner
16 prescribed by said Act; maintenance and operation of air-
17 craft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; and uni-
18 forms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of
19 September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

20 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

22 For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the
23 Commission as authorized by law, including newspapers (not
24 to exceed $200), land and structures (not to exceed $81,800),
25 special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and

1 repairs to buildings (not to exceed $13,900), services as
2 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
3 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and purchase of not to exceed three pas-
4 senger motor vehicles for replacement only, $10,400,000.

5 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,
8 as authorized by law, including not to exceed $375,000 for
9 expenses of travel; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not
10 to exceed $500 for newspapers; $7,062,000, of which not to
11 exceed $10,000 shall be available for special counsel and
12 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
13 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not exceeding $50 per
14 diem for individuals: *Provided,* That not to exceed $354,200
15 shall be available for investigations relating to Federal river
16 development projects.

17 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commis-
20 sion, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized
21 by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), not to exceed $700 for news-
22 papers, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
23 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed $285,000
24 for expenses of travel, $6,745,000: *Provided,* That no part

1 of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any
2 investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of
3 the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to
4 the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such
5 investigation.

6 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office,
9 including newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding $500);
10 rental or lease of office space in foreign countries without
11 regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised
12 Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529); and services as
13 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
14 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $41,800,000.

15 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

16 OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDING SERVICE

17 For necessary expenses of real property management and
18 related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in
19 the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises;
20 moving Government agencies (including space adjustments)
21 in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer
22 of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and
23 disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests
24 therein; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of

1 August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); $148,150,000: *Pro-*
2 *vided,* That this appropriation shall be available, without
3 regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as
4 amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to buildings, or
5 parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appropriation for
6 "Emergency operating expenses".

7 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT, FEDERALLY OWNED
8 BUILDINGS

9 For expenses necessary for the repair, alteration, preser-
10 vation, renovation, improvement, extension, equipment, and
11 demolition of federally owned buildings and buildings occu-
12 pied pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act
13 of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), not otherwise provided for, in-
14 cluding grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and
15 piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto;
16 acquisition of land as authorized by title III of the Act
17 of June 16, 1949 (40 U.S.C. 297); and care and safeguard-
18 ing of sites acquired for Federal buildings; $60,000,000, to
19 remain available until expended.

20 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

21 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any
22 other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to
23 the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40
24 U.S.C. 356), $1,675,000: *Provided,* That authority hereto-
25 fore granted under this head for the Administrator of General

1 Services to enter into a 10-year contract for the project at
2 Sacramento, California, for which the annual payment for
3 amortization of principal and interest thereon shall not ex-
4 ceed $1,250,600, is hereby extended to December 31, 1959.

5 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

6 For an additional amount for expenses necessary in con-
7 nection with construction of public buildings projects not
8 otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the
9 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, $25,000,000,
10 to remain available until expended, and this amount shall be
11 expended for projects at such additional locations as may
12 be selected by the Administrator of General Services and in
13 amounts he deems necessary.

14 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

15 For necessary expenses of personal property manage-
16 ment and related activities as authorized by law and not
17 otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $300 for
18 the purchase of newspapers and periodicals, $3,770,000:
19 *Provided,* That not to exceed $2,230,000 of any funds re-
20 ceived during the current or preceding fiscal year for deposit
21 under section 204 (a) of the Federal Property and Admin-
22 istrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and not otherwise
23 disposed of by law, shall be deposited to the credit of this
24 appropriation and shall be available for necessary expenses in
25 carrying out the functions of the General Services Adminis-

1 tration under the said Act, with respect to the utilization
2 and disposal of excess and surplus personal property.

3 EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

4 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for
5 operation of the stores depot system and other procure-
6 ment services, including contractual services incident to re-
7 ceiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items; and not
8 to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals;
9 $21,150,000.

10 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND
11 RECORDS SERVICE

12 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal rec-
13 ords management and related activities as provided by law,
14 including contractual services incident to movement or dis-
15 posal of records, $9,176,800.

16 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC
17 UTILITIES SERVICE

18 For necessary expenses of transportation and public
19 utilities management and related activities, as provided by
20 law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the
21 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to
22 exceed $75 per diem for individuals, $2,000,000.

23 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

24 Funds available for carrying out the provisions of the
25 Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C.

1 98–98b), during the current fiscal year, shall be available
2 for transportation and handling, within the United States
3 (including charges at United States ports), storage, security,
4 and maintenance of strategic and critical materials acquired
5 for or transferred to the supplemental stockpile established
6 pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade De-
7 velopment and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)),
8 and for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial
9 Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462), relating to
10 machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for
11 which the General Services Administration is responsible,
12 including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
13 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed $3,150,-
14 000 for operating expenses, but total obligations of funds
15 available for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and
16 Critical Materials Stock Piling Act during the current fiscal
17 year shall not exceed $33,000,000: *Provided,* That during
18 the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the
19 value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in
20 accordance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical
21 Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be
22 transferred to stockpiles established in accordance with said
23 Act: *Provided further,* That no part of funds available shall
24 be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage
25 facilities: *Provided further,* That unobligated balances

1 of funds in excess of $33,000,000 as of July 1, 1959, to-
2 gether with any receipts from sales or otherwise, during the
3 fiscal year 1960, are hereby rescinded and shall be promptly
4 deposited into the Treasury.

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

6 For expenses of executive direction for activities under
7 the control of the General Services Administration, including
8 not to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodi-
9 cals, $225,000.

10 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER
11 PRESIDENTS

12 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August
13 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), $200,000: *Provided,* That the
14 Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Sec-
15 retary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to
16 carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

17 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

18 Funds available to General Services Administration for
19 administrative operations, in support of program activities,
20 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a
21 single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided,* That costs
22 and obligations for such administrative operations for the
23 respective program activities shall be accounted for in ac-
24 cordance with systems approved by the General Accounting

1 Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount deposited
2 into said account for the fiscal year 1960 from funds made
3 available to General Services Administration in this Act shall
4 not exceed $12,500,000, of which not to exceed $100 may
5 be used for purchase of newspapers and periodicals: *Pro-*
6 *vided further*, That amounts deposited into said account for
7 administrative operations for each program shall not exceed
8 the amounts included in the respective program appropria-
9 tions for such purposes.

10 GENERAL PROVISIONS

11 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the
12 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)
13 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,
14 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from
15 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129);
16 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to
17 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the
18 General Services Administration, issued by public authorities,
19 States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to
20 such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems neces-
21 sary and in the public interest may, upon the request and
22 at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the
23 appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations
24 or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the
25 General Services Administration, in connection with prop-

1 erty transferred to the General Services Administration pur-
2 suant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and
3 such appropriations or funds may, with the approval of the
4 Bureau of the Budget, be so transferred.

5 Not to exceed $2,000,000 granted in the Independent
6 Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the appropriation
7 for "Construction, Federal Office Building Numbered Six,
8 Washington, District of Columbia", may be transferred to
9 "Construction, Public Buildings projects": *Provided*, That
10 the latter appropriation shall be available for acquisition of
11 a building in Portland, Oregon: *Provided further*, That the
12 limits of cost applicable to projects authorized under said
13 appropriation may be exceeded to the extent that savings
14 are effected on other projects.

15 Funds available to the General Services Administration
16 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

17 No part of any money appropriated by this or any other
18 Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Govern-
19 ment shall be used during the current fiscal year for the
20 purchase within the continental limits of the United States
21 of any typewriting machines except in accordance with
22 regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal
23 Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as
24 amended.

25 Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made

1 available to the General Services Administration for the cur-
2 rent fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other
3 such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be
4 thereby increased more than 2 per centum: *Provided,* That
5 such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and
6 shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of $2,000,000.

7 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

8 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Admin-
11 istrator, including rent in the District of Columbia; services
12 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
13 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and purchase of two passenger motor
14 vehicles (including one in the District of Columbia, to re-
15 main under the control of the Agency, at a purchase price
16 of not to exceed $3,500) of which one shall be for replace-
17 ment only; $8,702,000: *Provided,* That necessary expenses
18 of inspections and of providing representatives at the site of
19 projects being planned or undertaken by local public agencies
20 pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended,
21 projects financed through loans to educational institutions
22 authorized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as
23 amended, and projects and facilities financed by loans to pub-
24 lic agencies pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments
25 of 1955, as amended, shall be compensated by such agencies

1 or institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the
2 aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services, and
3 expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministra-
4 tive; and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the
5 Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may
6 accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such
7 institutions, or the Administrator, and shall credit such
8 amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such
9 charges have been made, but such nonadministrative ex-
10 penses shall not exceed $2,900,000.

11 URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

12 For grants in accordance with the provisions of section
13 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, $975,000.

14 CAPITAL GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN
15 RENEWAL

16 For an additional amount for payment of capital grants
17 as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as
18 amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), $90,000,000.

19 RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS (PAYMENT TO
20 REVOLVING FUND)

21 For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant
22 to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40
23 U.S.C. 462), $6,000,000.

1 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

2 ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

3 For the payment of annual contributions to public hous-
4 ing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United
5 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),
6 $120,000,000.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

8 For administrative expenses of the Public Housing
9 Administration, $12,660,000, to be expended under the
10 authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this
11 Act.

12 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce
15 Commission, including not to exceed $5,000 for the employ-
16 ment of special counsel; services as authorized by section 15
17 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not
18 to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; newspapers (not to
19 exceed $300); and purchase of not to exceed thirty passen-
20 ger motor vehicles of which nineteen shall be for replacement
21 only; $19,400,000, of which not less then $1,526,100 shall be
22 available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety
23 activities and not less than $1,051,400 shall be available for
24 expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activi-

1 ties: *Provided,* That Joint Board members and cooperating
2 State commissioners may use Government transportation
3 requests when traveling in connection with their duties as
4 such.

5 NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

6 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

7 For the operation and maintenance of properties under
8 title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act,
9 $40,000: *Provided,* That all receipts derived from sales,
10 leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of
11 the United States monthly: *Provided further,* That so long
12 as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing
13 purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act
14 of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not
15 be effective.

16 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
19 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42
20 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellow-
21 ships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
22 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50
23 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
24 not to exceed $350 for the purchase of newspapers and
25 periodicals; and reimbursement of the General Services Ad-

1 ministration for security guard services; $143,273,000, to
2 remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the fore-
3 going amount not less than $30,250,000 shall be available
4 for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a pro-
5 gram of supplementary training for secondary school science
6 and mathematics teachers.

7 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-
10 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as
11 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
12 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for
13 individuals, $2,700,000.

14 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $1,125
17 for the purchase of newspapers; uniforms or allowances
18 therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and serv-
19 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
20 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $7,800,000.

21 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary for the operation and main-
24 tenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by

1 title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act
2 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized
3 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a);
4 purchase of ten passenger motor vehicles for replacement
5 only; not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers
6 and periodicals; not to exceed $50,000 for the National Se-
7 lective Service Appeal Board; and $19,000 for the National
8 Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists,
9 and Allied Specialists; $29,000,000: *Provided*, That during
10 the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this ap-
11 propriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section
12 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he
13 deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national
14 defense.

15 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

16 General Operating Expenses

17 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-
18 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses
19 incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uni-
20 forms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to
21 exceed $3,500 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to
22 exceed $67,000 for preparation, shipment, installation, and
23 display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures,
24 and other visual education information and descriptive

1 material, including purchase or rental of equipment;
2 $160,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
3 shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged
4 in public relations work: *Provided further,* That no part of
5 this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions
6 for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions
7 an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each
8 eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

9 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS
10 OPERATING EXPENSES

11 For expenses necessary for administration of the medi-
12 cal, hospital, domiciliary, special service, construction and
13 supply, research, and employee education and training
14 activities; expenses necessary for carrying out programs of
15 medical research, as authorized by law; and not to exceed
16 $2,700 for newspapers and periodicals; $27,349,000, of
17 which $15,344,000 shall be available for medical research:
18 *Provided,* That $1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriations
19 shall remain available until expended for prosthetic testing
20 and development.

21 INPATIENT CARE

22 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-
23 tion of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and for the care
24 and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administra-
25 tion in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans

1 Administration as authorized by law, including the furnish-
2 ing of recreational articles and facilities; maintenance and
3 operation of farms; repairing, altering, improving or provid-
4 ing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the
5 jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise
6 provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary
7 employees and purchase of materials; purchase of fifty-two
8 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or
9 allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September
10 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State
11 or Territorial homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38,
12 United States Code, for the support of veterans eligible for
13 admission to Veterans Administration facilities for hospital
14 or domiciliary care; $777,500,000, plus reimbursements:
15 *Provided,* That allotments and transfers may be made from
16 this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education,
17 and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy,
18 and Air Force Departments, for disbursement by them
19 under the various headings of their applicable appropriations,
20 of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment
21 of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration: *Provided*
22 *further,* That the foregoing appropriation is predicated on
23 furnishing inpatient care and treatment to an average of
24 140,846 beneficiaries during the fiscal year 1960 including
25 members in State or Territorial homes, and if a lesser num-

1 ber is experienced such appropriation shall be expended
2 only in proportion to the average number of beneficiaries
3 furnished such care and treatment.

4 OUTPATIENT CARE

5 For expenses necessary for furnishing outpatient care to
6 beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, as authorized
7 by law; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles for re-
8 placement only; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as
9 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $83,000,000.

10 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF SUPPLY DEPOTS

11 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
12 of supply depots, including purchase of one passenger motor
13 vehicle for replacement only, and uniforms or allowances
14 therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), $2,218,000.

15 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

16 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,
17 and allowances (including burial awards authorized by sec-
18 tion 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence
19 allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under
20 any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based
21 thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and
22 annuities, the administration of which is now or may here-
23 after be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the
24 payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections

1 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended,
2 $3,300,000,000, to remain available until expended.

3 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

4 For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans
5 as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment
6 Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and
7 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equip-
8 ment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United
9 States Code, $585,000,000, to remain available until
10 expended.

11 VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

12 For military and naval insurance, for national service
13 life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-
14 disabled veterans insurance, $53,000,000, to remain avail-
15 able until expended: *Provided,* That certain premiums pro-
16 vided by law to be credited to the "Military and naval in-
17 surance" or "National service life insurance" appropriations
18 shall be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further,*
19 That this appropriation shall be subject to the same statu-
20 tory provisions and shall be available for the same purpose
21 as formerly applied to the appropriations for "Military and
22 naval insurance", "National service life insurance", and
23 "Servicemen's indemnities".

1 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

2 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants
3 in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United
4 States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treat-
5 ment of veterans, $2,000,000.

6 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY
7 FACILITIES

8 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and
9 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extend-
10 ing any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans
11 Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections
12 5001 and 5002, title 38, United States Code, $30,159,000,
13 to remain available until expended.

14 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

15 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for
16 the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions",
17 "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and in-
18 demnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned
19 appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appro-
20 priations so augmented, and not to exceed $500,000 of the
21 appropriation "Veterans insurance and indemnities" for the
22 current year may be transferred to "Service-disabled veterans
23 insurance fund".

24 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration
25 for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be

1 available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
2 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).
3 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration
4 for the current fiscal year for "Inpatient care" and "Out-
5 patient care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other
6 expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized
7 by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for bene-
8 ficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under
9 such appropriations.
10 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Vet-
11 erans Administration (except the appropriation for "Con-
12 struction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be
13 available for the purchase of any site for or toward the
14 construction of any new hospital or home.
15 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-
16 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons ex-
17 cept beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such
18 benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made
19 to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the
20 Administrator of Veterans Affairs.
21 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS
22 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expend-
23 able for travel expenses of employees and no specific limita-
24 tion has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel
25 expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in

1 the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Pro-*
2 *vided,* That this section shall not apply to travel performed
3 by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards
4 of the Selective Service System.

5 SEC. 103. Where appropriations in this title are expend-
6 able for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and no
7 specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures
8 therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed the
9 amount of $50: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not
10 apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic
11 periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of
12 the authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are
13 herein provided, nor to the purchase of newspapers and
14 periodicals necessary for the care and welfare of patients and
15 members in Veterans Administration hospitals and domi-
16 ciliary facilities.

17 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation contained in this
18 title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling
19 a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held
20 by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of
21 the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period
22 of active military or naval service and has within ninety
23 days after his release from such service or from hospitaliza-
24 tion continuing after discharge for a period of not more than
25 one year made application for restoration to his former posi-

1 tion and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission
2 as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position
3 and has not been restored thereto.

4 SEC. 105. No part of any appropriation made avail-
5 able by the provisions of this title shall be used for the
6 purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establish-
7 ing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided,*
8 That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have
9 been approved by the Congress and appropriations made
10 therefor.

11 SEC. 106. No part of any appropriation contained
12 in this title shall be used to pay the compensation of
13 any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the
14 number that would be provided by a ratio of one such em-
15 ployee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-
16 time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency
17 concerned: *Provided,* That for purposes of this section em-
18 ployees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if
19 they spend half time or more in personnel administration
20 consisting of direction and administration of the personnel
21 program; employment, placement, and separation; job
22 evaluation and classification; employee relations and serv-
23 ices; wage administration; and processing, recording, and
24 reporting.

1 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

2 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
3 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the
4 limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each
5 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
6 make such contracts and commitments without regard to
7 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the
8 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may
9 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the
10 Budget for the fiscal year 1960 for each such corporation
11 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

12 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

13 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXAMINATION
14 EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

15 Not to exceed a total of $1,800,000 shall be avail-
16 able for administrative expenses of the Federal Home
17 Loan Bank Board, and shall be derived from funds avail-
18 able to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including
19 those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving
20 fund and receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Adminis-
21 tration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home
22 Loan Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal
23 years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment
24 for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks,
25 the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan

1 Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Govern-
2 ment (including payment for office space) : *Provided,* That
3 all necessary expenses in connection with the conservator-
4 ship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan
5 Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of pro-
6 ceedings under section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan
7 Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act and
8 all necessary expenses (including services performed on a
9 contract or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
10 ices) in connection with the handling, including the pur-
11 chase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal
12 home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of,
13 or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the
14 Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-
15 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof:
16 *Provided further,* That members and alternates of the Federal
17 Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reim-
18 bursement from the Board as approved by the Board for
19 transportation expenses incurred in attendnace at meetings of
20 or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid
21 not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided*
22 *further,* That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this
23 Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore speci-
24 fied, the administrative expenses and other obligations of

1 the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance
2 with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of
3 July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421–1449):
4 *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses for
5 the examination of Federal and State chartered institutions
6 (other than special examinations determined by the Board
7 to be necessary) shall not exceed $7,700,000.

8 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
9 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

10 Not to exceed $775,000 shall be available for admin-
11 istrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and
12 shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly
13 capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liqui-
14 dation of insured institutions or preparation for or con-
15 duct of proceedings under section 407 of the National
16 Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived
17 from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action
18 for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of
19 losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and ex-
20 penses, and payments for administrative expenses of the
21 Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board
22 to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Cor-
23 poration may utilize and may make payment for services and

1 facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Re-
2 serve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and
3 other agencies of the Government: *Provided,* That, notwith-
4 standing any other provisions of this Act, except for the limi-
5 tation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative
6 expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be
7 incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the
8 Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724–1730).

9 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

10 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,
11 ABACA FIBER PROGRAM

12 Not to exceed $47,000 of funds available to the General
13 Services Administration for the abaca fiber program shall
14 be available for administrative expenses incident to the abaca
15 fiber program, to be computed on an accrual basis, and to
16 be exclusive of the interest paid, depreciation, capitalized
17 expenditures, expenses in connection with the acquisition,
18 protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposi-
19 tion of real or personal property relating to the abaca fiber
20 program, and expenses of services performed on a contract
21 or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal
22 services.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
2 FACILITIES CORPORATION

3 Not to exceed $20,000 shall be available during the
4 fiscal year 1960 for all administrative expenses of the Cor-
5 poration (including use of the services and facilities of Fed-
6 eral Reserve banks), to be computed on an accrual basis,
7 and to be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, capitalized
8 expenditures, expenses in connection with the acquisition,
9 protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or dispo-
10 sition of real or personal property belonging to the Corpora-
11 tion or in which it has an interest, expenses of services per-
12 formed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the
13 performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses
14 reimbursable from other Government agencies.

15 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECON-
16 STRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION
17 FUND

18 Not to exceed $40,000 (to be computed on an accrual
19 basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of
20 Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General
21 Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1
22 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the
23 current fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the
24 liquidation of said functions: *Provided,* That as used herein

1 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to
2 include all salaries and wages, services performed on a con-
3 tract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including
4 the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative
5 offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of services
6 performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the
7 termination of contracts or in the performance of legal serv-
8 ices: *Provided further,* That the distribution of administra-
9 tive expenses to the accounts shall be made in accordance
10 with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

11 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

12 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
13 THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

14 Not to exceed $1,723,000 shall be available for all
15 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis,
16 of carrying out the functions of the Administrator under
17 the program of housing loans to educational institutions (title
18 IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C.
19 1749–1749d), but this amount shall be exclusive of payment
20 for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or
21 any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any
22 insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the
23 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23,
24 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been desig-

1 nated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of
2 public money of the United States.

3 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
4 THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

5 Not to exceed $500,000 of funds in the revolving fund
6 established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments
7 of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative
8 expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment
9 for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or
10 any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any
11 insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the
12 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23,
13 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been desig-
14 nated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of
15 public money of the United States.

16 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
17 THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDAT-
18 ING PROGRAMS)

19 During the current fiscal year not to exceed $653,000
20 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount
21 shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of de-
22 faulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government
23 and legal services on a contract or fee basis and of payment
24 for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any

1 member thereof, any servicer approved by the Federal Na-
2 tional Mortgage Association, the Federal home-loan banks,
3 and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act of
4 August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Federal Deposit
5 Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which has been
6 designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository
7 of public money of the United States.

8 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
9 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

10 Not to exceed $6,050,000 shall be available for
11 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
12 basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses
13 (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on
14 a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and
15 servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized ex-
16 penditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (includ-
17 ing services performed on a force account, contract, or fee
18 basis, but not including other personal services) in connec-
19 tion with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance,
20 improvement, or disposition of real or personal property
21 belonging to said Association or in which it has an interest,
22 cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons
23 employed outside of the continental United States, expenses
24 of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection

1 with the performance of legal services, and all administrative
2 expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and
3 said Association may utilize and may make payment for
4 services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other
5 agencies of the Government: *Provided,* That the distribu-
6 tion of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Asso-
7 ciation shall be made in accordance with generally recognized
8 accounting principles and practices.

9 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINIS-
10 TRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRA-
11 TION

12 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-
13 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed $8,100,000 of the
14 various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall
15 be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act,
16 as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allow-
17 ances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1,
18 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided,* That, ex-
19 cept as herein otherwise provided, all expenses and obliga-
20 tions of said Administration shall be incurred, allowed, and
21 paid in accordance with the provisions of said Act: *Provided*
22 *further,* That funds shall be available for contract actuarial
23 services (not to exceed $1,500); and purchase of periodicals

1 and newspapers (not to exceed $750): *Provided further,*
2 That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of
3 Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not
4 exceed $48,000,000.

5 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
6 TIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

7 Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such ex-
8 penses by title I of this Act shall be available for the
9 administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administra-
10 tion in carrying out the provisions of the United States
11 Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401–1433);
12 purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by
13 the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131);
14 and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle
15 for replacement only: *Provided,* That necessary expenses of
16 providing representatives of the Administration at the sites
17 of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction
18 of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies
19 with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by
20 such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the
21 aggregate in relation to the development costs of such proj-
22 ects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and
23 expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall

1 be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received
2 from such payments may be used only for the payment of
3 necessary expenses of providing representatives of the
4 Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Pro-*
5 *vided further,* That all expenses of the Public Housing
6 Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in car-
7 rying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed
8 $1,500,000.

9 CORPORATIONS—GENERAL PROVISION

10 SEC. 202. No part of the funds of, or available for ex-
11 penditure by, any corporation or agency included in this title
12 shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee en-
13 gaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would
14 be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred
15 and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and in-
16 termittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided,*
17 That for purposes of this section employees shall be consid-
18 ered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or
19 more in personnel administration consisting of direction and
20 administration of the personnel program; employment, place-

1 ment, and separation; job evaluation and classification;
2 employee relations and services; committees of expert exam-
3 iners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage adminis-
4 tration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

5 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in
7 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
8 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used
9 for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support
10 or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

11 This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices
12 Appropriation Act, 1960".

INDEX

	Page
Civil Aeronautics Board:	
Salaries and expenses	4
Payments to air carriers	4
Civil and Defense Mobilization, Office of:	
Salaries and expenses	2
Federal contributions	3
Emergency supplies and equipment	3
Research and development	3
Civil Service Commission:	
Salaries and expenses	5
Investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations	6
Annuities under special acts	7
Employees' Life Insurance Fund, administrative expenses	7
Federal Aviation Agency:	
Expenses	8
Establishment of air navigation facilities	8
Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization)	9
Research and development	9
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport	10
Federal Communications Commission	10
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	34
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	36
Federal Power Commission	11
Federal Trade Commission	11
General Accounting Office	12
General Services Administration:	
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	12
Repair and improvement, federally owned buildings	13
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	13
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	14
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	14
Expenses, supply distribution	15
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	15
Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service	15
Strategic and critical materials	15
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	17
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents	17

General Services Administration—Continued — Page
Abaca fiber program, administrative expenses — 37
Administrative expenses, Federal Facilities Corporation — 38
Administrative expenses, RFC Liquidation Fund — 38
Administrative operations fund — 17
General provisions — 18
Housing and Home Finance Agency:
Office of the Administrator:
Salaries and expenses — 20
Urban planning grants — 21
Capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal — 21
Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund) — 21
Administrative expenses:
College housing loans, Office of the Administrator — 39
Public facility loans, Office of the Administrator — 40
Revolving fund (liquidating programs), Office of the Administrator — 40
Federal National Mortgage Association — 41
Federal Housing Administration — 42
Public Housing Administration:
Annual contributions — 22
Administrative expenses — 22, 43
Interstate Commerce Commission — 22
National Capital Housing Authority — 23
National Science Foundation — 23
Renegotiation Board — 24
Securities and Exchange Commission — 24
Selective Service System — 24
Veterans Administration:
General operating expenses — 25
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses — 26
Inpatient care — 26
Outpatient care — 28
Maintenance and operation of supply depots — 28
Compensation and pensions — 28
Readjustment benefits — 29
Veterans insurance and indemnities — 29
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines — 30
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities — 30
Administrative provisions — 30
General provisions — 31, 44, 45

Union Calendar No. 128

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7040

[Report No. 350]

A BILL

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

By Mr. THOMAS

MAY 8, 1959

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

H. R. 7040

A BILL

May 11, 1959

HOUSE

17. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 7040, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1960. The Appropriations Committee had reported this bill during recess on May 8 (H. Rept. 350). pp. 7084-5, 7090-7127, ~~7138~~.
As passed, the bill provides that no Civil Service Commission funds will be available for the Career Executive Board established in 1958. It includes funds for the following agencies: Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Civil Aeronautics Board, Civil Service Commission, Federal Avaiation Agency, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, General Accounting Office, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Science Foundation, Selective Service System, and Veterans Administration.

18. FEED GRAINS. Rep. Smith, Iowa, stated that many of the same Representatives who are complaining about low egg prices have been advocates of low feed grain prices and argued that "feed grain prices at 90 to 100% of parity would, in fact, be a long-term stabilizer for the price of eggs." p. 7084

19. MILK. Rep. Johnson, Wis., expressed his satisfaction with the "interest" shown by many in his bill to standardize milk laws and listed three additional sponsors of his bill. p. 7085

20. LOANS; FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Both Houses received from the President a message on the Agreement for the establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank together with a Special Report on the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems recommending U. S. particpation as a member of such Bank (H. Doc. 133). pp. 6975, 7085-6

21. FORESTRY. Rep. Sikes commended the Secretary's report, "Program for the National Forests," as a "complete appraisal of what needs to be done in the next 10 to 15 years and up to the year 2000" in the national forests, and complimented Assistant Secretary Peterson for his part in the preparation of the program. p. 7133

22. HEALTH RESERACH. Rep. Roberts discussed his bill, H. J. Res. 361, to establish a National Institute for International Health and Medical Reserach. pp. 7127-8

23. INFLATION; FARM PROGRAM. Rep. O'Hara inserted a letter by Sen. Douglas warning against administered price inflation, urging a balanced budget, and suggesting upper limits of $2,000 on farm support payments to any one producer and a shifting of government participation in the farm program by guaranteeing income and not holding up prices. pp. 7133-6

24. PERSONNEL. Subcommittee No. 1 of the D. C. Committee ordered reported to the full committee with amendment H. R. 4283, relating to exemption of certain members of executive branch of Government from paying income tax in the District. p. D338

25. ALASKA. The Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment to the full committee H. R. 6091, to amend certain laws of the U. S. in light of admission of the State of Alaska into the Union. p. D339

26. HOUSING. Received from the Comptroller General a report on their review of the Home Mortgage Section, Mortgage Insurance Division, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency. (H. Doc. 130). p. 7137

27. FEED GRAINS. H. R. 5432, relating to feed grain price supports, as reported with amendments by the Agriculture Committee on May 6 (see Digest 72), provides that beginning with the 1959 crop, price support for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums shall bear the same ratio to the support price of corn as the feed value of the commodity bears to the feed value of corn, provided that the level of the support price for each commodity shall not exceed the percentage of parity at which price support is established for corn; and provides that the price support for the 1959 crop of soybeans shall be at a level not less than that provided for the 1958 crop.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

28. MILK. Sen. McCarthy inserted his statement dealing with the subject of legislation relating to sanitary regulations in connection with milk. pp. A3881-2
Extension of remarks of Rep. Reuss urging a uniform national standard for milk sanitation. pp. A3951-2

29. CONSERVATION. Sen. Randolph inserted an address stressing the importance of and urging increased programs for "conservation education." pp. A3882-3

30. EXTENSION SERVICE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Boykin inserting an Auburn University Extension Service letter paying tribute to P. O. Davis, who recently retired as the director of the extension service at Auburn. pp. A3886-8

31. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Moss inserted an address by Sen. Humphrey favoring foreign aid programs. pp. A3893-4
Rep. Fulton inserted Asst. Secretary of State Robertson's testimony in support of the foreign aid program. pp. A3935-7

32. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Sen. Hruska stating that "the unfairness and inaccuracy of some of the city press ... in regard to the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture, totaling an amount approximating $7 billion, is very unfair," and inserting a letter to the editor of Life magazine on this subject. pp. A3896-8
Extension of remarks of Rep. Gross inserting an editorial criticizing the administration's farm program. p. A3954

33. WATER RESOURCES. Rep. Evins inserted Maj. Gen. Itschner's testimony describing the development and achievements of water resources programs in other lands. pp. A3919-21

34. SMALL BUSINESS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Weaver inserting an address by the exec. vice chairman of the Nat'l Resources Development Ass'n and stating that it calls attention to a "new threat to the construction industry -- the invasion of that industry by the Small Business Administration." pp. A3945-6

35. INDUSTRIAL USES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Brock protesting the proposed sale by GSA of the Omaha alcohol plant until such time as Congress has the opportunity to consider and enact legislation which would provide for the increased use of agricultural products for industrial uses, and inserting a Nebr. Legislature resolution on this subject. p. A3951

House of Representatives

MONDAY, MAY 11, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. J. Paul Brown, associate pastor, First Methodist Church, Houston, Tex., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the Supreme Architect of the Universe, we come to Thee at the beginning of this week to take a fresh look at Thy plans for Thy people and their betterment. Dedicate our motives as we hear our Master saying, "He that is greatest among you shall be your servant."

May the memories of the yearnings for places of influence and prominence burn upon our conscience that we may be humbled before our tasks. May we be diligent in the pursuit of our calling that we may prove ourselves to be workmen that needeth not be ashamed.

Bless this our legislative body. May they be empowered with divine wisdom. In the midst of their perplexities, give them a vision that will illumine this darkened world.

May Thy presence in our lives be a source of wisdom and truth, of order and sanctity.

Bless Thy people throughout this good earth, that by the diligence of their hands they may seek to spread wide freedom's banner.

In the name of the Master we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 7, 1959, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 27, 1959:

H.R. 2575. An act to authorize the appropriation of $500,000 to be spent for the purpose of the III Pan-American games to be held in Chicago, Ill.; and

H.R. 3648. An act to regulate the handling of student funds in Indian schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and for other purposes.

On May 5, 1959:

H.R. 2589. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel); and

H.J. Res. 301. Joint resolution providing for printing copies of "Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives."

THE LATE HONORABLE DONALD AUBREY QUARLES

(Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that we note the passing of an able and dedicated public servant, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Donald Aubrey Quarles.

Mr. Speaker, no Member of the Congress, no resident of the District of Columbia, no citizen of the Nation, can be unfamiliar with the tremendous responsibilities of the Department of Defense. And the Department of Defense is not a self-operating organization. Next after the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense occupies one of the most important offices in our Federal Government.

Mr. Quarles occupied the position of Deputy Secretary of Defense from April 9, 1957 until his death. Prior to that date he served as Secretary of the Air Force, and prior to that date, from September 1, 1953, he had served as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development.

Few American citizens have devoted themselves so completely, and so unselfishly, to the task of national security as did Donald A. Quarles.

An Arkansan by birth, a graduate of Yale University, and a veteran of World War I, having served as an enlisted man and as a captain in the Field Artillery, Mr. Quarles was a man of great accomplishments.

He was successful in every endeavor to to which he applied himself. An engineer at the Western Electric Co.; department head of the Bell Telephone Laboratories; director of the transmission development department and director of apparatus development of Bell Telephone Laboratories; vice president of Western Electric Co.; and president of Sandia Corp.

In addition to his important positions in the executive branch of the Government, he was also a member and later Chairman of the Committee on Electronics of the Joint Research and Development Board, Department of Defense; Chairman of the reorganized Air Navigation Development Board; and a member of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

He is claimed, rightfully so, by two States: the State of his birth, Arkansas, and the State of his residence, New Jersey.

He was active in local affairs. Mr. Quarles served as president of the Common Council of Englewood, N.J., from 1940 to 1946, and as mayor of Englewood from 1946 to 1948.

He received honorary degrees from the University of Arkansas, New York University, Grinnell College, Stevens Institute, and Yale University. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma XI, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the Yale Engineering Association and the Telephone Pioneers of America, as well as a fellow of the American Institute of Radio Engineers and the American Institute of Electrical Engineers. In fact, Mr. Quarles was president of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers from August 1952 to August of 1953.

Mr. Quarles was a devoted public servant. He was an engineer and a scientist. He was interested in obtaining the facts. I am told by those who worked directly with him that he was properly intolerant of superficial answers, but inspired those who worked for him to efforts beyond their normal capacity. He had a mind trained to preciseness, coupled with an inexhaustible memory. Whether one agreed or disagreed with this distinguished American citizen, one always realized that he was fully informed and that any decision he reached had been reached after careful consideration. Each person who had business with him was given his day in court. The example he set to the devotion of the task at hand and for never accepting or providing less than the best, made all of those who were associated with him aspire to his high standards.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation can ill afford the loss of men of Mr. Quarles' capacity and devotion to duty. I can only summarize my own impression of Mr. Quarles by quoting from a poem by John Quincy Adams, delivered in the 2d session of the 25th Congress on December 4, 1837:

Almighty Father! Look in mercy down!
Oh! grant me virtue, to perform my part—
The patriots fervor, and the statesman's art
In thought, word, deed, preserve me from thy frown.
Direct me to the paths of bright renown—
Guide my frail bark, by truth's unerring chart.
Inspire my soul; and purify my heart;
And with success, my steadfast purpose crown.
My country's weal—be that my polar star—
Justice—thou rock of ages' is thy law—
And when thy summons calls me to thy bar
Be this my plea, thy gracious smile to draw—
That all my ways to justice were inclin'd—
And all my aims—the blessing of mankind.

When death touched the sleeping Donald Quarles on the 8th of May, our Nation lost one of its most distinguished and able leaders. To his bereaved wife and to their children we proffer our heartfelt sympathy. Their loss is our loss. Husband, father, friend, and public servant, this distinguished gentleman will live on in our memories.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Rumanians are one of the largest of Balkan nationality groups who have had the misfortune to suffer under oppressive alien regimes during most of modern times. As a matter of fact they had to struggle hard and fight relentlessly in defense of their freedom throughout their long history. In the course of these life-and-death struggles they often suffered defeats, even though even in defeat they survived as a distinct national entity.

Late in the 15th century Rumania was overrun and conquered by the Ottoman Turks, and for centuries Rumanians lived under the rule of cruel Ottoman Sultans. For several centuries they endured the almost unbearable yoke of their alien rulers, but they succeeded in maintaining their traditional national beliefs and national ideals, freedom and independence. During the middle of the last century they had their chance to attain their goal, and after the conclusion of the Crimean War in 1856, they regained autonomy with the guarantee of the great powers of Europe. Years later, in 1880, the Sultan's suzerainty was relaxed and the kingdom of Rumania was created. On May 10 of 1881 King Carol was crowned as the King of United Rumania, and that is the date which is being celebrated as the founding of the Rumanian kingdom, or the Rumanian Independence Day. Today, even though some 17 million Rumanians live in their homeland under Communist totalitarian regime, they and their more fortunate kinsmen in the free world celebrate the 78th anniversary of that memorable day, the founding of the Rumanian kingdom, the real Independence Day of the Rumanians.

I join all Americans of Rumanian descent and hope that their unfortunate kinsmen suffering under totalitarian dictatorship will one day attain their freedom and that Rumania will again assume its place among the free and independent nations of the world.

TO PRESERVE ELLIS ISLAND AS A NATIONAL SHRINE

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to establish Ellis Island as a national shrine to be administered by the Smithsonian Institution. Such a shrine would contain exhibits of early immigrant life and complete microfilm records of all immigrants. The Statue of Liberty ferry from the New York City Battery could be rerouted to include a stop at Ellis Island. Ellis Island was the port of entry for more than 10 million immigrants whose descendants today number at least one-tenth of our present population. To these millions of Americans Ellis Island is their Plymouth Rock. Establishment of Ellis Island as a national shrine will forever complement the Statue of Liberty. The Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island are synonymous. Both epitomize freedom and individual liberty to the world.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the independent offices appropriation bill that is coming up shortly contains cuts in three very important items for the Veterans' Administration. One is the in-patient care, the other is the out-patient care and the third has to do with the administrative offices. I have had protests already from the DAV, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and other veterans' organizations. I hope very much that these cuts may be restored.

THE LATE HONORABLE DONALD A. QUARLES

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Under Secretary of Defense Donald A. Quarles, our Nation has lost one of the finest men and most dedicated public servants that I have ever known. He had great strength of character and ability and was a tireless worker. A great soldier. A great American. He worked day in and day out and gave his life to his country. He was very helpful to so many. He never refused to help me in any matter for my district and for my State, and after he had done so, he would say, "What can I do next to help?" The success of the Lowell Technological School in my district is a living memorial of his assistance, as President Sydne of the institute said he made the institute when he sent the Air Force Reserves to be trained there and he helped with the great research development there. Secretary Quarles was a very remarkable man and one that the country can ill afford to lose. My sympathy goes to his wonderful wife and his children. Mrs. Quarles took up flying after she married the Under Secretary and was of great help to him. In every way they made a wonderful couple and one that Washington and the country will never forget. My deepest sympathy goes to all of his family and friends who mourn him.

EGG PRICES

(Mr. SMITH of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed with interest lately that the Representatives from many areas are complaining that eggs produced at a cost of about 38 cents per dozen are bringing only about one-half that amount on the market. This is a very serious matter to those who have worked so hard to make an abundance of eggs available.

The thing that I want to call to your attention, however, is that many of these same Representatives are great advocates of low grain prices and that they and others have promoted the idea of low feed grain prices. Low feed grain prices have resulted in many farmers increasing drastically the number of hens that they keep on the farm for egg production.

Low feed grain prices may have temporarily benefited some egg producers, but the long term result has been a loss for both the feed grain producers and the egg producers. Feed grain prices at 90 to 100 percent of parity would, in fact, be a long term stabilizer for the price of eggs.

I hope that some of those low feed grain price advocates will profit by this additional proof of the utterly fallacious approach they have had to feed grain problems. One will never benefit from his mistakes unless he recognizes them, and then tries to do something about them. I do hope that some of these low feed grain price advocates will now recognize the mistakes in their thinking and forever more avoid the idea that some segments of agriculture can profit at the expense of other segments of agriculture.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate during all of this week.

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

There was no objection.

HASTY LEGISLATIVE PROCESSES

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to object to the consideration this afternoon of the independent offices appropriation bill. I point out, Mr. Speaker, that it was impossible to obtain a numbered copy of this bill until this morning. In a short time we will be dealing with a bill providing for appropriations totaling $6½ billion; yet the Members will not have had an opportunity to read the bill or the report ac-

companying the bill before they are called upon to consider it.

I object to this method of trying to run a legislative railroad.

INCREASING SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL MILK SANITATION CODE

(Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased at the way interest is mounting in my national milk sanitation bill, which would let milk that meets the standards of the U.S. Public Health Service's Milk Code move freely in interstate trade. My colleagues, Congressmen QUENTIN BURDICK, of North Dakota, and MORGAN MOULDER, of Missouri, have recently joined the 18 other House sponsors of the proposed legislation. Many others have requested background information on this bill, which will eliminate the use of outdated sanitary standards as trade barriers against the free flow of high-quality milk from State to State.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING TO CONSIDER NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM BILLS

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House that the Subcommittee on the Library of the Committee on House Administration will hold hearings next Monday afternoon, May 18, at which time we will consider all bills which have been introduced proposing the selection of a national flower or floral emblem. Any bill introduced by that time dealing with the subject will be taken up.

All Members who are interested are invited to be present at the meeting which will be held in the hearing room of the Committee on Agriculture, room 1310, New House Office Building.

THE LATE HONORABLE DONALD QUARLES

(Mr. KEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to pay tribute to the late Under Secretary of Defense, who left us last Thursday. I followed his career very closely, not only here but around the world. It is my personal opinion that very few men who have served the military have ever made such a fine contribution to the solution of our international problems and our military strategy as did Donald Quarles. Not only was he a great soldier but also his vast wealth of knowledge in the field of science added much to the effectiveness of our Department of Defense. Long after he is gone the people will remember his splendid contribution.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 133)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read; and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I herewith submit to the Congress the Agreement for the establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank together with a Special Report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems recommending United States participation as a member of such Bank. Representatives of the United States took an active part in the inter-American meetings which formulated the agreement. I urge that the Congress enact legislation authorizing the President to accept membership in the Bank for the United States and to assume the subscription obligations prescribed in the agreement.

The establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank and our participation in it will be a most significant step in the history of our economic relations with our Latin American neighbors. It will fulfill a long-standing desire on the part of the Latin American Republics to have an inter-American institution specifically designed to promote the financing of accelerated economic development in Latin America. At the Buenos Aires Economic Conference in August and September of 1957, the United States supported a resolution calling for a study of possible solutions for the problems of financing economic development. In August of 1958 the United States indicated that it would be prepared to consider the establishment of a development institution for Latin America and in September of that year an informal meeting in Washington of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics recommended that a specialized committee of governmental representatives negotiate and draft an instrument for the organization of such a development institution. A specialized committee, thereafter established by a resolution of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, was convened at the Pan American Union in Washington on January 8, 1959, and devoted 3 months of continuous effort to the preparation of the agreement which I now lay before the Congress for its approval.

The proposed institution is well designed to serve the needs of the Latin American Republics on a sound financial basis. The bulk of its assets, $850 million, which are subscribed for the capital stock of the Bank, are to be used to make or facilitate loans on banking terms, repayable in the currency in which the loan has been made. Each member republic is called upon to make a significant subscription to the capital of the Bank. Of the $850 million in authorized capital stock, $400 million is for paid-in shares to be paid for in installments over a period of approximately 3 years. Half of each installment is payable in gold or dollars, and half in the national currency of the members. The U.S. subscription to the paid-in capital is $150 million. The Latin American subscriptions for such capital total $250 million.

The balance, $450 million of callable capital, will constitute a guarantee of borrowings by the Bank in capital markets and would only be actually expended if the Bank were unable to meet its commitments. It is planned that the Bank will rely heavily on raising funds from private sources for the financing of sound economic development projects in Latin America. The U.S. portion of the callable capital is $200 million.

It should be noted that the agreement expresses the intention of increasing the capitalization of the Bank by an additional $500 million after September 30, 1962, if the increase is approved by a three-fourths vote in the Board of Governors. The increase would be in the form of callable capital and the U.S. share would be approximately $200 million. This arrangement was included in recognition of a deep conviction on the part of the Latin American representatives that definite provision should be made in the agreement for an increase in the capital of the Bank at an early date. The U.S. representatives agreed that such an increase would be desirable but believed that it would be wise to have an initial period of experience with the Bank's operations before the additional capital was subscribed. Accordingly, if the Bank's operations are established on an effective basis in accordance with expectations, the United States will in good faith be committed to vote for the increase and subscribe to its share of the increased capital.

The agreement also establishes a Fund for Special Operations to be financed by specified contributions by all of the member countries, half in gold and dollars and half in the national currencies of the members. Its initial resources will be $150 million. The United States contribution of $100 million is payable in installments, the first of which will be $50 million. The Fund is established for the making of loans on terms and conditions appropriate for dealing with special circumstances arising in specific countries or with respect to specific projects, where normal terms of lending would not be appropriate. Loans by the Fund may be made repayable in whole or in part in the currency of the borrowing country. The agreement carefully segregates the resources of the Fund from the capital resources of the Bank so as not to jeopardize, in any way, the financial soundness of the institution and its ability to raise funds in the capital markets.

It is proposed that the funds necessary to meet the initial portion of the U.S. subscription to the Bank be provided by a no-year appropriation, to be expended at such time after its enactment as may be desirable taking into account the active role which the United States has

played in formulating the proposal for the Bank.

The charter authorizes the Bank to provide its members, and private entities in the territories of the members, with needed technical assistance. Particular attention is given to technical assistance in the fields of preparation, financing, and execution of development plans and projects, and the training of personnel specializing in the formulation and implementation of development plans and projects. These are two areas where there has long been a need for additional assistance and the facilities which will be provided by the Bank should be very helpful to member countries in utilizing their international borrowing capacity for the development projects most essential to their economies.

Throughout the agreement emphasis is given to the promotion of private investment in Latin America. It is recognized that only through the increased flow of private investment can the desired rate of progress be attained, and that public institutions such as the one now being created, must complement, rather than substitute for, private investment.

In the preparation of the agreement careful attention has been given to the experience of other institutions for international financing. The representatives of the Latin American countries, as well as those of the United States, have demonstrated an awareness of the necessity of making adequate provision for safeguarding the resources of the institution in order that its future existence as an important factor in the development of the hemisphere may be assured. In this respect the agreement follows, in many aspects, the charter of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. It is anticipated that the new Bank will work closely with existing sources of public credit, including the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Export-Import Bank, and the Development Loan Fund.

The special report of the National Advisory Council, submitted herewith, describes the agreement creating the Bank in greater detail.

I am strongly of the opinion that because of the following general policy considerations the United States should support the creation of this Bank for Latin America:

(1) The special relationship, historical, political and economic, between the United States and the Latin American Republics;

(2) The pressing economic and social problems in the area resulting from a rapid rate of increase in population and widespread desire for improved living conditions; and

(3) The desirability of an institution which will specialize in the needs of Latin America, which will be supported in large part by Latin American resources and which will give the Latin American members a major responsibility in determining priorities and authorizing loans.

I urge the Congress to enact promptly legislation enabling the United States to join with the other members of the Organization of American States in establishing the Inter-American Development Bank which will foster, in a sound and efficient manner, more rapid advance by the people of the nations south of our border as they strive to improve their material well-being.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 11, 1959.*

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1559. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the first significant discovery of silver in the United States, June 1859.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN].

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have permission to insert in the RECORD, after consideration of each bill that is taken up today, an explanation thereof.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

REGULATION OF THE PRACTICE OF DENTISTRY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 4072) to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto", approved June 6, 1892, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8 of the Act entitled "An Act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto", approved June 6, 1892 (27 Stat. 42), as amended (sec. 2-308, D.C. Code, 1951 edition) is amended by adding the following sentence at the end thereof: "The Board of Dental Examiners may, in its discretion, waive the theoretical examination and issue a license to any applicant who holds a certificate from the National Board of Dental Examiners: *Provided,* That such applicant shall pass a practical examination given by the Board of Dental Examiners: *Provided further,* That in exercising its discretion to waive theoretical examinations the Board of Dental Examiners shall satisfy itself that the examination given by the National Board of Dental Examiners was as comprehensive as that required in the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. The foregoing amendment of said Act of June 6, 1892, as amended, shall not be considered as affecting the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824), and the performance of any function vested by said plan in the Board of Commissioners or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners shall continue to be subject to delegation by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan. Any function vested by this amendatory act in any agency established pursuant to such plan shall be deemed to be vested in said Board of Commissioners and shall be subject to delegation in accordance with said plan.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Board of Dental Examiners in its discretion to waive the theoretical examination which is usually given if the candidate to practice dentistry in the District has had or now has a certificate from the National Board of Dental Examiners.

Under existing law the Board of Dental Examiners for the District of Columbia is required to give two examinations, a theoretical and a practical examination.

The National Board of Dental Examiners is composed of 9 members of the Council of the National Board of Dental Examiners together with 20 additional persons who come from all parts of the United States, and who act as consultants in the preparation of the National Board questions. This council was established by the American Dental Association in 1928 and has a standing committee.

It was felt that the questions that are prepared by the National Board give a much broader cross section or scope in the dental field than is possible by the Dental Board itself making up its own questions.

The bill does not waive the power or the rights of the District of Columbia Dental Board to give an examination—it merely authorizes them to accept a certificate that the candidate has passed the National Board examinations. If they are not satisfied with those questions which were asked in the National Board examination were comprehensive enough for practice in the District they can go ahead and give their own theoretical examination.

This bill was requested by the District Commissioners. We had hearings on it, and it was unanimously reported by the subcommittee and the full committee. It will cost no money, and as far as I know there is no opposition to the bill.

I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman is correct in his statement, and there is no opposition.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

" 'The bond which may be required by the Commissioners under the authority of this subparagraph shall be a corporate surety bond in an amount to be fixed by the Commissioners, but not to exceed $15,000, conditioned upon the observance by the licensee and any agent or employee of said licensee of all laws and regulations in force in the District of Columbia applicable to the licensee's conduct of the business, trade, profession, or calling licensed under the authority of this section, for the benefit of any person who may suffer damages resulting from the violation of any such law or regulation by or on the part of such licensee, his agent or employee.

" 'Any person aggrieved by the violation of any law or regulation applicable to a licensee's conduct of a business, trade, profession, or calling involving the collection of money for others shall have, in addition to his right of action against such licensee, a right to bring suit against the surety on the bond authorized by this subparagraph (c), either alone or jointly with the principal thereon, and to recover in an amount not exceeding the penalty of the bond any damages sustained by reason of any act, transaction, or conduct of the licensee and any agent or employee of said licensee which is in violation of law or regulation in force in the District of Columbia relating to the business, trade, profession, or calling licensed under this section; and the provisions of the second, third, fourth, and fifth subparagraphs of paragraph (b) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 820; sec.1–244(b), D.C. Code, 1951 edition), shall be applicable to such bond as if it were the bond authorized by the first subparagraph of such paragraph (b) of the first section of said Act approved December 20, 1944: *Provided,* That nothing in this subparagraph (c) shall be construed to impose upon the surety on any such bond a greater liability than the total amount thereof or the amount remaining unextinguished after any prior recovery or recoveries.

" 'This subparagraph (c) shall not be applicable to persons when engaged in the regular course of any of the following professions or businesses:

" '(1) Attorneys at law.

" '(2) Persons regularly employed on a regular wage or salary, in the capacity of creditmen or in a similar capacity, except as an independent contractor.

" '(3) Banks and financing and lending institutions.

" '(4) Common carriers.

" '(5) Title insurers and abstract companies while doing an escrow business.

" '(6) Licensed real estate brokers.

" '(7) Employees of any class or subclass of licensees required to give bond under this subparagraph.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 7 of 'An Act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and three, and for other purposes,' approved July 1, 1902, as amended, so as to provide for the bonding of persons licensed to engage in a business, trade, profession, or calling involving the collection of money for others."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose in the amendment to this legislation is to give the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in their discretion, the right to require that any class or subclass of licensees licensed under the authority of paragraph 46 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended—section 47–2345, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition—to engage in a business, trade, profession or calling involving an express or implied agreement to collect money for others, to give bond to safeguard against financial loss those persons with whom such class or subclass of licensees may so agree.

The bond which may be required by the Commissioners under the authority of this subparagraph shall be a corporate surety bond in an amount to be fixed by the Commissioners but not to exceed $15,000, conditioned upon the observance by the licensee and any agent or employee of said licensee of all laws and regulations in force in the District of Columbia applicable to the licensee's conduct of the business, trade, profession, or calling licensed under the authority of this section, for the benefit of any person who may suffer damages resulting from the violation of any such law or regulation by or on the part of such licensee, his agent, or employee.

It was pointed out to the committee that there were approximately 30 agencies operating in the District of Columbia with little or no restrictions under law. While the vast majority of these agencies probably operate ethically under good business standards and serve a useful and important function in the community, it is not unknown for an out-of-State agency to come into the area, solicit accounts for collection, collect money for our businessmen and then vanish from the area with the money. Without restrictions or licensing it is difficult to administer or prevent abusive behavior toward the public and the debtor. It is felt that by bonding such operators it will raise the standards under which they operate.

This legislation is not new in the United States. Statutes are already in effect in the following States: Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin, California, Connecticut, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, Tennessee, Utah, Wyoming, and Hawaii.

H.R. 2317, as amended, specifically exempts persons when engaged in the regular course of any of the following professions or businesses: Attorneys at law, persons regularly employed on a regular wage or salary, in the capacity of credit men or in a similar capacity, except as an independent contractor, banks and financing and lending institutions, common carriers, title insurers and abstract companies while doing an escrow business, licensed real estate brokers, employees of any class or subclass of licensees required to give bond under this subparagraph.

RELATING TO CERTAIN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CORPORATIONS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H.R. 4454) to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to eliminate the requirement that certain District of Columbia corporations be managed by not more than 15 trustees, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 608 of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 29–204), is amended by striking out "nor more than fifteen".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, business corporations incorporated under sections 605 through 641 of the act approved March 3, 1901—31st Statutes, page 1284; title 29, chapter 2, District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition—are required, by section 608 of such act to limit the number of their trustees to "not less than three nor more than fifteen." The purpose of this legislation is to strike the words "not more than fifteen" thus enabling such corporations to have more than 15 trustees.

EXEMPTING CERTAIN COMMON CARRIERS FROM MILEAGE TAX

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 2322) to amend the act of July 1, 1902, to exempt certain common carriers of passengers from the mileage tax imposed by that act and from certain other taxes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subparagraph (b) of paragraph (31), of section 7 of the Act approved July 1, 1902, as amended (D. C. Code 47–2331 (b)), is amended as follows:

(1) The third sentence of such subparagraph (b) is amended by inserting after "each such applicant" the following: "who is not otherwise exempt under this subparagraph from payment of the mileage tax imposed by this subparagraph,".

(2) The fifth sentence of such subparagraph (b) is amended to read as follows: "Upon receipt by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent of the approved copy of the application of any applicant who is exempt under this subparagraph from payment of the mileage tax imposed by this subparagraph, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent shall issue a license authorizing the applicant to carry on the operations embodied in the approved application. No increase of operations shall be commenced or continued unless and until an application similar to the original and covering such increase in operations shall have been approved and forwarded in the same manner as the original and, if a payment is necessary, the corresponding additional payment is made, and license issued. No applicant engaged in the transportation of passengers for hire principally within the commercial zone of Washington, District of Columbia, as such commercial zone has been established on the date of enactment of this amendment by the Interstate Commerce Commission for the purposes of section 203 (b) (8) of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 303(b)(8)), shall be required to pay any tax under this section and no such applicant shall be subject to—

"(1) the gross sales tax levied under the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act;

"(2) compensating use tax levied under the District of Columbia Use Tax Act;

"(3 the excise tax upon the issuance of titles to motor vehicles and trailers levied under subsection (j) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925 (D. C. Code 40–603 (j) (4));

"(4) the tax that is imposed on tangible personal property, to the same extent that the District of Columbia Transit System, Incorporated, is exempt from such taxes on the effective date of this amendment, under section 8(b)(5) of the Act entitled 'An Act to grant a franchise to the District of Columbia Transit System, Incorporated, and for other purposes', approved July 24, 1956."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall take effect as of October 1, 1959.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under existing law any person, partnership, association, trust, or corporation operating or proposing to operate any vehicle or vehicles not confined to rails or tracks for the transportation of passengers for hire over all or any portion of any defined route or routes in the District of Columbia shall, on or before the 1st day of October in each year, or before commencing such operation, submit to the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, in triplicate, an application for license, stating therein the total number of vehicle-miles to be operated with such vehicles within the District of Columbia during the 12-month period beginning with the 1st day of November in the same year. The Public Utilities Commission shall thereupon verify and approve each such statement. Upon receipt of the approved copy, and prior to the 1st day of November in the same year, or before commencing such operation, each such applicant shall pay to the Collector of Taxes, in lieu of any other personal or license tax, in connection such operation, the sum of 1 cent for each vehicle-mile proposed to be operated in the District of Columbia in accordance with the application as approved. Upon presentation of the receipt for such payment, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent shall issue a license authorizing the applicant to carry on the operations embodied in the approved application.

The purpose of this bill is to exempt from the operation of the mileage tax effective October 1, 1959, applicants engaged in the transportation of passengers for hire principally within the commercial zone of Washington, D.C.

This bill would also exempt common carriers coming within its provisions from the gross sales tax levied under the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act, the compensating use tax levied under the District of Columbia Use Tax Act, the excise tax upon the issuance of titles to motor vehicles and trailers levied upon subsection (j) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925, and the tax imposed on tangible personal property, to the same extent that the D.C. Transit System, Inc., is, on October 1, 1959, the effective date of H.R. 2322 exempt from such taxes under section 8(b)(5) of the act entitled "An act to grant a franchise to the D.C. Transit System, Inc., and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1956.

It is believed that the following-named transportation companies, that is, those companies operating principally within the commercial zone of Washington, D.C., will be exempt from all of the foregoing taxes by the enactment of this legislation: Alexandria, Barcroft & Washington Transit Co.; American Bus Lines, Inc.; Atwood Transport Lines, Inc.; Federal Coach Line; the Gray Line, Inc.; Suburban Transit Co.; Washington, Marlboro, Annapolis Transit Co.; Washington, Virginia & Maryland Coach Co., Inc.

The estimated loss of revenue to the District of Columbia will amount to approximately $24,200 annually.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 41]

Alford	Buckley	Doyle
Alger	Byrne, Pa.	Flynn
Anderson	Cahill	Fogarty
Ashley	Carnahan	Fountain
Bailey	Celler	Frelinghuysen
Barden	Chenoweth	Gallagher
Barrett	Collier	Giaimo
Barry	Cooley	Hays
Bass, N.H.	Corbett	Healey
Betts	Daniels	Hébert
Bolling	Devine	Hess
Bowles	Diggs	Hosmer
Brademas	Dingell	Hull
Breeding	Dorn, N.Y.	Jackson
Johansen	O'Konski	Rostenkowski
Kilburn	Philbin	Shelley
Kitchen	Pirnie	Slack
Kluczynski	Poage	Steed
Laird	Powell	Taylor
Lesinski	Quie	Teller
McCulloch	Quigley	Thompson, N.J.
Macdonald	Reece, Tenn.	Toll
Mailliard	Rivers, S.C.	Withrow
Merrow	Robison	Zelenko
Moeller	Rodino	
Montoya	Rogers,	
Nix	Roosevelt	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 346 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. THOMAS. 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. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

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. 7040, with Mr. IKARD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully say to my colleagues that we will cooperate with you in trying to finish consideration of this bill today. I know a lot of you have some things you want to do. This will be a hard week, and we will do our best to get you out of here no later than 5:30 or 6:00 this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I hope you will agree with us. We think we have a reasonably good bill. We on both sides of the aisle have worked long and hard on the bill, and there is no serious disagreement inside the committee in reference to it.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], over on the other side of the aisle, know as much about this bill as I do, and, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], on this side, know exactly as much about it. None of us

are going to talk too long, and we will do our best to cooperate with the membership and give you as fair and frank answers as we are capable of doing. And, we prayerfully ask your indulgence and your help.

May I yield 10 minutes now to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations brings its recommendations for fiscal year 1960 in this bill. The committee labored long and hard. If you have not as yet examined the hearings, I suggest that you do so, for on 2,500 pages you will find that the committee analyzed tables, went through charts, conducted a very detailed cross-examination of the 18 agencies which appeared before our Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, it is a delightful custom each year for those of us who serve on this subcommittee to pay tribute to our chairman. I haved served in this House for 10 years now during which time it was my good fortune to be affiliated with the committee headed by the genial gentleman from Texas. I know of no one in this House who is better qualified, who is more able, who is more familiar with the subject matter of the legislation over which he has charge than the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. The manner in which he conducts the hearings before our subcommittee was recently described in one of the evening newspapers as a combination of a charm school and a snakepit. I think if you will read the hearings, you will find that there is much truth in that description. He can be charming—he can be tough as the occasion demands—but one thing is clear: he is thorough and requires the agencies to justify their budget in every respect.

Suffice it to say that I think the budget before our subcommittee received a thorough going over, a complete review. I only hope that in our deliberations and our recommendations for the amounts to be allowed for the various governmental agencies which are a part of this bill we were as correct in coming to the right conclusions as we were in the hearings. If we erred at all, we erred on the side of economy, for the weight of the budget is heavy.

This bill calls for a very substantial amound of money. The budget estimates for the year 1960 totaled $6,584,188,000. There is recommended in this bill $6,438,839,800, which is a reduction of approximately $250 million below the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget. That is quite a cut when you stop and consider the fact that this was supposed to be a very tight budget this year that the President submitted to the Congress. If I had my way entirely, I might have recommended more money for some of the agencies, such as in the medical budget for inpatient and outpatient care in the VA appropriation. The Federal Aviation Agency might have used more money for navigation facilities and for training its personnel to operate them. This is the first year for this agency. It was organized pursuant to an act of Congress last year to make the airways of our Nation much safer. It is now seeking to make sure that our airlines are the finest commercial airlines in the world. It has a tremendous job of training personnel and purchasing and installing a modernized, thoroughgoing, complete set of air navigation equipment. We want it to accomplish its mission as promptly as possible, and I hope there is sufficient money in this bill for their purposes. When it is remembered that they have not yet been able to fill 3,400 authorized jobs, it would seem that the additional 500 positions approved by my bill would be adequate.

We have under our jurisdiction the matter of appropriations for the regulatory agencies, too. To my mind these are some of the most important operations of the Federal Government; the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, agencies that have been established pursuant to acts of Congress in an effort to make sure that the businesses which come under their regulatory supervision should not carry on excesses in business operations which the basic legislation sought to guard against. Many have a critical task to perform.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to interrupt the gentleman when he was speaking on the Federal Aviation Agency. There are a number of emergency landing fields throughout the country. I want to know if anything has been done to reduce that number, or if any specific consideration has been given to them.

Mr. YATES. No effort has been made to reduce that number. We join you in seeking to make sure that all safety facilities are maintained.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I was in a plane that was forced to land on one of these fields, a plane with 2 motors knocked out, a scheduled airline plane with 56 people in it. That was some 2 months ago. I now have a fine realization of the necessity for these emergency landing fields that I did not have prior to that time. Some information has been given out that in the interest of economy, you were going to reduce the number of those fields or to discontinue their operation. I do not know that the committee has done that, but I think the number should be increased. I should like to say that I am willing to trade places with anyone here, who has had the experience that I had recently, because I assure you that he would have a much deeper sense of the value of these emergency landing fields throughout the country. I should like to yield to the chairman, if he would like to comment on this matter.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the chairman of the committee, who is on his feet.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for permitting me to say this: he is not 100-percent correct, he is 1,000-percent correct in his desire for this service. And his desire is the desire of the committee. Suffice to say that since 1953 or 1954 we have doubled our efforts in this field of safety; we have not diminished them, but more than doubled them. So the situation is in pretty good shape now.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I know the committee has, and I compliment the chairman on it. I just wanted to bespeak consideration of these little emergency fields throughout the country. I did not used to think they amounted to much, but I do now.

Mr. THOMAS. But when you need them, it is good to have them.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I agree with him entirely. We are attempting through this budget appropriation to make air travel much safer than it has been in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment, too, on the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration. I think we could have provided additional funds both for inpatient care and outpatient care in this budget. I think we may have hurt the Veterans' Administration a little in a $9 million cut that we made for inpatient care. We went into the matter thoroughly. We allowed $9 million additional for inpatient care over what the agency had last year. We thought that would be sufficient, and I would not like to see any curtailment in services afforded patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals or any cut in the excellent medical case that they have received over the years.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the Veterans' Administration tells us that the reduction in inpatient care was $9,279,000.

The present budget provides an increase over 1959 of $6,478,000. May I state to the gentleman that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs would like to have that money put back in there because we think it is needed desperately.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman there is some question about the appropriation for inpatient care. There should be no reduction in the quality of medical care offered in the VA hospitals.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. And also about the outpatient care.

Mr. YATES. There was an increase in outpatient care of $667,000. There was a reduction of $866,000, which was directed against increased fees.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That pertains to service-disabled veterans. The Veterans' Administration tells us it would definitely hurt them.

Mr. YATES. The question is whether medical fees to the doctors who are taking care of the patients should be increased. The impression we gained was that this question had not yet been deter-

mined, and we thought that this reduction could safely be made.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is not what the Veterans' Administration tells me. It says this reduction will result in a backlog of physical examinations for compensation and pension purposes, which we think is wrong.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman that the determination of the qualifications for pensions and benefits is a necessary and vital part of the Veterans' Administration program, but we also believed the amount being paid for fees was adequate and should not be increased. The fee schedule presently in existence seems to be perfectly fair. Why should it be increased again? The fees were raised only a short time ago. If the gentleman has other statistics to go on other than were presented to our committee, we would be very happy to receive them.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The Veterans' Administration is very reluctant to get into an argument with the committee.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows that the committee appropriated the same amount for veterans' research as of last year, which was $4 million above the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. In this respect, certainly the gentleman will agree that the committee did act wisely.

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

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this Independent Offices Appropriation bill represents a large number of agencies, and I might add, important agencies. The committee has labored long and hard under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. The members of this subcommittee under his leadership have done a rather thorough job, and by and large I believe we present to the House a very good bill. I do not agree with all that is in the report. I also concede that there are some very severe cuts in this bill.

May I point out that one of the agencies coming within the jurisdiction of the Independent Offices Subcommittee is that of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. That appropriation is not included in this appropriation bill because of the lack of the necessary authorization for the appropriation of funds.

In the overall picture with regard to this bill may I point out that last year the Independent Offices bill amounted to $6,845 million. The budget requests for these 18 agencies, for the fiscal year 1960 amounted to approximately $6,584 million. In this bill funds are provided in the amount of $6.438 million, which is a total reduction of $252 million. The actual cuts in this bill amount to $145 million, coupled with $107 million in the form of a rescission from prior funds or unobligated funds of the stockpile program.

Of the total overall picture of $6,438 million, I think it is important to note that the Veterans' Administration alone receives $5,020 million.

In other words, five-sixths of this total bill involves veterans' affairs, veterans' benefits and Veterans' Administration. I should like, because of one or two points that already have been made in connection with this appropriation bill, to say a word about the Veterans' Administration and these veterans' programs. There are two increases in these veterans' appropriations. One is for an amount of $4,300,000 over the budget request for research, medical research in veterans' hospitals. I might add that it is the largest hospital system in the world. The other item is an increase of $10 million over the budget request. Nevertheless, the total Veterans' Administration budget is $5,020 million and this bill reduces the total sum approximately $9,200,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the administration of veterans' affairs, particularly to the Administrator, Mr. Sumner G. Whittier. I believe our Veterans' Administration is doing an outstanding job of service to our veterans. They are operating with efficiency. In that connection I might point out that the cost of administration in this budget is less than 3 percent of the total cost of benefits or the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration. Favorable hospital costs are in order today. There are 25,000 employees in the Veterans' Administration plus 121,000 in the hospitals. It might be interesting to note that there are nearly 23 million veterans in America today, and when you add their families to that number, it constitutes more than 40 percent of the population of the United States.

The largest item in the Veterans' Administration appropriation, of course, is that of compensation and pensions. It amounts to $3,300 million. As every Member of the House knows, that is a statutory obligation on the part of the Congress and the Federal Government of the United States to provide whatever necessary funds are required to meet the costs of compensation and pensions. There are today 2,400,000 veterans receiving compensation for service-connected disability and 1,400,000 veterans receiving disability pensions. In other words, the total number of veterans receiving either compensation or pensions of one form or another is 3,800,000.

Another important and large item is that of the cost of hospital care. That is known as inpatient care recently discussed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], and about which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], expressed his concern and interest. The total appropriation for inpatient care is about $777,500,000, and I want to agree with the gentleman from Illinois in his statement that the cut in the appropriation for in-patient care is too severe. I feel that it might work some hardship, and I believe we should provide all the funds necessary to meet this responsibility.

There are 123,800 beds available today. This is in addition to the 4,000 phantom beds referred to in the report. I think it is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that there are some 4,000 beds chargeable to the Veterans' Administration for which they have no use and for which no purpose is served.

The average patient load for fiscal 1960 is estimated at 112,000 sick and disabled veterans which is an increase of 356 beds over the average of 1959.

Outpatient care was also discussed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. That amount is $83 million. This is necessary for the care or treatment and the servicing of veterans outside of hospitals. In that connection I might point out that there are over 2 million veterans receiving outpatient care today.

An important item in this Veterans' Administration budget is that of hospital construction and domiciliary facilities. In that connection there is $30 million in this bill for fiscal 1960. We must bear in mind that there are some 172 hospitals and 17 domiciliary institutions operating today.

The committee, as I mentioned earlier, has approved an additional $10 million over the budget for the hospital construction program, but for fear there may be some misunderstanding I think it ought to be pointed out that this additional $10 million is for improvements and repair of existing facilities, and not for new starts and not for new hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that the gentleman feels that the cut in in-patient care is too great.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes, that is what I said.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman accept the restoration of that cut?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I feel some adjustment might be made if it is determined that it is not sufficient, because that is an important part of service to our veterans, and we want to provide adequate funds for in-patient care in our veterans hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know there is great need there. The patients need expensive medicines which they do not get as often as they should. Then, it is very expensive to operate hospitals, particularly the mental hospitals where they have locked wards, locked elevators, where they do not have enough nurses, butlers, and attendants to care for the patients properly.

They are not doing what they ought to do. Many of the cases that they thought were cured came back to the hospitals.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that the $10 million will go for maintenance and not for new construction?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Let me respond by saying I did not intend to imply that it would go for maintenance. As I understand the program presented to us of the moneys made available by the committee in this bill, an additional $10 million will go for improvements and repairs of existing facilities.

Mr. Chairman, referring to agencies, unfortunately time will not permit going into a discussion of funds and services of all these agencies involved in this independent offices, appropriation bill, however, I do think one additional important agency might well be mentioned. I refer to the General Services Administration. The budget request for the General Services Administration was $255 million. In this bill we provide $271 million. The committee made one important and significant increase in the bill allocated to the General Services Administration. The addition of $25 million is intended to provide for sites and planning in connection with public buildings. There is no money in here for new construction, there is no money in here for the acquisition of property; but the committee felt in its wisdom that too much money is being spent for the rental of space, very expensive space, in Washington and elsewhere, and that in the interest of economy in the Government itself, it might well be better to eventually construct these additional buildings.

As a first and important step, $25 million is made available for the acquisition of sites and for the planning program.

The committee also eliminated $500,000 for the leasing of additional space for the Library of Congress. The reason the committee took this step was due to the fact that a committee of the Congress is currently studying and reviewing the whole question of space in connection with the Library. The sum of $60 million is provided in here for the repair and improvement of buildings generally.

It might interest you to know that the GSA today rents some 37,000,000 square feet at a cost of $63 million a year. That is an increase of 500,000 square feet of office space at $2,500,000 over that for the fiscal year 1959.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that the construction of additional office buildings is going to take care of the space proposition insofar as leasing in the District of Columbia is concerned?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Of course, the Government is involved in some long-term leases, very expensive leases, but basically they are requiring additional space year after year; and rather than look forward to leasing additional office space at very high prices, it was felt that the Government would save money by moving in the direction of the construction of these public buildings.

Mr. GROSS. We have the example now of the State Department leasing nearly 100,000 square feet of space in one of the plush apartment buildings just across the river, over in Virginia. I am informed that even though the new State Department building is being constructed at a cost of $55 million or $60 million, there will be no space available for the Foreign Service Training Institute. The way to cure this huge spending for buildings in Washington is to stop expanding the various Government agencies. That is the only effective way.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge approval of the 1960 appropriation bill for the independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, and agencies. And, I want to emphasize that this is a good bill. It has been said to be a big bill, but that does not mean it is not a good bill, because it certainly has been thoroughly considered for a period of over 4 months, with very extensive and intensive hearings on all phases of the budget requests of the independent offices. I should like also to say a word of tribute to our chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. He is one of the most genial and certainly one of the most able men in the House; yes, in the entire Congress. I want to say that when an agency passes the Thomas Test, it has passed a very thorough test and its budget is generally justified.

A glance at the printed hearings which totaled some 2,600 pages in 2 volumes will suffice to indicate the great task which faced the subcommittee. This bill and the report thereon are testimonials to the excellent way in which the gentleman from Texas organized and carried out the hearings. It has been a real pleasure to be associated with Representative ALBERT THOMAS as well as with the distinguished gentleman from New York, Representative HAROLD OSTERTAG, the ranking minority member, and all the other members of the subcommittee, my colleagues Representatives SIDNEY R. YATES, EDWARD BOLAND, CHARLES JONAS, and JOHN J. RHODES.

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

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question. It is very apparent and noticeable today that the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and the former chairman of that committee, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], are rather disturbed in reference to the reductions in the appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, especially the inpatient, and outpatient, and hospital programs, and whatnot. I would like to ask the gentleman to be kind enough to confine some of his remarks to an explanation of the reduction in those amounts in this independent offices appropriation bill to see whether or not the veterans are going to receive those services to which they are properly entitled.

Mr. EVINS. I certainly expect to do that, and I want to say to my friend that I served for a time as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. As a member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations I never have opposed any program for the benefit of the veterans of our Nation. I want to point out that we have the greatest veterans benefit program of any nation in the world, with more than $5 billion carried in the budget for the veterans program for next year. It has been for a time under $4 billion, but now the veterans program is more than $5 billion. There have been some reduction in administrative costs and administrative expenses. And, we commend the administrator, Mr. Sumner Whittier, for the improvement of the administrative processes and credit is due him for making those improvements and thus reducing administrative costs. The major reduction in this program has to do with readjustment benefits. Most of the veterans have come home from World War II and the Korean conflict, and the readjustment programs have been tapering off. Compensation and pensions have been increasing, and more than half of the amount in this bill is carried for pensions and the compensation programs of the veterans. I, for one, am opposed to reducing desirable and worthwhile program for the benefit of the veterans of our Nation. It is very difficult to determine the number of inpatients that will be taken into our veterans hospitals. It fluctuates and varies from time to time. Last year the administrator, Dr. Middleton, wanted some increased funds for this purpose, and the committee provided the VA with these increases with the understanding that next year they would have a reexamination and take a look at the question of number of beds for the veterans of the Nation. Now, we find that the number of tuberculosis patients is decreasing, and there will be a surplus of beds in that department. So, possibly an adjustment can be made. And, I want to say that if a supplemental request is offered by the Administrator for needs in this area, I, for one, will want to support it. This bill will have to go through the Senate, and perhaps further studies can be made, and if a supplemental fund request for in-patient care is made, I pledge myself to support whatever funds are recommended as needed for this program.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask if the money for research, for prosthetic appliances for the amputees and the paraplegics, and the blind is included in this bill.

Mr. EVINS. Yes, I will say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, who is the former chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a devoted friend of the veterans of our country, that in most of the items for the Veterans' Administration increases were made. An increase in medical administration of $622,700 over last year has been provided; an increase in outpatient care, $668,000; an increase of $9 million for inpatient care over last year; an increase for operation of supply depots for the VA, $16,300. As has already been pointed out, there is a substantial increase for pensions and compensation of $47.5 million, making a total of $3,000,300,000 for compensation and pensions. There is an increase in the veterans' insurance program of $1,900,000. There is an increase in the hospital construction and domiciliary program of $10,864,000. So, all in all, there are substantial increases in various of our veterans programs. The committee did provide some reductions in administrative expenses.

The medical program of the VA has improved in recent years but we cannot expect to really meet the need until we complete the program of new hospitals. The funds in this bill make it possible for the VA to continue its medical-care program at a level which, if it is not fully up to what we would all desire, at any rate makes it possible to use the present medical facilities as effectively as possible.

As pointed out above, we cannot expect adequate and complete medical care for all our veterans until we complete our program of constructing new hospitals. The Appropriations Committee has for several years urged the Veterans' Administration to accelerate its hospital modernization and replacement program. As we know, in the past few years we have appropriated funds for the construction of several new hospitals. Some of these new hospitals will soon be completed but others are still several years from completion. In order to further accelerate this program of hospital construction and modernization, the Appropriations Committee recommends an increase of $10 million in the program for for this purpose. This makes a total of $30 million for hospital construction in the coming year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask if the special program which was initiated years ago and has been appropriated for every year, in the amount of $1 million, is in this bill?

Mr. EVINS. There is a total of $1 million in the bill, I will say to the gentlelady. We consider it a most important service that the Veterans' Administration is rendering.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So much has been done for civilians as a result of that, as well as for the veterans.

Can the gentleman tell me with reference to repairs of hospitals, where those renovations will be made?

Mr. EVINS. There is no more worthy program than the program for the amputees, those who have lost an arm or a leg, and the program of research in that field, in the field of prosthetic appliances. The committee is very much interested in seeing that the fine work that is being done moves ahead, I will say to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell me what hospitals are to be renovated?

Mr. EVINS. I will say to the gentlelady that for a long time the committee has felt that with the tremendous investment, of more than $2 billion, I believe, in all of our veterans' hospitals, that the failure to make timely repairs and renovations would be false economy. The committee has urged the Administrator to make such repairs wherever in his discretion those repairs are necessary. It is largely a matter of what the Administrator thinks should have first priority.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is just a blanket authority, not specifically related to specific hospitals?

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

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentlewoman that there is a table in the hearings showing where those renovations will be made.

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

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the Chairman of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. In answer to the gentlewoman's question, they earmark $6 million for day-to-day repairs, when the budget only asked for $5.1 million. Let me repeat, they earmark $6 million.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my friend from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I do not think the record ought to be allowed to rest as it now is. An impression may be gained from what has been said so far that the committee reduced the appropriation for inpatient care compared with last year. That is not true. The bill contains an increase of $9 million of funds for inpatient care above the amount that was available for that purpose in the current year. There is another $9 million cut in the budget request, but the committee did not reduce the funds below what was available the previous year. The committee bill increases those funds by $9 million.

Mr. EVINS. I thank my friend for his contribution.

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

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

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I might say to the gentleman that one thing that has given the Committee on Veterans' Affairs considerable concern is the fact that according to the testimony before our Subcommittee on Hospitals, there is a backlog of approximately $15 million of deferred maintenance. I think we are being penny wise and pound foolish when we have an investment of $2.8 billion, if we do not furnish sufficient moneys to make the necessary repairs.

I might say to the gentleman that the Veterans' Administration has broken down these needed repairs over a 3-year program. It seems to me, going over these amounts that they have requested for repairs that are needful to protect our investment that we should give that request favorable consideration. I hope some amendment will be offered to increase the amount for necessary repairs.

Mr. EVINS. The Administrator is going forward with an extensive modernization and repair program.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentle lady.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. All of the administrators of hospitals tell me—and this is particularly true of mental-patient hospitals—that these new buildings are very much more expensive to operate. So you have an added cost of maintenance there for those hospitals.

Mr. EVINS. I thank the gentle lady for her fine contributions.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my friend the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I should like to read to the House exactly what the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs told me about inpatient care.

Mr. EVINS. This is one of our largest appropriation bills involving a total of almost $6½ billion. It is a carefully considered bill. Your committee has held hearings for almost 4 months on these appropriations. It has considered the needs of these agencies in the light of their own needs and has balanced those needs against the total budgetary situation facing us. This bill as it comes to you reflects the committee's determination that the important agencies whose budgets we are considering, should be able to discharge their duties and obligations effectively and efficiently; but it also expresses the realization of the members of the committee that all the agencies of our Government should operate without extravagance or frills.

This bill carries appropriations for some 18 boards, bureaus, commissions and independent agencies. These include the Civil Service Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Veterans' Administration, the General Services Administration, and the National Science Foundation among others.

I might recall to the members of the committee that most of these agencies are arms of the Congress—established orginally more or less as deputies of the Congress to carry out in detail certain functions granted to the Congress by the Constitution. Although in recent years

some of these agencies have lost some of their independence, and the Congress has lost some of the previous control it exercised over them, nevertheless we should bear in mind that in appropriating funds for these independent agencies we are dealing not with agencies of the executive branch but basically with agencies established by the Congress to carry out its own functions.

This bill recommends $6,438 million in funds for these agencies. This is a reduction of a quarter of a billion dollars over the estimates submitted to the committee by the President's budget, and $400 million less than we appropriated for the same agencies last year.

The reductions involve almost every item in this bill and almost every agency concerned. I might point out that this bill comes to you with the unanimous approval of the subcommittee as well as the unanimous approval of the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, in general, the Appropriations Committee has made considerable reductions in the administrative or overhead costs of these agencies. It has also considered the appropriations for the programs of these agencies carefully and particularly in regard to the ability of the agencies to carry out the proposed programs. We have all noted in the past that very often the various agencies of the Government—not merely those we are concerned with here—come to us with ambitious programs which, as a matter of fact, they could not carry out in the period covered by a given budget. In the past, this has resulted in building up a large carryover of funds. It seems to the Appropriations Committee to make good sense to appropriate in the first place funds that can reasonably be expended and to avoid as far as possible overappropriations that result in building up carryovers. The committee believes sincerely that with the appropriations in this bill all of these agencies can carry out their functions and their programs effectively.

It would be impossible, of course, to cover all of the agencies involved in this budget. I should like to concentrate my remarks on three of them, the General Services Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and the National Science Foundation.

It will be noted that the committee recommends a net increase of $16 million above the Budget recommendations in appropriations for the General Services Administration. Despite this increase, however, the appropriations for the GSA for the coming year are $215 million less than for the present fiscal year. Most of this reduction is in the funds for the construction of new public buildings. Last year, it will be recalled, the Congress appropriated $152 million for construction of public buildings. This reflected the need for stimulating our economy in view of the recession which faced us a year ago. In this bill there are no funds for additional public buildings construction.

The budget as presented to the committee did not include funds for the acquisition of sites for needed public buildings. Your Appropriations Committee, however, recommends $25 million for this purpose. It is the feeling of the committee that the GSA should be able to continue in an orderly fashion the planning of new public buildings and the acquisition of suitable sites for them.

In part, this represents the committee's observations that the costs of renting space are increasing each year. As a result, the annual rental bill for the Government is increasing at a disturbing rate. We all know that it is more expensive to rent space, and it seems foolish to keep increasing the cost of the Government in this way. Therefore, the Appropriations Committee is convinced, first, that the GSA should exercise vigorous efforts to reduce its annual rental bill; and secondly, that the orderly program of construction new public buildings should continue without interruption.

THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

No agency of our Government is more important to the future of our Nation than the National Science Foundation. We all know that today science is fighting in the frontline for the security of our Nation. Never in history has the safety of our Nation and indeed of the world been so dependent on the ability, caliber, and quality of our scientist. This is a field in which our Nation cannot afford to be second best.

As we all know we are devoting a very considerable part of our national budget for scientific research and development in various fields and through many agencies, including the Defense Department and the National Space Agency. But, the work of the National Science Foundation is directed at the very foundation of the problem—the encouragement of basic research and the education and production of first-class scientist in the future. In other words, these other agencies are working largely to apply the scientific knowledge we already have today. The National Science Foundation addresses itself to the problem of producing new scientific knowledge and new scientist for the future.

The budget of the National Science Foundation is, therefore, divided into two parts. On the one hand, the program of encouraging basic scientific research today and on the other hand the program for encouraging the education of scientist. Both of these are tremendously important and I am sure the Congress desires to give the National Science Foundation the means to perform these two important functions effectively.

The recommendations in this bill for the NSF represent a net increase of about $7 million over the funds appropriated for this year. The Appropriations Committee has made no significant change in the funds for the program of supporting scientific manpower—that is the program of encouraging the education of scientists and scientific education. This program, under this bill, would be carried out on about the same level as during the present year. I know there are those who would like to accelerate and increase this program and I might say that I would like to be counted among them. However, it became apparent during the hearings that there is a limit as to the amount of work the Foundation can do in this area. Last year it will be recalled we made a large increase in funds for this purpose and the Foundation has employed these funds well. But, it takes time to get such a program going and it is believed that the funds we are recommending for this purpose represent just about all that the Foundation could effectively employ in the coming year.

I might remind the committee that last year we authorized a very ambitious program of loans to college students. To a certain extent those loan funds supplement the fellowship program of the National Science Foundation. It is believed that as the loan program goes into high gear in this coming year there will be a smaller demand in some areas in the National Science Foundation. At any rate, the recommendation of the committee for this portion of the Foundation's work are substantially the same as the request of the National Science Foundation.

The committee recommends about $16 million less in funds for the total basic scientific research than was requested in the submitted budget. The budget requested $71 million for basic research. This compares with $49 million appropriated last year. The committee recommends $60 million for the coming year, an increase of approximately 25 percent. It is felt that this increase is about all that the Foundation can efficiently employ in the coming year.

In regard to the funds for this basic research program, I pointed out above that we have many programs for encouraging scientific research in the Defense Department and the National Space Agency particularly. Those programs have also been tremendously accelerated in the past year. Many of the universities which are working on National Science programs are also working on research and development contracts for the Defense Department. There was a real question in the minds of the subcommittee as to whether these universities could absorb any great additional increase in scientific work and it is felt that the increase we have allowed in the bill is one that can reasonably be absorbed.

In looking over the budget for the National Science Foundation is apparent that the $143 million we recommend for the coming year—though not a very large increase over last years total budget for this agency—represents an increase of more than 50 percent over the budget of 2 years ago which is a very large increase in the program of this agency in so short a space of time.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me repeat that this a good—a carefully considered bill—it is a bill that tries to find a balance between the two great questions that occupy our thinking in this significant year.

On one hand, we have the need to maintain an orderly progress in the development of our Nation and its material and human resources. On the other hand, we have the problem of

keeping the expenditures of our Government within the ability of our economy to support them. In this bill the Appropriations Committee has tried to find a path between these two much to be desired objectives—to reconcile them in the public interest.

I believe that, the bill has achieved a good balance and I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the measure as recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

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

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

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

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

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration disposes of a great deal of the taxpayers' money—nearly $6½ billion of it. This is more money than was required to run the entire Federal Government when I began to work for a living. Yet the bill covers the financing of only 18 of the independent offices of the Government and does not even include any of the activities that are under the supervision of a Cabinet officer, nor does it include any funds for the new Space Agency. Funds to finance the Space Agency will be provided in a second bill later in the session.

We heard all of the witnesses that indicated a desire to testify. The total number of witnesses that appeared before the committee runs into the hundreds—317 to be exact. Their cross-examination and testimony will be found in these two large printed volumes, containing more than 2,500 pages. The hearings began on January 23 and were not concluded until April 23, 1959.

This bill, therefore, which we present to you today is the result of extensive hearings and careful and earnest consideration.

I would not contend that this is a perfect bill. The members of this committee are human and therefore are prone to err. We do not represent ourselves as knowing everything that should be known about all of these agencies or having any crystal ball through which we can look to determine to the penny what these sensitive and essential agencies of Government will require to finance their activities during the next fiscal year. But if we have made any mistakes in this bill they are mistakes of judgment.

I would not maintain either that there are not areas of controversy in the bill. I doubt if you could find seven Members of the House who would agree with every single item in this bill. Certainly there were differences within the committee itself, but I have been a Member of this body long enough to know that on appropriation bills you have to make compromises.

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

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I think it might be well to point out that the point I made was that the subcommittee unanimously approved this bill and the full Committee on Appropriations unanimously approved it also.

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Irrespective of some differences that might exist within the committee, which would be natural in a bill of this size, the bill which the committee presents today represents the composite view of a seven-man subcommittee, and it was approved by the full committee last Friday without dissent.

Nor do I subscribe to all of the language in the report. There are several comments that I would not have included if I had been writing it, but seven men cannot write a report. The language used is that of the author, and it was ably prepared. I just do not subscribe to every paragraph of the language, particularly in the sections dealing with civil service and civil defense.

During the sitting of the House before it resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole this morning, I obtained permission to include in my remarks certain tables and certain parts of the record which we compiled during the hearings. I do that because there are some very significant facts that I think should be brought to the attention of the Members of the House, and also to those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but who may not have access to the printed hearings.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The bill provides $7,062,000 for FPC for 1960, a slight increase over 1959 but a reduction of $363,000 in the budget estimate. The funds provided will permit the filling of 75 vacant positions and thus assure continued operations at or above the current level.

It has become a habit in recent years to draw comparisons between the United States and the Soviet Union. A cartoon on the editorial page of Sunday's Washington Post shows a fat and complacent Uncle Sam drifting down the river in a canoe apparently oblivious to a fast overtaking shell being propelled through the water by a vigorous and aggressive group of Soviet crewmen.

In an effort to develop some facts concerning relative United States and Soviet power development, the committee closely questioned commission witnesses and some interesting and revealing information was secured. This appears on pages 349 to 356 of part I of the hearing. But for the benefit of those who may not have access to the printed hearings, I wish at this point to include the statement and tables prepared and furnished the committee by the Commission showing a comparison of United States and Russian power development. This comparison, I am pleased to report, shows that U.S. superiority in installed electric generating capacity is increasing and not diminishing:

COMPARISON OF UNITED STATES AND RUSSIAN POWER DEVELOPMENT

Table 1 shows the total installed capacity of electric generating plants in the United States at the end of 1957 together with electric energy production during the year. The data are broken down by Federal Power Commission regions. Forecasts up to the year 1975 are also shown. Table 2 shows a breakdown of the installed capacity in the United States for each year back to 1945.

Available information indicates that the total installed generating capacity in Russia at the end of 1957 amounted to 45,970,000 kilowatts, including 35,500,000 kilowatts of thermal capacity and 10,470,000 kilowatts of hydro capacity. Generation in 1957 amounted to about 210 billion kilowatt-hours, of which 173.5 billion kilowatt-hours were generated in thermal plants and 36.5 billion in hydroplants.

With a population of around 201 million, the capacity per capita in Russia amounted to 0.229 kilowatts and the annual energy production per capita amounted to 1,045 kilowatt-hours. These figures may be compared with the following for the United States, with a 1957 population of 171 million; capacity per capita, 0.846 kilowatts; annual energy production per capita, 4,184 kilowatt-hours.

The total estimated potential hydroelectric power in Russia has been reported as 340 million kilowatts of capacity with annual production of some 2,978 billion kilowatt-hours, which is 3 to 5 times the estimated hydro potential of the United States. On the basis of these figures, it appears that about 2½ percent of the total Russian potential has been developed as compared with 23 percent development in the United States.

The following tabulation compares the total installed electric generating capacity in the United States and Russia at 5-year intervals. Details by years are shown in table 3. It will be noted that the U.S. superiority has become 2½ times as great as in 1940, having increased from 39,962,000 kilowatts in 1940 to 100,251,000 kilowatts in 1957.

[Kilowatts]

	United States	U.S.S.R.	U.S. superiority
1940	50,962,000	11,000,000	39,962,000
1945	62,868,000	10,700,000	52,168,000
1950	82,850,000	22,400,000	60,450,000
1957	146,221,000	45,970,000	100,251,000

The following tabulation shows the average annual growth of installed electric generating capacity in the United States and Russia from 1940 to 1957. In the last 7 years the United States has been adding capacity at an average rate nearly three times that of Russia.

Average annual growth in kilowatts

	United States		U.S.S.R.	
	Growth in period	Per year	Growth in period	Per year
1940–45	11,906,000	2,380,000		
1945–50	19,982,000	3,996,000	11,700,000	2,340,000
1950–57	63,371,000	9,053,000	23,570,000	3,367,000

During the above period the maximum yearly installation for the United States was 11,531,000 kilowatts in the year 1954 although almost precisely the same amount, 11,529,00 kilowatts, was added in 1955. Russia's maximum year was 1956 during which 5,564,000 kilowatts were installed. For the year 1958, preliminary data are available for the United States and they show that generating capacity added in this year reached an alltime high of 14 million kilowatts.

The accompanying chart shows a comparison of total generating capacities in the

United States and Russia for the years 1940–56 with projections to 1975. It shows graphically how the United States has been outdistancing Russia in the installation of electric generating capacity. As shown on the lower curve, if Russia is to catch up with the United States by 1975 it must install new capacity at the unprecedented rate of 16,200,000 kilowatts annually, or at a rate more than four times their actual rate (3,399,000 kilowatts) during the 6-year period 1950–56, and nearly three times their maximum annual rate of installation (5,564,000 kilowatts) during that period.

TABLE 1.—*Electric generating capacity and production of electric energy of the United States by regions with projection to 1975 (utility and industrial)*

FPC region	Installed capacity at end of year (millions of kilowatts)					Production (billions of kilowatt-hours)					Production kilowatt-hours per capita 1957
	1957	1960	1965	1970	1975	1957	1960	1965	1970	1975	
I	30.3	35.8	43.9	53.2	63.6	137.3	157.9	193.9	234.8	281.1	3,198
II	28.6	34.7	44.4	54.5	65.1	145.8	178.0	223.3	270.7	320.4	5,038
III	26.3	31.8	41.6	51.7	63.4	137.8	159.9	198.5	243.2	295.1	5,040
IV	17.2	21.6	28.1	35.0	42.5	80.1	102.5	134.1	167.0	202.7	3,463
V	16.6	22.3	30.0	37.4	45.7	85.3	104.2	134.2	164.5	195.2	4,019
VI	3.5	4.0	5.4	6.8	8.0	12.7	16.8	22.4	27.8	32.8	2,490
VII	10.5	14.7	18.6	23.3	28.4	57.2	76.3	97.1	120.7	146.7	8,667
VIII	13.2	15.1	21.0	27.1	34.3	60.2	72.3	97.0	125.2	157.1	3,960
Total	146.2	180.0	233.0	289.0	351.0	716.4	867.9	1,100.5	1,353.9	1,631.1	4,184

TABLE 2.—*Hydroelectric generating capacity in the United States*

Year	Utilities			Industrial MW	Total MW	Annual increase MW
	Federal MW [1]	Nonfederal MW	Total MW			
1945	4,621	10,291	14,912	980	15,892	
1946	4,488	10,360	14,848	980	15,827	−65
1947	4,596	10,375	14,971	985	15,956	+129
1948	5,095	10,557	15,652	983	16,635	+679
1949	5,784	10,870	16,654	1,008	17,662	+1,027
1950	6,448	11,227	17,675	999	18,674	+1,012
1951	7,401	11,467	18,868	1,002	19,870	+1,196
1952	8,257	12,162	20,419	996	21,415	+1,545
1953	9,311	12,734	22,045	1,009	23,054	+1,639
1954	10,191	13,020	23,211	1,027	24,238	+1,184
1955	11,300	13,704	25,004	738	25,742	+1,504
1956	12,135	13,519	25,654	732	26,386	+644
1957	13,018	13,933	26,951	725	27,676	+1,290
1958 [2]	13,697	15,666	29,363	735	30,098	+2,422

[1] MW equals 1,000 kilowatts.
[2] Preliminary date for 1958.

Mr. Chairman, in the debate last week on the TVA bond financing bill, there was some discussion of rates charged the Atomic Energy Commission by TVA as compared with rates charged AEC by private utilities. This situation was referred to in the hearings and the Commission was requested to and did file with the committee a table showing a comparison of these rates. The table appears on page 364 of part I of the hearings and I include it as a part of my remarks at this point:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Purchased power costs

Projects and supplier	1957			1958 (January through November)		
	1,000 kilowatt-hours	Amount	Mills per kilowatt-hour	1,000 kilowatt-hours	Amount	Mills per kilowatt-hour
Oak Ridge: TVA	17,843,659	$70,792,070	3.967	15,582,407	$60,814,201	3.903
Paducah:						
TVA	12,099,815	47,037,403	3.887	10,024,304	37,069,669	3.698
EEI	6,765,908	26,115,831	3.859	5,888,467	22,797,391	3.872
Portsmouth: OVEC	17,060,922	66,583,416	3.902	15,592,088	62,483,649	4.007

NOTE.—EEI—Electric Energy, Inc.; OVEC—Ohio Valley Electric Corp.

I think it is worthy of note that during the period of 1935 to 1958, when inflationary forces have been pushing the cost of living up and up, the cost of electricity has remained stable and, in some instances has gone down. To show the trend the Commission filed with the committee a table which appears on page 368 of part I of the hearings and which I reproduce at this point:

TRENDS IN ELECTRIC RATES

During 1957 as a result of rate revisions slight increases were shown in the weighted average of electric bills for representative residential, commercial, and industrial uses. General trends in the level of bills for these services since 1935, based on data for cities of 50,000 population and more, are shown by the following table:

Average bills for electric service

Year	Residential (250 kilowatt-hours)	Commercial		Industrial (1,000 kilowatts, 200,000 kilowatt-hours)
		Light (6 kilowatts, 750 kilowatt-hours)	Power (30 kilowatts, 6,000 kilowatt-hours)	
1935	$8.90	$37.09	$182.23	$3,081
1940	7.05	31.76	170.96	2,828
1945	6.89	29.96	166.21	2,863
1950	6.81	27.64	160.75	3,024
1951	6.76	27.35	158.06	3,011
1952	6.79	27.48	159.40	3,042
1953	6.93	27.00	158.03	3,154
1954	6.96	27.06	158.16	3,162
1955	7.03	27.20	159.16	3,168
1956	7.07	27.38	160.05	3,204
1957	7.11	27.44	160.71	3,235
1958	7.18	27.70	162.88	3,279

Although the average trend was slightly upward in 1957–58, a number of utilities decreased rates for certain types of service and amounts of consumption, with residential customers principally affected.

An important factor in the upward trend of electric rates in recent years has been the necessary fuel costs. However, the industry has been able to restrict increases in service charges despite higher costs of operation. In 1958, for example, the residential bill was approximately 6 percent above the low established in 1951, while commercial light and power bills for 1958 remained lower than those for any year prior to 1950. But in the industrial category, where fuel costs exerted a predominant influence, 1958 charges exceeded those of any previous year listed in the table, with the 1958 industrial bill about 16 percent higher than the 1950 low but only about 6 percent above the 1935 level.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The bill provides $143,273,000 for NSF. This is an increase of $9,273,000 over 1959 but is $17,027,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee is impressed by the importance of science in the modern world but it does not believe that we should issue a blank check to the Foundation even though its work is of supreme importance. We felt that an increase of nearly $10 million over the funds provided last year should provide a substantial increase in NSF activities. The growth of NSF since it was created is shown by the following figures:

1951	$225,000
1952	3,500,000
1953	4,700,000
1954	8,000,000
1955	12,250,000
1956	16,000,000
1957	40,000,000
1958	40,000,000
1959	130,000,000
1960	143,000,000

The following table sets forth the major programs of NSF and how they will be financed by the funds provided in the bill:

	1959 appropriation	1960 budget	Recommended in bill
Support of science:			
Basic research	$48,999,000	$71,900,000	$60,450,000
Facilities	13,995,000	12,600,000	9,300,000
Surveys and reports	290,000	355,000	290,000
Dissemination of scientific information	3,620,000	5,100,000	3,620,000
Program development and evaluation	1,780,000	2,365,000	1,780,000
Allocations to other Government agencies	1,091,145		
Total, support of science	69,775,145	92,320,000	75,440,000
Support of scientific manpower:			
Fellowships	12,400,000	12,700,000	12,700,000
Institutes	33,050,000	33,050,000	33,050,000
Clearinghouse of scientific information	860,000	1,000,000	860,000
Projects in science education	11,593,000	11,600,000	11,593,000
Course content program	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Program development and evaluation	2,270,000	2,249,000	2,249,000
Total	66,173,000	66,599,000	66,452,000
Executive direction	1,381,000	1,381,000	1,381,000
Total	[1] 137,329,145	160,300,000	143,273,000

[1]Includes $2,000,000 by transfer from the Atomic Energy Commission and $1,329,145 of prior year funds.

While I am on the subject of the support of science let me say that we read occasional comments indicating that the Federal Government is being too parsimonious in the support of medical research. We therefore asked the National Science Foundation to bring together in one table a record showing the amount of funds the Federal Government in all of its agencies is spending in this important field, and I think the Committee may be interested in knowing that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1958 spent $167 million in that field; the Department of Defense spent $3 million; the Atomic Energy Commission spent $15 million, and the Veterans' Administration spent $10 million, or a total of $196 million for medical research.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I notice here an item of about $2 million for a program of collecting scientific information; in other words, a reduction. The Budget recommended $5,100,000 and the committee appropriated $3,620,000.

Let me say this is an extremely important field of operation. I know of no place where we could get as great a return in the way of scientific information for as small an expenditure as in the assembling and developing which is done by other scientists and other nations throughout the world, and that undoubtedly is the purpose of that program. I am sure the gentleman realizes the importance of that program.

Mr. JONAS. May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana that the Committee does recognize the importance of that program. We went into that rather thoroughly, as the record will show.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I merely wanted to call attention to the vital importance of that program where we can obtain the information which we ourselves do not have to develop but just merely assemble.

Mr. JONAS. We have a big program in that field, and the committee allowed a substantial amount of money for it.

CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

The committee report is very critical of the Budget Bureau for failing to include $773,734,000 in the budget for the civil service retirement fund. The committee could have added this sum, as it increased budget requests in several instances, but it obviously was unwilling to assume the responsibility of increasing the budget by three-fourths of a billion dollars. I do not concur in the severe criticism directed at the Bureau of the Budget in the report because there is an honest difference of opinion as to whether this money is actually needed.

The report fails to point out, as I believe it should have, that the budget for 1960 includes $720 million as agency contributions to the civil service retirement and disability fund. This substantial sum appears in the budgets of the several agencies and, if Congress appropriates the money, will be added to the retirement fund. Government employees will pay in an equal amount so that the contributions plus interest will augment the fund next year by $1.676 billion. The anticipated payouts from the fund will amount to $943 million, so that there will be a net improvement in the fund by the difference between receipts of $1.6 billion and disbursements of $943 million or approximately $700 million.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The committee recommends $7,062,000, which is an increase of $284,000 over last year but $230,000 under the budget estimate. The funds provided will allow the employment of 32 additional people and will bring authorized positions for 1960 to 770.

In 1936, when gross national product was $83 billion, the Commission had a staff of 571. Today, with gross national product $435 billion, the staff has increased to 738. But in the meantime Congress has added some heavy responsibilities to the Commission, in the following ways:

First. In 1936 Congress amended the Clayton Act by enacting the Robinson-Patman Act. Enforcement of this act accounts for the largest number of FTC complaints in the antimonopoly field. There were 64 such actions in 1958.

Second. In 1938 the FTC Act was amended by the Wheeler-Lea Act which increased the Commission's responsibilities in the advertising of foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices. In 1951, it was again amended to prohibit representing oleomargarine as a dairy product.

Third. Enactment of four major pieces of consumer legislation: In 1939 the Wool Products Labeling Act; in 1951 the Fur Products Labeling Act; in 1953 the Flammable Fabrics Act; and in 1958 the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act.

Fourth. In 1958 Congress also amended the Packers and Stockyards Act and transferred jurisdiction over companies engaged in meatpacking from the Department of Agriculture to the FTC.

As the Nation's advertising bill has gone above the $10 billion a year mark, and as the jurisdiction of the FTC has been expanded by the enactment of new legislation, the workload of the Commission has increased by leaps and bounds. This increase is illustrated by the following figures: Deceptive practice complaints have increased from 125 in 1955, to 160 in 1956, to 187 in 1957, to 270 in 1958. Antimonopoly complaints have increased from 36 in 1955 to 86 in 1958. Applications for complaints have likewise increased sharply. In 1957 these applications came in at the rate of 283 a month but in 1958 the number moved up to 291 a month and during the first 6 months of the current fiscal year the number had gone up still higher to 324 and is still climbing as the months pass.

There is also a steady increase in the compliance work of the Commission. This activity is under the direction of the General Counsel and it is his responsibility to enforce compliance with the orders of the Commission. It may be of interest to note that during the last 4 years or since 1955, 43 penalty suits were certified to the Attorney General compared with 21 such cases in the preceding 7 years or from 1947 to 1955.

My own mail indicates that there is some feeling that the government agency charged with responsibility in the field of monopoly, price and promotional discrimination, restraints of trade, and deceptive practices, has not been as active in recent years as it should have been. In case other Members have occasion to respond to inquiries on this point, I invite their attention to pages 119–124 in part I of the hearings for a rather complete and revealing record of FTC activity in these fields during the past year. In brief, the record shows that the Commission issued 7 new merger complaints during the year, bringing the number of pending cases to 19; it proceeded against seven suppliers of chain food stores and against a variety of other manufacturers to force discontinuance of the practice of granting illegal or discriminatory promotional allowances; it filed complaints against six drug manufacturers charging a conspiracy to fix prices and to monopolize their sale and promotion and issued orders against a number of other manufacturing organizations prohibiting price fixing and other illegal or discriminatory practices; and it stepped up its activity in the deceptive practice field 54 percent over fiscal 1957 and 73 percent over fiscal 1956.

The Commission is currently engaged in certain economic studies as directed by the Congress. One of these is a study of food distribution. Questionnaires have been sent out to 1,000 food retail organizations asking for data on sales, acquisitions, and manufacturing activities they conduct on their own behalf. This is the first step the Commission is taking under its mandate to study the subject of food retailing.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The committee recommends an appropriation of $5,020,226,000 to finance the activities of the VA during 1960. The breakdown by activity is as follows:

General operating expenses	$160,000,000
Medical administration	27,349,000
Inpatient care	777,500,000
Outpatient care	83,000,000
Maintenance and operation of supply depots	2,218,000
Compensation and pensions	3,300,000,000
Readjustment benefits	585,000,000
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	2,000,000
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	30,159,000
Total	5,020,226,000

The VA has shown a remarkable decrease in administrative personnel over the last 10 years. This is all the more significant when you realize that the veteran population has substantially increased, causing a considerable increase in workload. The committee requested the VA to provide a table showing comparable employment figures during the 10-year period. This table appears on page 769 of part I of the hearings but I will include it at this point for the information of all concerned:

Comparison of average employment from fiscal year 1947 through fiscal year 1960

Program or appropriation	Administrative appropriations—Average number of employees														Change from fiscal year 1947 to fiscal year 1960	
	Actual, fiscal year 1947	Actual, fiscal year 1948	Actual, fiscal year 1949	Actual, fiscal year 1950	Actual, fiscal year 1951	Actual, fiscal year 1952	Actual, fiscal year 1953	Actual, fiscal year 1954	Actual, fiscal year 1955	Actual, fiscal year 1956	Actual, fiscal year 1957	Actual, fiscal year 1958	Estimated, fiscal year 1959	Estimated, fiscal year 1960	Percent increase	Percent decrease
General administration	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	$3,063	$2,555	$2,288	$1,949	$1,762	$1,455	$1,511	$1,512	--------	--------
Department of Veterans' Benefits	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	25,847	24,306	22,806	21,766	20,606	18,913	18,456	17,815	--------	--------
Department of Insurance	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	11,103	9,481	7,620	6,128	5,446	4,734	4,312	4,471	--------	--------
General operating expenses, subtotal	$106,684	$88,619	$80,071	$68,990	$61,277	$48,676	40,013	36,342	32,714	29,843	27,814	25,102	24,279	23,798	--------	78
Medical administration	3,617	3,015	2,714	1,603	1,430	1,424	1,460	1,313	1,185	1,120	1,072	1,048	987	1,027	--------	72
Research	--------	77	240	371	422	396	530	680	760	809	1,030	1,286	1,538	1,299	--------	--------
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses, subtotal	3,617	3,092	2,954	1,974	1,852	1,820	1,990	1,993	1,945	1,929	2,102	2,334	2,525	2,326	--------	36
Maintenance and operation of hospitals	78,992	85,892	92,077	97,860	99,523	105,182	105,435	111,860	112,014	115,360	116,038	114,835	115,096	117,658	49	--------
Maintenance and operation of domiciliary facilities	5,087	2,966	3,632	4,021	4,042	4,192	4,198	3,859	4,019	3,921	3,891	3,876	3,935	3,935	--------	23
Inpatient care, total	84,079	88,858	95,709	101,881	103,565	109,374	109,633	115,719	116,933	119,281	119,929	118,711	119,031	121,593	45	--------
Outpatient care	9,025	11,793	12,837	12,179	10,717	9,907	11,325	10,392	9,525	8,965	8,526	8,189	7,938	7,973	--------	12
Maintenance and operation of supply depots	746	945	906	716	538	482	476	405	336	326	328	332	379	374	--------	50
Medical program, subtotal	97,467	104,688	112,406	116,750	116,672	121,583	123,424	128,509	128,739	130,501	130,885	129,566	129,873	132,266	36	--------
Grand total	[1] 204,151	193,307	192,477	185,740	177,949	170,259	163,437	164,851	161,453	160,344	158,699	154,668	154,152	156,064	--------	24

[1] The peak VA employment of 219,242 (full-time equivalent) was in February 1947.

NOTE.—Due to reorganization, comparative employment by the new organizational elements in the appropriation "General operating expenses" for fiscal years 1947 through 1952 is not available. Excludes construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities and equivalent employment for consultants.

It should be noted that in the category of general administration, employment has done down from 106,684 in 1947 to 23,798 for 1960. In this day when there is considerable criticism about loose Government administration, the substantial improvement shown by the VA in this field is deserving of commendation.

The overall total veteran population and families as of September 30, 1958, is as follows:

Total male veterans in civil life:	
World War II	14,900,000
Korean conflict	4,300,000
All other	3,000,000
Total	22,200,000
Total wives	19,000,000
Total children	24,600,000
Total other (relatives by blood, marriage or adoption living in family units headed by veterans	11,400,000
Total	77,200,000

It is staggering to contemplate the fact that more than 40 percent of the entire population of the United States is either entitled to some form of benefit under programs administered by the VA or is potentially entitled thereto. No wonder the cost of administering these programs and of financing these benefits is in excess of $5 billion a year.

The VA Medical Director assured the committee positively that there is no waiting list at any VA hopsital for service-connected cases. There is, however, a substantial list of eligible veterans, with non-service-connected disabilities awaiting admission to VA hospitals.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

This is the housekeeping agency of the Federal Government. GSA operates and maintains public buildings, acquires space for Government agencies, operates the Federal Supply Service, disposes of surplus property, maintains the National Archives, and engages in a wide variety of other services to departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

The bill provides $271,346,800 to finance these activities during 1960. This is $215,802,390 less than was provided last year but is $16,847,800 above the budget estimates.

The largest cut from last year comes about because no new funds were budgeted for the construction of public buildings. This accounted for a reduction under last year's appropriation of $151,810,000.

The principal increase over budget estimates is in the item for sites and planning for public building projects. There was no budget estimate for this but the committee added $25 million to enable GSA to go forward with its acquisition of sites and planning for future building projects. This compares with $39,915,000 for this item in the 1959 bill.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The committee approved $1,800,000 for expenses of the Board and $775,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. These sums represent slight increases over the current year but not quite as much as the budget estimates.

The growth and vitality of the savings and loan business in this country is amazing. Membership in the Federal Home Loan Bank System at June 30, 1958, was 4,534 and total assets increased during the year by 12.4 percent or to $50.1 billion. Mortgage loans made by member associations in 1958 aggregated

$10.3 billion, the third highest year on rccord. These loans represent 38 percent of the Nation's home financing. Home purchasers accounted for 43 percent of the total, construction 34 percent, and improvements and refinancing for 23 percent.

The flow of savings into member associations was over $17 billion in 1958, withdrawals amounted to $11.8 billion, leaving a net gain of $5.3 bilion. This is an alltime record and is 8 percent above the previous peak which was established in 1956.

The activities of the 11 Federal home loan banks also reflected substantial gains during 1958. Assets reached $2.4 billion; net income increased by 9 percent to $21.4 million and investments by 34 percent to $1.4 billion. Loans to member institutions aggregated $1.3 billion and repayments aggregated $1.4 billion, another alltime record.

Memberships in the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation at June 30, 1958 were 3,832. Members' assets were up during the year by 13 percent to $47.6 billion while reserves and undivided profits climbed to $3.2 billion, an increase during the year of 15 percent.

The Corporation's insurance losses since its creation to date total $5.2 million or 1.6 percent of its cumulative gross income through June 30, 1958. Its insured liability at June 30, 1958 was $41.6 billion.

During the past year the Corporation retired the last of its $100 million capital stock. For the 24 years the Corporation had capital stock outstanding, it paid as a return on such stock $42,976,000 or an average of $1,791,000 a year.

This is a magnificent record of accomplishment and is proof of the dynamic vigor of our expanding economy.

The Board estimates that new private housing starts this year will total 1,200,000, of which approximately 700,000 will be conventional or uninsured loans. The home loan banks will furnish approximately 38 percent of the financing.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

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

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, what has been said on this bill so far gives the members of the committee a pretty good idea of the kind of proposal we have brought to the floor.

Let me say this is the kind of a committee one delights in serving on, not only because of the multiplicity of agencies with which we deal but also because of the personalities that are involved. I can say without fear of any mental reservation of mine that the men with whom I serve on this committee are some of the finest in the Congress and the most able.

As has been pointed out, Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a total appropriation of about $6½ billion. This figure represents a reduction of $406 million, as compared with the 1959 appropriation. It is $145 million below the 1960 budget estimate, and there is also the rescission of prior year funds in the total amount of $107 million. Thus the total effected savings and reductions come to $252,348,200.

We have brought a good bill to the floor. There are some items affecting various agencies that were not unanimously agreed to by the committee, but this is not an unusual phenomenon in a bill of this kind. I personally was not in full agreement, nor were many of the other members in full agreement, with all of the reductions; however, a majority of the committee rules. None of us has made any reservations. If there are errors, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from North Carolina, they were errors of judgment, and we have erred on the side of economy.

After thorough and exhaustive hearings, your committee believes that the 18 agencies that are blanketed in this appropriation bill can live and live very comfortably with the total amounts we have provided.

The agencies under this appropriation are some of the finest in the Federal system. Their programs and their activities touch every corner of the Nation and all facets of our society in some manner or other. Your committee believes it has made adequate provision for the continuation of and recommended extensions of all of the activities in which these 18 agencies are involved.

I was delighted a moment ago to listen to the support of the gentleman from North Carolina for science that this committee and this Congress has given over the past decade or so. As he pointed out, back in 1951 the National Science Foundation received its first appropriation in the total amount of $225,000. This bill today makes an amount available to the National Science Foundation of $143,273,000. Just think of it, an increase of $143 million in the past 10 years.

So I think, Mr. Chairman, this conclusively points out that this committee and the Congress have met their responsibility in this field. As the gentleman from Louisiana has pointed out, there was a reduction in some particular items; but they always ask for more than they need and they usually get more than they can use.

I submit that this is a good bill. It has been brought here under a unanimous agreement of the committee and comes only after exhaustive hearings by your Subcommittee on Independent Offices and the full Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Under the item Housing and Home Finance Agency, you have an appropriation of $90 million for capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal. The last line of the paragraph in the report states:

> The amount provided in the bill is expected to be adequate for the liquidation of obligation for projects during 1960.

Now, I would like to know to what extent and what discretion does the Committee on Appropriations have in the commitments that are made by the Agency with various cities for urban renewal. In other words, we are going to have a housing bill on the floor here very shortly, and I understand that there is a large backlog of demands for urban renewal. Now, if those commitments are made by the agencies with the cities and the counties, how much screening do you apply to those commitments and how much did you allow for those commitments in this appropriation bill?

Mr. BOLAND. Well, in reply to the gentleman, let me say that is an administrative priority. This committee gives very little or no consideration to specific commitments. They come in and ask for a specific amount, and we give them the amount which we think covers all of the commitments that have been made. We have done so in this particular bill.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I am the freshman member of this subcommittee. I want to say to the House that I have thoroughly enjoyed being on the subcommittee. The work is very demanding. The jurisdiction is very broad, but the quality of people with whom you are associated is very high.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], does a tremendous job in getting through masses of very difficult information quickly and in such a way as to create what I think is a very good record supporting the bill that he brings out. The gentlemen on both sides of the aisle were very zealous in their attendance at the committee, and I think that as far as I can tell I have never had the pleasure of working with people who are more conscientious and more dedicated to the job than the members of this particular subcommittee.

I would like to say, however, Mr. Chairman, that the idea of appropriating this much money is rather appalling. I wonder sometimes if we should not here in the House take a closer look at our appropriations facilities and compare those facilities with those we had when this Government was appropriating much less money than it now is. I think we would find those facilities have not increased proportionately. We have people working for the House who are absolutely dedicated, who spend many hours a day, many days a week on understanding what this Government is doing, trying to keep the purse strings of the Government in the hands of the Congress. These people deserve all the credit in the world. Sometimes I wonder if there are enough hours in the day and enough days in the week for the number of people who are trying to do this job to actually do the kind of job which we have all taken oaths to do. In other words, this is a tremendously big Government, Mr. Chairman, and this subcommittee, as well as the other subcommittees of the Appropriations Com-

mittee, have tremendous jurisdictions. We must always make certain that the facilities to do this job properly are kept available. To do otherwise is false economy, and risks failing to do the job of appropriating the Constitution delegated to the Congress.

As far as the report itself is concerned, I think it is very well written. There are some parts of it with which I do not agree, but I do not see any good reason why I should belabor these points at this particular time. I have discussed these matters before with members of the subcommittee.

I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that those Members of the House who feel that this appropriation bill represents a great saving below the budget should read the footnote on page 1. You will note that the appropriations for 1959 were $6,845,000,000 plus. In this bill we recommend $6,438,000,000 plus which on the face of it appears to be a reduction of $407 million. However, the appropriations figure for 1959 also includes funds which were in the first supplemental and which are in the second supplemental appropriation bill as these bills passed the House. This, then, is the bill which is the first step in the appropriating procedure for the fiscal year 1960. We are fairly certain that, as always, there will be supplementals. We hope that the total of all those bills will be in an amount which will at the end of the year result in an overall reduction as far as appropriations are concerned, comparing this year with the last fiscal year, but this is a hope which is not likely to be realized, as will be shown.

The appropriation for the year 1959 for the National Aeronautics and Space Agency is an item of $184 million which appears in the committee report as a basis of comparison of this bill with appropriations for 1959. There is no money appropriated for this item in this bill for a very good and sufficient reason. The authorization legislation has not been passed.

However, in considering this appropriation bill, compared with the appropriation bill for 1959, it must be remembered that there will be a bill which will come before this body and which must be passed for a very substantial sum of money to be appropriated for the Aeronautics and Space Agency. This amount must be considered before a valid comparison may be made.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I have been listening very patiently trying to learn something about this bill, and I appreciate and concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from Arizona.

I should like to ask with reference to the subsidy that is paid to local service carriers, an appropriation that is made available to the Civil Aeronautics Board. With reference to that, what is the appropriation for helicopter service subsidy?

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, it is about $4,800,000. It concerns only three lines, one in New York, one in Los Angeles, and one in Chicago. Those are the only three helicopter lines that are getting a subsidy.

Let me say to the gentleman that I do not, myself, like that subsidy and have so expressed myself in the hearings. I think this is a field in which we could spend millions and millions and millions of dollars—that is, subsidies for helicopter operations. This is precisely the direction in which we are headed. I disagree with it. It helps passengers in town to get to the major airports. All of our airports are now situated, most of the great ones, on high-speed highways. Specifically, there is no reason in the world why we should provide money to subsidize that service, in order that someone in the heart of New York City, or someone in the Loop in Chicago, or in downtown Los Angeles, can take a helicopter to save himself 20 minutes. Why that should be done, I do not know. This is the kind of day and this is the kind of time in which we are living. I disagree with this theory, and I do not like it.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman tell me what is the amount appropriated for this service?

Mr. BOLAND. Five million, one hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. VANIK. Did the committee cut down that amount, or allow the original request?

Mr. BOLAND. The committee did not cut this requested appropriation one dime.

Mr. VANIK. Can the gentleman tell me about local service, local carrier airlines?

Mr. BOLAND. The gentleman is talking about feeder lines?

Mr. VANIK. That is correct.

Mr. BOLAND. That sum is about $52 million.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a minute?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. We regard that as an obligation that has to be paid. The exact amount may vary some 5 to 10 percent. That is a matter of guesswork. We might cut it a little bit, and if it proves not sufficient, we could supply the deficiency the next year.

Mr. VANIK. Under the law, do we have any alternative?

Mr. THOMAS. No; it was testified that it is a debt.

Mr. VANIK. And we must pay it.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am sure that the gentleman, like many others of us, is being importuned and is himself determined to keep within the budget figures of the President. I am therefore disturbed to find this language in the committee report, on page 6:

> Although the budget did not include funds for this purpose, the bill provides $25 million for sites and planning of public buildings to enable the Administrator to continue in 1960 the program of acquiring sites for needed public buildings.

Being mindful of the many cavernous holes around the Capitol where buildings are now being constructed, may I ask if the gentleman is convinced that the committee is indeed justified in recommending this $25 million?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I think I can agree with the gentlewoman from Illinois that we should be very careful in going beyond the President's figures. I believe as she does that we should certainly be zealous in getting the budget balanced. This $25 million for sites and planning we thought was necessary in consequence of the continuing need of the Federal Government for new buildings, mainly to replace old ones, and to house Federal agencies in Federal buildings to save paying high rents.

Mrs. CHURCH. We certainly hope so.

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

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has addressed himself to the question of the feeder lines, the local air carriers. I think it is very important that the gentleman make some statement as to the fact that the reduction in the amount requested for the local air carriers, the feeder lines, having been made is not an indication that the Congress is not going to meet its obligations to these air carriers. They are dependent upon this subsidy for their existence. With new purchases of equipment coming along now, a reduction that is considered to be the will of Congress not to pay this bill could seriously affect their operations. Would the gentleman care to comment that this is not an attempt to curtail their operations?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As far as I am personally concerned, and if I am wrong I should like to be corrected by some member of the subcommittee, I think the gentleman has made an accurate statement.

Mr. BOW. The money that is going to them will be paid under existing law. This is not taking anything away from them, for their obligation must be paid.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. VANIK. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman is familiar with the language under which we must appropriate this money. I cannot follow that. I recognize the subsidy principle, but what would happen if we just decided not to pay them?

Mr. BOW. I think the gentleman will find that the air carriers would have a right then to go to the Court of Claims to secure their funds through the Court of Claims, that it is an obligation of the Government to the air carriers and they would have a right to enforce it in the Court of Claims if we did not appropriate it.

Mr. VANIK. Is it the gentleman's contention that that is a legal obligation?

Mr. BOW. That is my contention.

Mr. VANIK. I would appreciate having the staff of the committee advise me on that. I can recognize the moral obligation, and I think may be one exists, but I want to know if it is a legal obligation.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield, I think the liability arises by reason of the fact they are certified. When carriers are certified, and they were all certified as a mandatory proposition a few years ago, then they become entitled to subsidy. It is a question of providing the money. If they do not receive it, they can go into the Court of Claims.

Mr. VANIK. Is my understanding correct that the Civil Aeronautics Board can allocate whatever funds are appropriated among the several carriers, and if there were no money appropriated the CAB could decide that there was none to be allocated?

Mr. JONAS. To take care of it, all of the money will ultimately have to be provided.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have one more point I wish to make. In considering the appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission it became apparent that there is very likely, duplication of effort in the Federal Trade Commission and the Office of the Attorney General a far as antitrust activities are concerned. We questioned the Commission rather carefully on its activities. I cannot say that its activities are wrongfully taken, that the Commission has gone into territory occupied by the Attorney General but I do feel very strongly that this is an area in which the proper agencies of the administration, insofar as coordination is concerned, should take cognizance of the very distinct possibility that here we have two agencies of the executive department who are getting into the very same field, and probably there could be better coordination between them in an effort to eliminate duplication of effort and bring about a consequent saving to the taxpayers.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. MEYER], wanted to ask a question.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a couple of questions about the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. I notice the committee recommends $43,735,000. I was quite pleased to hear that the full committee as well as the subcommittee were unanimous in endorsing the recommendations of the committee report. My question is: Does this mean that there is a full recognition now that by appropriating such a small sum for civil defense, there is no real practical defense for that type of war that we might face in a nuclear war and that we are not going ahead with a civil defense program that really would be adequate for that type of war?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to my distinguished and lovable friend from Vermont that you took us over the hurdles a far piece in one or two short sentences. I think the first year's request for an appropriation was in the neighborhood of $500 million. They wanted to go into some underground shelter program. That frightened us all to death. But to make a long story short, we have had some very able and distinguished men such as Governor Caldwell of Florida, the distinguished gentleman from New York, and the very able Governor from Nebraska, and certainly we have no finer in the land than the ex-Governor from Iowa. But this is a big program, and we are trying to carry it on very well.

Mr. MEYER. There are quite a few sincere workers in the field of civil defense. I think it is a little sad sometimes that we have the American people laboring under the impression that they are probably doing an awful lot. If this is the type of defense program that we are going to have, if this is the type of civil defense program, then basically the main thing is—it is merely propaganda or something of that type which leads the people to believe that they will have a civil defense program, when, as a matter of fact, they are not having it. Therefore, I wanted to bring this point out—not that I say we should spend the $50 billion that might be necessary to build a shelter system and all that type of thing, but I do feel the point should be brought out, and I just wonder if this is the real feeling of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS. I know the gentleman is sincere, and we appreciate his sincerity. The gentleman is asking not only pertinent questions, but some very interesting questions.

After all, we have been stockpiling medical supplies, and we have been conducting schools, and we have been supplying to the cities and to the States certain money to buy pumps and fire fighting equipment, and so forth. The gentleman used the word "propaganda" a while ago. I do not know whether you meant that in the exact sense, but sometimes the committee might agree with you that maybe there is more talking going on than is necessary, and with this situation of traveling around and talking. I do not know what else they can do, and I say that in all sincerity to you. We go out here and make some maps and spend good money these days nailing signs up on the highways saying, "In case of emergency or attack, this highway will be closed."

You can go to a football game, as we frequently do, but let me see you get away before the game is finished. I do not know what the answer to the gentleman's problem is, but I want to commend him for his interest in the item.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. A few days ago we had some people from the International Cooperation Administration before the members of the Foreign Affairs committee, I asked one of the gentlemen to estimate for me the cost to recruit each person this agency will hire in this fiscal year, and he said $2,000. I have been very much interested in some comments I have read in the papers with reference to the number of people that the Civil Service Commission examines, and I believe I read the statement that the Civil Service Commission has a part in recruiting only one-quarter of the people hired by the U.S. Government annually.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Why cannot the Civil Service Commission with its vast experience in examining people, examine a higher percentage or be the primary agency in recruiting a higher percentage than one-quarter of the people required by the U.S. Government?

Mr. THOMAS. Let us be perfectly frank about it; about one-half is done by the agencies under the supervision of the Commission.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Is it the opinion of my very able colleague from Texas who does such excellent work as a Member of this body and as a chairman that that is the more economical way?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I would not say so.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I think this particular point should be looked into. The $2,000 recruitment cost per person by one of the agencies is very high, it seems to me. It is urgently necessary to bring about economy in Federal expenditures and to curb inflation. Perhaps a considerable saving in examining and recruitment costs could be made. I include at this point in the RECORD seven letters I recently have received.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1959.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives

DEAR MR. BECKWITH: I am returning herewith my letter of March 24, 1959, concerning the cost of our recruiting activities. In your footnote on that letter you asked that we also give you the cost of conducting and rating the examinations and the total number of people that will be recruited.

For fiscal year 1959, we estimate that 592,000 applicants will be examined and that 72,000 appointments will be made from our lists of eligibles. The following table shows the estimated cost of our work in processing these examinations and appointments:

(a) Recruiting activities	$383,100
(b) Conducting examinations and rating and reviewing applications	1,346,700
(c) Setting up and maintaining lists of eligibles	481,700
(d) Issuing certificates of eligibles for appointment to specific vacancies and auditing the selections	530,000
Total	2,741,500

Sincerely yours,
ROGER W. JONES,
Chairman.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1959.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter dated April 17, 1959, it is estimated that approximately 487,900 appointments of all types will be made in fiscal year 1959 by June 30. Hiring has been running behind fiscal year estimates made last year. Of these appointments about 93,200 will be appointments based on previous Federal service. They will include transfers between agencies, reinstatements of persons with civil service status and restorations and returns

to duty after military furlough or extended leave without pay.

We compile no statistics on previous Federal employment of persons whose appointments are not based on such service. They are hired in the same way as new employees and so considered in our statistics. Of the remaining 394,700 expected appointments which we consider "new" ones, 128,800 will probably be "excepted" appointments and 265,900 will be to positions in the competitive service. Some of these employees may have had prior Federal service but we believe the proportion to be relatively small.

The following table compares the above estimates for the current fiscal year with actual totals for the two previous fiscal years:

	1959 estimates	1958 actual	1957 actual
Total accessions	487,900	495,938	567,565
Former Federal employees	93,200	98,050	93,403
"New" employees	394,700	397,888	474,162
"Excepted" employees	128,800	137,331	157,288
"Competitive" employees	265,900	260,557	316,874

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1959.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In our letter to you on April 22, 1959 we stated that a report would be forthcoming from this office in answer to your inquiry of April 15, 1959 concerning the recruitment activities of the Department of the Navy.

We have compiled data covering Navy recruiting activities from the best available statistics, and we estimate this to be as follows for fiscal year 1959:

(a) Applications to be examined by Boards of Examiners, 230,000.

(b) Appointments to be made (include appointments to be made by other agencies from registers maintained by Navy Boards of Examiners), 21,000.

We do not have available the fine breakdown of cost figures on examinations and appointments submitted to you by the Civil Service Commission. However, we do have on record a total cost figure for Boards of Examiners' work; and by applying the percentages used by the Commission for its cost figures against our total costs, we have been able to establish a similar summary. We have used this method since we firmly believe that our costs closely parallel the Commission's costs in the area of examining and appointing applicants. We find, therefore, that the estimated costs for fiscal year 1959 for processing examinations and appointments are as follows:

(a) Recruiting activities	$120,000
(b) Conducting examinations and ratings and reviewing applications	423,000
(c) Setting up and maintaining lists of eligibles	151,000
(d) Issuing certificates of eligibles for appointment to specific vacancies and auditing the selections	166,000
Total	860,000

As requested, your letter of April 15, 1959, is herewith returned.

Sincerely yours,

R. E. CRONIN,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Chief of Industrial Relations.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1959.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: The following information is furnished in reply to your letter of April 15, 1959 to the Secretary of the Army. In your letter you asked for information on this Department's examining and appointment activities for fiscal year 1959 paralleling that furnished you by the chairman of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, whose letter of April 13, 1959 you forwarded with your note.

We have appointed approximately 9,400 persons from registers during the first 9 months of fiscal year 1959. We anticipate that we will appoint an additional 2,400 during the final quarter for a fiscal year total of 11,800. To secure the eligibles needed for these appointments, we will have examined approximately 110,000 applicants by the end of the fiscal year.

Since our boards of examiners are very small operations, ranging from part of the time of 1 employee to 3 or 4 employees for large installations, we do not separate our costs by the fine divisions of work shown in the Civil Service Commission's letter. In addition, our recruiting activities are not performed by our examining boards, but by our regular installation personnel staffs. These are performed for all occupations in short supply, including many employed through examinations conducted by the Civil Service Commission. We cannot, therefore, furnish recruiting cost data paralleling that furnished in the Commission's letter, for our board operations. We have done very little recruiting during this fiscal year. Since we are reducing in strength in many of our operations, our appointments are primarily for replacement of normal turnover.

Cost for examining the 110,000 applicants, certifying eligibles for the 11,800 placements and handling approximately 6,700 noncompetitive actions will be approximately $400,000 for fiscal year 1959. This is $3.40 per application reviewed or $21.60 per action processed by our boards, including the noncompetitive cases in which promotion and reassignment actions are examined for conformance to the same standards used in examining for appointment. Since it is not possible to separate the cost of this work from the appointment workload, our cost figures are not completely comparable to those furnished you by the Civil Service Commission.

I trust that this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

R. H. WILLEY,
Director of Civilian Personnel.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1959.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Returned herewith is the letter you received from the U.S. Civil Service Commission furnishing data on its recruiting activities. Your request for similar information from AEC, found in the marginal notes, has been carefully considered, and the following advice submitted:

Exception from civil service: Because AEC is an excepted agency, it should be borne in mind, in considering this reply, that the Civil Service Commission performs no recruiting, examining, or certification functions for AEC. Unlike the Government departments in the competitive service, AEC performs for itself, without reference to the Civil Service Commission, all the activities relating to employee selection which are normally carried out through the combined efforts of the operating department and the Civil Service Commission.

Applications for Federal employment: The number of persons outside AEC who will apply for employment direct to AEC's headquarters and 12 operations offices in fiscal year 1959 will approximate 17,000. This figure covers written applications which have been formally submitted and does not include informal oral inquiries. AEC accepts applications for employment at any time in fields of work it utilizes. As the result of a single application, an applicant may be considered for several types of work in which his principal qualifications might profitably be used.

Appointments to Federal positions: The number of persons outside AEC who will be appointed in fiscal year 1959 to positions in AEC headquarts and operations offices will approximate 630 (a smaller number than estimated in our last letter to you).

Cost of recruiting and related activities: AEC maintains no figures on costs which are comparable to those furnished by the Civil Service Commission. Employment is decentralized and is one of several functions performed by the personnel offices in AEC Headquarters and each Operations Office. In a relatively small agency such as AEC (approximately 6,800 Federal employees, with fairly low turnover), it is difficult to isolate costs relating specifically to recruiting, and especially difficult to break them down by the specialized activities listed by the Civil Service Commission. In an AEC personnel office, one person may recruit candidates, review applications, conduct examinations, prepare lists of "eligibles" (qualified candidates), and issue AEC's counterpart of the CSC "Certificate of Eligibles." These activities would be in addition to work concerned with such matters as interviewing, internal placement and promotaion, job evaluation, employee relations and training. It would appear that AEC's activities would be more comparable to the combined personnel activities of other Government agencies and those services performed by the Civil Service Commission in the recruitment, examining and selection of personnel for the competitive service.

Our best estimate, however, of the cost of such personnel activities as recruiting, examining, setting up and maintaining lists of eligibles, and issuing certificates of eligibles for appointments as performed by an independent excepted agency, is approximately $61,000 for fiscal year 1959.

It is hoped this information will serve your purpose.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR L. TACKMAN,
Director, Office of Personnel.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1959.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your communication of April 29, 1959, asking that we relate the figures furnished in our letters of April 13 and April 27, the former covers only the work done in the Civil Service Commission's own offices; the latter contains Governmentwide totals.

The 72,000 appointments estimated to be made from our lists of eligibles this fiscal year are part of the 265,900 competitive appointments which we expect will be made throughout the Federal service. Of the balance approximately 151,800 competitive appointments are expected to be made from lists of eligibles established by Boards of Examiners. The remaining 42,100 appointments consist of those the Commission authorizes the agencies to make directly because (1) the job is temporary or of a short-term-nature and an examination is not practical or economical or (2) a continuing job must be filled by making a temporary appointment whenever a list of eligibles is not immediately available.

The examinations for appointments to the competitive service are conducted by the Commission or by Boards of U.S. Civil Service Examiners operating under our supervision. Competitive examinations are generally not conducted for the appointment made directly by agencies; however, they are reviewed as a part of our inspection program.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1959.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I am returning the Civil Service Commission's letter with your footnote dated April 15, requesting a breakdown of the cost of our examining activities.

We do not have actual figures of the percentage of time our employees devote to each of the activities listed in the Civil Service Commission's letter of April 13. Our examining costs as contained in our letter of January 2, 1959, on this subject represent the cost of operating civil service boards of examiners. However, we have made an estimate of the cost to be allocated to each of the categories, excluding recruitment. They are as follows:

Conducting, examining, rating and reviewing applications	$78,080
Setting up and maintaining lists of eligibles	20,740
Issuing certificates of eligibles for appointment to specific vacancies and auditing and selections	23,180
Total	122,000

Last year approximately 3,200 employees were hired of the approximate 32,000 applicants recruited and tested.

It is our understanding that the item "Recruitment activities" in the Civil Service Comimssion's leter of April 13, 1959, covers the cost of such items as preparation of examination notices and recruitment material, development of recruitment sources, and conducting recruitment visits to high schools, colleges, and civic groups. We are unable to furnish you an accurate figure as to the cost of such activities for the Department of the Interior. The majority of the activities of this type in the Department are performed as an incidental part of some employees' jobs. There are no figures maintained of the cost or the amount of time involved. A copy of our letter of January 2, 1959, is enclosed for easy reference.

Sincerely yours,

NEWELL B. TERRY,
Director of Personnel.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman take a couple of minutes more to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. First, I should like to make a statement and then ask a question. I appreciate the fine statement the gentleman from Texas, Mr. THOMAS, chairman of the subcommittee, has made about the former Governor of Iowa, and Administrator of Civil Defense. I can assure the gentleman that Mr. Hoegh would spend no money which he did not feel was completely justified in this big job that he has to do. It is a job in which the American people are greatly interested, and they want to know whether the money which is in this bill is sufficient to carry on that great a .d important task. Now I wish to ask this question of my very good friend from Texas, Mr. THOMAS:

What is the situation relative to personnel that is carried in this bill? What is the number of personnel provided for in this bill for fiscal 1960 as compared to the number of personnel in the 1959 budget?

Mr. THOMAS. My good friend from Iowa embarrasses us.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not mean to do that.

Mr. THOMAS. I know the gentleman did not. But the impression has gone abroad that this committee does nothing but cut, cut, cut, and then cut some more. If anything, there is a slight increase in personnel in this bill over what was provided for the current fiscal year.

Mr. JENSEN. Just a slight increase?

Mr. THOMAS. To the contrary, people think we just come in here and wield a heavy hand and just cut, cut, cut. That is not true. Is that statement correct?

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is correct?

Mr. THOMAS. If anything, it is an increase over last year.

Mr. JENSEN. I might say to the gentleman I was in hopes he would say that there was a reduction.

Mr. THOMAS. No; I cannot. That is why I said the gentleman's question embarrassed us.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me a minute to make an observation?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee 1 minute.

Mr. EVINS. In view of the great interest in the subject of civil defense I might point out that the testimony disclosed that the warehouses for stockpiles are filled, the hospitals are completed and staffed to a complete amount; there is a surplus of material to such an extent that they are now considering disposing of some of it as surplus material. So the fact is that the civil defense program is amply restored.

The equipment for air raid warnings on the various courthouses and city halls has been installed, and we have a very fine and very adequate civil defense program. As I say, they have so much material on hand that they are now considering declaring some of it surplus.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I know the committee has had a difficult time in dividing as best it could the sum of $6 billion, which is not a minor amount of money.

I do want to say a few things and point out certain facts which I think are important at the present time. It is, of course, very comforting to see in the report that the committee wants some of these programs reviewed. I fully agree with the committee on that. We adopt laws here like the Stockpiling Act; then we pay very little attention to it afterward, especially the committees that report these measures out. We have a shortage of time and we are doing the best we can. That program should have been reviewed some time ago. There are some other programs here that ought to be reviewed very carefully.

I am for research and have always been a strong supporter of research, but we have to take a look at some of these things to see what we are getting and whether or not we are getting results from the money we are spending.

I think the committee did very well in connection with most of these scientific organizations with funds; but, when you go from $126,000 to $143 million in the short space of 10 years, you are making great strides, so far as appropriating money is concerned. I believe the National Science Foundation is a good organization and very valuable one for the advancement of science.

There is one other thing I want to point out, and it has been mentioned here. I refer to the Civil Defense Act. I handled that act in the beginning and all the other legislation in connection with it that has come out of the Committee on the Armed Services. You did very well by them as far as the overall amount of money is concerned. There are, however, some spots in here that we have to take care of one way or the other—take it away from something and put it into something else, if necessary, to get results from this organization. I will point this out to you in what I put in the RECORD and shall ask permission when we go back into the House.

This is not merely a question of the danger of nuclear war. We know what our policy is right now. It is a policy of mass retaliation. That ought to be reviewed as to whether or not that is satisfactory for the security of our country.

We have put fission material in the atmosphere, tons of it; in 1945, 60 kilotons. That is in the United Kingdom and the United States. In 1946 we put in 40 kilotons; in 1948, 100 tons; in 1951, 500 tons; in 1952 and 1954 we put in 37,000 kilotons of fission material; in 1955 we put in 200 more; in 1956, we put in 9,000; in 1957 and 1958 we put in 19,000.

Russia put in, which we cannot control, in 1945 to 1951, 60 kilotons; 1952 to 1954, 500 tons; 1955 and 1956, 4,000 tons; 1957 and 1958, 21,000 tons.

United States, United Kingdom, and Soviet nuclear events

[Yield in kilotons]

Inclusive years	Fission yield			Total yield	
	Air burst	Ground surface burst	Water surface burst	Air burst	Surface burst
1945 to 1951	190	550	20	190	570
1952 to 1954	1,000	15,000	22,000	1,000	59,000
1955 to 1956	5,600	1,500	6,000	11,000	17,000
1957 to 1958	31,000	4,400	4,600	57,000	28,000

I mention this because of the fact it is up there and it has got to come down or will come down some time in the future.

When we enacted Public Law 606 for civil defense, there were a lot of people who wanted to go back to the States and put the power in the hands of the States. But we come back here, take the Fed-

eral agency, and put the entire power in the Federal Government. So, the intent of that law 606 was to put some of this authority back into the local States and make them responsible for it. Now, somebody has got to be trained to know something about what is going on in the world, and I do not know of any way to do it except teach people. And, this is not going to be a city hall game, as people point out sometimes. Certainly I, as well as everybody else, would be opposed to such programs if it turned out to be such a thing. I do not believe in it. But, intelligence has got to be displayed in this country if we expect to survive. This is up there fission debris, whether we like it or not, and it has to come down. Somebody should know something about it. We had 4 days of hearings recently and we had every top scientist in the country before us who knows anything about fissionable material. So, I am just pointing these things out, that we have got to have a balanced program. This is one way to improve it, or else we cannot have civil defense in this country. It is a tough program; it is a tough proposition. I know all about it, because we have gone into it thoroughly. The report brought out by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], of the Government Operations Committee, I think every Member of the House ought to read. You would be surprised what Sweden and other countries have done. They have gone underground, and they have far better protection than we have in this country. I do not know what Russia has got, but it is assumed that they are not sitting there as a bunch of idiots and not doing anything about it. I know it is a costly program, but we have to survive, and if we do not want to survive, we might as well close shop.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. In the Committee on Armed Services last week the head of Convair Division of General Dynamics Corp. testified that ATLAS could travel at the rate of 16,000 miles an hour; that it would go from New York to Los Angeles in 15 Minutes, and therefore about the same 15 minuates from Moscow to New York. Would the gentleman tell me what real defense we have and why we are spending these hundreds of millions of dollars on civil defense and in what way we could possibly evacuate the cities when we have but 15 minutes' stand from the time the ATLAS will go from New York to Los Angeles?

Mr. DURHAM. I think it is generally agreed there is no defense against such a weapon, but that is a good reason to try to do the best we know how to cope with the present day weapons and one way is to keep the people informed.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, 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. Chairman, I can well understand the feeling of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], when he spoke a few minutes ago and said that he was having a hard time finding out anything about this bill. He never had an opportunity to find out very much about it, because the bill was not available until this morning. And, I want to continue—well, now, the chairman of the subcommittee shakes his head. I tried to get a copy——

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

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment, and I will yield to the gentleman. I tried to get a copy of this bill last Friday and again on last Saturday and could not obtain a copy of it. Now I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. I beg the gentleman's pardon if he did not get it. It was available at 10:30 Friday. I humbly apologize, and I think the committee will apologize, too. I do not know why he did not get it. Maybe it was our fault, but it was available.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman speaking of the committee print or the numbered copy of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS. The committee print. It has not been changed.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa has no way of knowing whether you changed the committee print or not. Oftentimes committee prints are changed before they come to the House, and the gentleman is well aware of that fact. Even though the bill was available on Friday at noon, even though the bill was available then, that was not ample time for the Members of the House of Representatives to get the bill, go over the hearings, and find out what happened in the period of Saturday and Sunday. We are supposed to devote ourselves to other things on Sunday. To call this bill up, a bill that deals with $6.5 billion and 18 agencies of the Government on such short notice is a wholly unfair procedure. Hereafter, I will be constrained to object when unanimous consent is asked for committees to have until midnight Friday or Saturday to file reports. Let me say to the majority leader, if this is the kind of procedure we are going to have—I will be constrained to object to such unanimous consent requests. This bill could well have come up on Wednesday or Thursday of this week, by which time we could have had an opportunity to study the bill, know what is in it, correlate the bill with the hearings and the hearings with the bill.

Now I should like to ask a question or two of the chairman, if I may. Am I correctly informed that there is no money in this bill for the so-called Career Executive Board?

Mr. THOMAS. Not one penny. I should like to beg the gentleman's pardon that he did not have an opportunity to see this bill. There was no idea of trying to hide anything, I assure him.

Mr. GROSS. I did not intend to address my remarks to the gentleman from Texas. I do not say that he or the committee was trying to hide anything.

Mr. THOMAS. Frankly, I spent Saturday and Sunday studying this bill, and I do not like that, either. But there is no money in here for the Executive Board.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the committee for not providing a penny in the bill for the Executive Career Board. I hope, if there are any other appropriation bills in which it is expected funds will be carried for this elite corps in Government, that those items will also be eliminated.

I should like to ask a question with reference to the retirement fund. Is there any contribution made by the Government in this bill to the employees retirement fund?

Mr. THOMAS. Over and above the present fund; no. The Government's contribution for this year should be about $775 million.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, the employees are continuing to carry the load?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Does the Government pay interest on the money it should have contributed to the fund to make it actuarially sound?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman knows that the Treasury used to pay 3 percent. That was reduced to 2½ percent. Regardless of the niceties of this matter, in my judgment, the Government should make these contributions. I agree with the gentleman. I really think the Government should contribute in order to keep this fund from becoming insolvent. That amount would be $775 million. The Budget said, "No; they had the faith and the credit of the Government behind it." It is a two-sided argument, but I do not agree with them.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman that some provision ought to me made for this purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. We ought to pay as we go. That is good, old common horsesense.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Last year the committee sought to put it in the bill, it passed the House and the other body, and the President vetoed it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I voted to put it in the bill last year.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Just to straighten the record at this point, the Government is contributing $720 million to this fund, this year, 1960. The employees are putting in an equal amount, and the Government is putting in about $235 million in interest in addition to that. So the fund will receive $1,676 billion in 1960 and will pay out about $943 million. So the fund will be nearly $700 million better off.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

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

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. YATES. The fact that the Government has made this contribution does not prevent the fund from becoming additionally insolvent to the tune of $775 million.

Mr. GROSS. That is right. May I ask the Chairman if there is anything in this bill for the former Presients' pension fund, and if so, how much?

Mr. THOMAS. There is $200,000.

Mr. GROSS. I read the hearing with respect to this appropriation and did not get very much information. I thought the committee gave this item a little too much of the once-over-lightly treatment for something that is brandnew and something about which we ought to have more information. Can the gentleman tell me which former Presidents are getting pensions under this fund?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; the two living ex-Presidents, Mr. Hoover and Mr. Truman.

Mr. GROSS. And they are both taking it?

Mr. THOMAS. As far as we know. I understand one gives it to charity, but he takes it.

Mr. GROSS. Was thought given to reducing Mr. Truman's pension, in view of the fact that the other day he said that if Members of Congress cut the foreign giveway bill they ought to first reduce their own salaries? Was there any thought given to reducing his pension?

Mr. THOMAS. No, there was no thought given to reducing any item in here, the rent or postage or anything else.

Mr. GROSS. Now about the widows. How many widows are there?

Mr. THOMAS. Two widows, Mrs. Roosevelt and Mrs. Woodrow Wilson, at $10,000 each.

Mr. GROSS. Where did Mr. Hoover and Mr. Truman establish their offices?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Hoover is in the Waldorf-Astoria in New York.

Mr. GROSS. Is that where he lives?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. And Mr. Truman?

Mr. THOMAS. We are not paying any rent for Mr. Truman because it is in the library out in Independence. But let us not go into that. I do not criticize Mr. Hoover. If he wants to have it on Times Square I do not care.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the other members of the committee in complimenting the work of this fine and distinguished subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and the Appropriations Committee itself. I realize, as you do, that $6 billion-plus is a lot of money. We recognize that when we are considering sums of this kind it makes a tremendous impact on the Federal Treasury and the pocketbooks of the taxpayers.

We do, however, as fully as this committee has done, recognize the responsibility of the Congress in meeting certain necessary obligations to provide for services which the public, the citizens, the people of this country demand.

I am somewhat concerned about one or two phases of this appropriation, and specifically at this point the funds for the New Federal Aviation Agency. I should like to ask some questions about it because I think it is tremendously important for the future of transportation and the services that are to be provided by this agency of the Government.

In the first place, I might remind you, Mr. Chairman, the last Congress recognized that the Government must do a better job of assuring safety in aviation and, first, established the Federal Aviation Agency; and second, provided the necessary funds for making rapid improvements in air safety. These actions were well considered and took into account:

First. Our air traffic control system is inadequate.

Second. Jet aircraft operations cannot be effectively performed with the air navigation and traffic control devices currently available.

Third. The volume of activity in aviation is increasing at a rate of about 15 percent annually.

Fourth. Extensive technical studies have made clear that a major 5-year effort is necessary to expand the capacity of and advance the Federal airway system to where we have positive control over all aircraft that are operating under instrument conditions.

Fifth. That maximum air safety and effective and economical operation can be achieved by the merging of the military and civil air traffic management and navigation facilities under the administration of FAA.

In accordance with the will of Congress, the new Agency has been established. Major efforts are being undertaken to prevent accidents such as happened at Grand Canyon, Brunswick, Md., and Las Vegas with the funds for new equipment authorized in fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959. In fiscal year 1960, many important facilities will be ready for service, including, 17 long-range radars, 19 terminal radars, 28 traffic control towers, 166 VORTAC facilities, and 44 approach light systems.

The fund allowance by the Appropriations Committee, which makes a reduction of $76 million, will not permit this new equipment to be placed in service. In fact, new equipment valued at more than $50 million will have to be mothballed and the recruitment and training of air traffic control personnel would need be stopped immediately, even though the committee report would appear to authorize 500 new positions for 1960.

A 5-year plan of the types and costs of new equipment required for this program has been available to the Congress for several years. We have known that assuring safety in aviation is expensive. Deferring the day when we provide what is required to assure aviation safety is not economy, it is only a deferment of the inevitable. The training of men to be competent in air traffic control and the operating of equipment necessary for air safety, while expensive, is a small cost for the results obtained in public safety, effective conduct of air commerce and military aviation. To further defer the time when recognized needs are met will place our Nation in a position where unlimited funds could not provide what is required for development and production of equipment and tarining of skilled manpower requires time.

Finally, I would point out that a function of this new agency is to assimilate, with large attendant economies, air traffic control services from the Department of Defense. This important objective cannot be attained if Congress fails to support the FAA requirements.

Our committee was called upon to investigate the tragic accident of the new turbo-jet Lockheed Electra, at New York. We have had conferences where there were innumerable misses reported, when an Air Force jet barely missed a commercial airplane loaded with people. We had reports that on another occasion without any intention, I suppose, a jet not knowing perhaps just what its target was, took a bead on a commercial airline and with just a few hundred feet of it took off in another direction.

This agency has a tremendous job. There are many thousands who were transferred from the military to this new agency.

I know the committee has considered these important problems because I have read over your report. But what I am concerned with is the progress being made. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, are there funds in this appropriation bill for 1960 to provide for the facilities which are being readied—No. 1, for the additional 17 long-range radar stations? Are there appropriations made available for the additional 19 terminal radars that are necessary in this jet age? There are 28 traffic control towers. How are they going to be operated or can they be operated with the funds appropriated here? There are 166 of the Vortac facilities. Mr. Chairman, I do not need to outline these any further, but may I ask our distinguished chairman and other members of the committee—do we have funds in this bill to take care of these additional facilities?

Mr. THOMAS. I think you have the funds and personnel. I think you have a plus side on both. There was an increase of 8,000 jobs from 1958 to 1959, I will say to my very able friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, than whom there is no finer chairman of a committee in the House of Representatives. This year they want to go 5,000 above that 8,000 and the evidence showed that there are 3,000 unfilled jobs. First, they got the figures mixed up and said it was 5,000 unfilled jobs. But, I think when they reconsidered and recounted, the figure of 3,000 was nearer correct. So we gave them 500 more than they had last year. When you take their facilities and spell it out—for instance, they wanted to buy three jet aircraft to the tune of $5 million.

Mr. HARRIS. I know that and I am not concerned with that item.

Mr. THOMAS. All right, that is out.

Mr. HARRIS. I join the committee in that. But, let us get back to the subject.

Mr. THOMAS. I believe that you will join us in everything that we are going to say here, if you will give us just a little bit of a chance here.

Mr. HARRIS. If you can assure me that there is sufficient money to provide the personnel necessary to carry out this program, of course, I join with you.

Mr. THOMAS. In our humble judgment, we think they have more than they need.

Mr. HARRIS. There is a feeling on the part of some of those who are responsible for this program that the 3,500 so-called vacancies are really not vacancies. That is a part of the accentuated program that was supposed to reach a certain figure by the first of July of this year, and when the gentleman's committee took the testimony, as he well knows and I have read a great deal of this record, and you have done a splendid job in developing it, but at that time back in February, it lacked 3,500 and I think you will find by now it lacks only about 900 of reaching that figure.

I am sure that if the gentleman in the light of this discussion will again consider the present situation and the future he will find that they will have to stop recruiting at the particular moment right where we are and that many of these facilities that have been purchased and paid for are going to have to be put in mothballs. I trust that if this bill goes through, the gentleman will reconsider and that these additional facts will be taken into consideration and necessary funds to carry out this terrific and important program will be restored.

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

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to use my time to ask a few questions of the chairman of this committee. One is with respect to the items on page 12, Veterans' Administraiton, where it states that this item is for hospital inpatient care. It is stated that the amount is $9,378,000 more than the appropriation for 1959, but $9 million less than the request of the budget. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct, I will say to my genial friend from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is it not true that the amount is left just where it was a year ago?

Mr. THOMAS. No. There is not one additional hospital that came into service this year. Let me give you a little explanation of this. We are talking to one of the finest Members of this House, a man who is level-headed, I do not care which side of the aisle he is on, and reason registers with him.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is very kind.

Mr. THOMAS. Last year we went above the budget—now, listen—above the budget $8,365,000—$8 million round figures above the budget, and in my judgment under perhaps the finest administrator we have ever had, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Whittier. He came before our committee and he said that there were 4,165 phantom beds which you have been appropriating for that do not exist. That took a lot of nerve, did it not? There was nothing dishonest about it, not at all, and I will tell you how it came about. The administration would take over some old Army hospital and carry it on the books for 745 beds when as a matter of fact there were 35 or 40 beds that have not been used for 10 years but they have been carrying them as active beds although the Veterans' Administration could not use them. So through the years it has accumulated to the extent that last year we had $8 million more than the year before, that they could not use. They have an additional $9,300,000 in the bill for 1960, or altogether $17 million. It is no attempt to not give them the money they need should they need an increase, but it was not needed. The gentleman is on sound ground.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if there is anything in this bill for the long-promised Cleveland G.M.S. Hospital that last year we were told would be in this budget?

Mr. THOMAS. Is that the one that had not been started?

Mrs. BOLTON. It has been held up for 10 years; yes.

Mr. THOMAS. We started one hospital for the gentle lady, then she wanted another couple of hundred beds and after we got through we were very much involved.

Mrs. BOLTON. This hospital has not been started.

Mr. THOMAS. I thought the gentlewoman had a hospital underway.

Mrs. BOLTON. We have just broken ground for a mental hospital.

Mr. THOMAS. I know money has been appropriated for that one.

Mrs. BOLTON. Last year the gentleman was very kind. Two years ago he made it possible for us to start plans for the G.M. & S. Hospital, and there was the promise that there would be money in this bill for the building of this hospital.

Mr. THOMAS. The Budget did not request it.

Mrs. BOLTON. Who does the gentleman mean by budget—the budget or somebody in the veterans' organization?

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the gentlewoman not to get me started on the budget. The money is not in here, and I sympathize with the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. The money is not there?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that accurate information is the hardest thing to get in Washington, but at 12 o'clock today I asked the Administrator of Veterans Affairs about the patient load, and I would like to say to the gentleman from Kansas that he tells me there will be an increase in 1960 over 1959. In fiscal 1959 the patient load was 140,493 and 1960 it will rise to 140,846 or an increase of 253.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is my understanding, also.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I made reference to the increase in patient load. The total overall patient load will be increased somewhat in 1960 over 1959.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Civil Aeronautics Board

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including contract stenographic reporting services; employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $50 per diem; $6,925,000: *Provided*, That the Chairman is authorized without regard to any other provision of law, to place five General Schedule positions in the following grades: one in grade GS-18, one in grade GS-17, and three in grade GS-16, and such positions shall be in adidtion to positions previously allocated to this agency.

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

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, it is important, in my opinion, that we note the fact that Civil and Defense Mobilization have been combined into one agency. The bill itself appropriates $43,700,000 for fiscal 1960, but the original budget request was for $74,900,000, a reduction of $31,200,000, which is substantial and a very severe cut. The bill carries $10 million, or approximately that, as Federal contributions to the States and to the localities for the procurement of equipment, education and training of special assistants. The sum of $15 million was cut in this area.

Under the Durham Act that we passed in this House a year or so ago there is an obligation on the part of the Federal Government to carry forward the program with regard to services in the States and localities. The committee in its report referred to the dangers imminent in this question of Federal grants to States and localities for personnel.

I want to say for the record that I do not share the concern or the fear of our chairman and others that Federal grants to States and localities for personnel purposes would be a political proposition, sort of a city hall racket. Nevertheless, the cut has been made and Civil Defense has been more or less denied the inauguration of this program which was recommended in the basic law known as the Durham Act. I regret this change or this development, although I shall not at this time offer any amendment to restore these funds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand that when the Clerk read, that the Clerk had read on page 4, line 1 through line 16?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language contained in the bill beginning on line 11 through line 16, page 4, as being legislation on an appropriation bill. Mr. Chairman, it may well be that the Civil Aeronautics Board needs more super grades, but this is not the way to get it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the point of order. Let me make this explanation to my distinguished friend. You will recall that this language was put in the bill and thoroughly argued and debated last year. It was covered by a rule, you remember that, only it was for 10 of these jobs, and the Civil Service Commission, through some misunderstanding, only granted 5 of them. Now, the same language was in for FAA, and they were granted those 10.

Mr. GROSS. Mr Chairman, the subcommittee on which I have the privilege of serving has been trying very hard to regulate the disposition of super grades and the expansion of super grades.

Mr. THOMAS. We are not violating any rule. It was approved last year.

Mr. GROSS. I must insist on my point of order in protection of the committee and in protection of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. THOMAS. I oppose the point of order because the paragraph was read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Iowa was within his rights to make the point of order. He observed the gentleman standing when unanimous consent was granted to go back to the previous section.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, the point of order is good, then. We admit it, then.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 763–765), as is payable by the Board, $57,000,000, to remain available until expended.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: On page 4, line 21, strike out "$57,000,000" and insert "$51,900,000."

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, by this amendment I seek to cut out and eliminate subsidy in this budget for passenger helicopter operation at Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York. The arguments in support of subsidy seek to justify this expenditure of $5.1 million in order to obtain a so-called operating experience of the helicopter. It seems to me that the amount of this subsidy is completely out of line with any experience benefit on this type of operation.

Helicopter service is generally used by expense account business executives who spend most of the extra time they save writing to Congressmen urging them to cut Federal expenditures.

I think this is an appropriate place to start saving money. Helicopter operation experience is abundantly available to the Government in the operation of Army helicopter service between Army compounds here in the Washington area. In addition to that, we have the benefit of the operating experience of the Gettysburg express which operates on a regular schedule.

It seems to me that this is an unnecessary waste of public money, and I urge the adoption of this amendment to save a useless expenditure of public funds.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph end in 30 seconds.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the committee is merely trying to carry out in some measure the legislative enactment of the House. If the House wants to take it out, in its wisdom, that is up to the House. Mr. Chairman I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK.]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VANIK) there were—ayes 33, noes 44.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at not to exceed $3,500; not to exceed $12,950,000 for expenses of travel; and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; $283,200,000: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriations funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 minutes additional.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce raised on the floor of the House today what I consider to be a very serious and pertinent question. That question goes to appropriations in this bill for the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. Chairman, for some years I have been a member of the subcommittee that has been making appropriations for the old Civil Aeronautics Administration which has now been taken over by the FAA. I supported the bill to create FAA. I thought it was the thing to do. I think it is a step forward for transportation and safety in transportation and the advancement of the art in this country. But it must be remembered that when we established FAA we did more than take CAA out of the Department of Commerce. We established an agency in which the military would be coordinated with civil aviation in the airways of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, may I point out that last week this House and the Committee on Appropriations went about $158 million over the budget estimates for Health, Education, and Welfare, because that department has to do with research and the saving of lives. May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that in this case we reduced the budget by $76 million, and there is involved in this item exactly the same consideration that was involved in HEW, the saving of lives and research looking to additional saving of lives. I will say to you that if you crash in a midair collision you are going to be just as dead as you are from cancer, tuberculosis, heart disease, or any of the others. So it seems to me that it is important that we give careful consideration to this fact.

I am not speaking for airlines, aircraft manufacturers, or the Federal Aviation Agency. I am talking for those Americans who are traveling in the air and for whom we have an obligation to create the safest aviation in the world.

I will say this to you, and I mean it sincerely, and I have said it on this floor before. I believe we should have a user charge. I think the time has come that those who use the airways, the corporations, the traveling public, and others, should be charged commensurate with the cost of the maintenance of these great airways of ours. But Congress has not done that, so we are still in the position where Congress must provide for the safety of those in the air. I am afraid that by this severe cut in this appropriation we are jeopardizing the lives of those who travel on the airways.

The gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, pointed out that there have been established certain facilities that will be closed. May I say to you that this reduction will cause the closing of 17 long-range radars, 19 terminal area radars, 28 traffic control towers, 166 VORTAC facilities, and 44 approach light systems. In other words, this Congress, this House, you, my colleagues. have over the years appropriated the money to establish these facilities. Many of them are now in being. The balance of them that I have read off will be in being during 1960. But with the appropriations here made there will not be bodies on board at the Federal Aviation Agency to man these facilities

and the very important navigational facilities will have to be put in mothballs because there will be no one to operate them.

I assume that that statement will be questioned, but let me look at the record. The employment authorized by the 1959 Appropriation Act was 29,893. The Agency had planned on June 30, 1959, to have that many people on board, that is, 29,893, which this Congress authorized last year. The employment now financed by the House subcommittee with this bill now before you will employ 29,000 employees, or a reduction of 893. That is the number necessary to man these facilities.

If you go forward with other new facilities which have been authorized and appropriated for, you will need an additional 2,791. So we are going to be shy not only those from this bill, 893, but if you are to man all the new facilities which you have voted for and provided for, you are going to be shy 2,791. Then, if the workload increases, you are going to have further difficulty.

It has been said there are 3,500 vacancies. That just is not exactly right. There are not that many vacancies. There never were. These jobs never were filled. They were authorized last year to take care of this new Agency and to set up this new facility. They have never been filled. But as of February of 1959 the actual employment was 27,445, in March, 28,099; and if this had not been reduced, we would have the 29,893 to maintain these facilities. So, you see, you are not increasing a single person in this bill, you are reducing by 893 the number of people you have to have to man these important facilities.

As I said, there are 17 long-range radars. I intend to get permission when we go back into the House to insert in the RECORD where these will be. They will be at Montauk, Long Island; Roanoke, Va.; El Paso, Tex.; surprisingly enough, Houston, Tex.; Jackson, Miss.; Nashville, Tenn.; Orlando, Fla.; Pensacola, Fla.; Texarkana, Ark., LaGrange, Ind.; Fresno, Calif.; Klamath Falls, Oreg.; Las Vegas, Nev.; Needles, Calif.; Paso Robles, Calif.; Salem, Oreg.; and Sacramento, Calif.

Now, there are terminal radars right down the line. May I say that the air traffic control towers that will be cut out will be Atlantic City and Cleveland, Ohio—I say to my colleague from Ohio. Cleveland is losing the new lake-front control tower.

Huntington, W. Va.
Trenton, N.J.
Williamsport, Pa.

I could go on and read them all, all over the country, where these necessary facilities for safety in the air will not be in operation by reason of these severe cuts.

It can be said that this is a great increase over the years. Last year we brought it to you on the floor of the House and you passed it and approved it. But today you are reducing the manpower, but you still have the facilities which cannot be operated. I say to you my colleagues, I sincerely hope, and I am not going to offer an amendment, but I sincerely hope that when this bill comes back from the other body, some of these funds will be restored. I do not believe this whole $76 million should be restored. Believe me, this committee has done an excellent job on this bill. I do not believe the research development is particularly necessary. I think what should be put in this bill is the amount of money necessary to man all of these facilities so that these things which we have purchased, the facilities which we have ready for operation, can be manned and operated rather than for this new modern technique for the jet age, built and established by the wisdom of this Congress, should have no one to operate them.

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

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I would just like to say to the gentleman from Ohio that I have never agreed with any statement more than with the statement just made by the gentleman. All you have to do is to look at these numerous installations here which will not come into being because of the lack of these funds—and I might add—below the budget request. I think it is a serious matter and something to which we should give more attention. Just recently in this House, we talked so long about air safety and air safety devices and many other things that we should do for the traveling public, and yet here today we are going to cut out many of these installations that are so vital and so necessary. I commend the gentleman for the position he has taken on this particular matter.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

The committee's action in reducing the Federal Aviation Agency's 1960 budget request by $76 million cannot be reconciled with recent actions of the Congress to correct serious deficiencies in Federal aviation programs. Starting in 1957 the Congress has consistently supported efforts to develop, purchase, and install the electronic and communications equipment required to increase the capacity of the air navigation and traffic management system and has provided the funds needed to support this objective. These increased appropriations have financed the first stages of a several year program to close the gap between the capacity of the traffic management system and the expanding needs of civil and military aviation. In providing substantial sums to establish additional air navigation and traffic control facilities, the Congress certainly intended that resources would be made available to operate these and existing facilities to their capacity.

Only last year, the Congress authorized the establishment of the Federal Aviation Agency to centralize in a single organization responsibility for those functions necessary to meet the common needs of military and civil aviation. An important purpose of this act was to integrate, during the next few years, military air navigation, traffic management and communications activities into one system, administered by FAA.

Successful completion of these major efforts to correct deficiencies and effectively integrate civil-military activities and achieve the economies that will flow from this integration, is largely dependent on the availability of adequate resources to FAA. Appropriation reductions of the magnitude recommended by the committee will effectively prevent the FAA from achieving the purposes of the Federal Aviation Act and will, in fact, lead to a reduction in the existing level of services.

EXPENSES

With respect to FAA's appropriation for operating expenses, the committee recommends an allowance of $283.2 million, a reduction of $43.2 million from the Agency's request. The committee indicated that the increase of $26 million over the 1959 appropriation will provide 500 additional positions in 1960 and increase the authorized strength of FAA by 3,500 from the current payroll. This is not the case. The vacancy figures of 3,000 used by the committee were as of February 28, 1959, which has been reduced at a rate of 600 per month. The practical effect of the committee's action is to freeze the present authorized strength of the Agency as the dollar allowance is approximately $9 million less than the amount needed to finance, in 1960, the program authorized by Congress for the end of the 1959 fiscal year.

The allowance makes no provision for increased workload requirements arising from a 14 percent increase in aviation activity and the rapid transition from piston-driven to turbine-powered aircraft. Furthermore, FAA will not have the manpower and funds necessary to operate some 500 new air navigation and traffic management facilities, representing an investment of more than $50 million for procurement and installation funds appropriated in prior years.

FAA requirements for operating expenses in a given year are largely determined by prior appropriations for procurement and installation of new facilities and by workload requirements resulting from increased aviation activity. The request for 1960 indicates that $292.3 million is needed to continue the level of operations to be reached in the current fiscal year, $15.4 million for additional workload, and $17.2 million for new facilities and services that are required to keep the operating program in phase with the commissioning schedule of the long-term improvement program.

Failure to provide the additional funds needed will result in an increase in traffic delays and flight cancellations. It will not be possible to operate such important new equipments as 17 long-range radars, 19 terminal area radars, 28 traffic control towers, 166 VORTAC facilities, and 44 approach light systems. All segments of aviation in all areas of the country will be adversely affected by this action. These are key facilities in extending positive traffic control and relieving airspace congestions. Without these radar facilities, it will not be possible to extend areas where controllers can see potential traffic conflicts along busy airways.

My experience indicates that budget estimates for these activities represent

sound, straigthforward planning of requirements. The committee is kept advised of program changes that materially reduce the Agency's dollar requirements.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

The allowance of $131.2 million is $13.8 million below the request and $100 million below the amount called for in 1960 in the 1959 Federal airway plan. In anticipation of joint use of military facilities and to hold back all but the most urgent needs pending the outcome of the research and development effort of the Agency, the FAA supported the $145 million in the President's budget, but did so recognizing it was the the absolute minimum in light of undeferrable needs. The report specifically denies $5.1 million for the purchase of three jet aircraft required to perform high altitude flight inspections of the reliability of our facilities. The military and civil jet aircraft are now operating at high altitudes. The FAA does not have the capability of determining at high altitudes the reliability of ground-based air navigation equipments. The additional reduction of $8.7 million is primarily attributed to excessive cost estimates for equipment to be procured. The estimates submitted were based on engineering studies and considerable experience in procuring the types of equipment included in the 1960 estimate. Therefore, the effect of this reduction is to eliminate needed equipments.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The allowance of $47.1 million for research and development is a reduction of $16.5 from the request. Capital improvements at the FAA test facility, including the construction of a runway, were specifically denied. This program is the means through which the new concepts of equipments, leading to greater capacity and equipments, will be developed. This will retard the evaluation of research efforts which are being conducted by industry. There is a need to test the results of all of our research and development efforts, prior to their adoption for use and the expenditure of substantial capital funds.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

The allowance of $47.5 million is a reduction of $2.5 million in the budget estimate. These funds are required to make payments for obligations authorize by Congress in prior years. This action will delay payments to participants in the Federal-aid airport program.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

The full amount of the budget estimate of $2.4 million was approved by the committee.

Federal Aviation Agency expenses appropriation

Employment authorized by 1959 Appropriation Act	29,893
Agency planned employment, June 30, 1959	29,893
Employment financed by House committee allowance	29,000
Reduction required by House allowance	893

Federal Aviation Agency expenses appropriation—Continued

New employees required beyond June 30, 1959:	
To man new facilities	2,791
To meet increasing workload	2,207
Additional employment required above House committee 1960 allowance	5,891

Employment[1] financed by expenses appropriation

Date	Agency plan[2]	Actual employment	1960 House allowance
June 1958	22,676	22,763	--------
July	23,422	23,309	--------
August	23,893	23,780	--------
September	24,312	24,218	--------
October	24,991	24,833	--------
November	25,778	25,384	--------
December	26,430	26,113	--------
January 1959	26,896	26,761	--------
February	27,496	27,445	--------
March	28,096	28,099	--------
April	28,696	--------	--------
May	29,296	--------	--------
June	29,893	--------	29,000

[1] Includes permanently authorized positions, temporary positions, and intermittent employees.

[2] Planned employment levels anticipate continuing vacancies at a rate of about 2 percent, due to employee turnover. Permanent positions authorized for June 30, 1959, are 30,382.

EXPENSES APPROPRIATIONS

The House allowance for fiscal year 1960 does not provide for the manning of the facilities listed below, which have been procured with funds already provided by the Congress: 17 long range radars, 19 terminal radars, 28 traffic control towers, 166 short range navigation facilities, 44 approach lights systems, 24 instrument landing systems.

Funds required to place these facilities in operation were estimated at $17.2 million.

Detailed breakdown follows:

Long range radar

The 17 additional long range radar facilities requested for fiscal year 1960, which are not provided for under the House allowance, are located at the following sites: Montauk, Long Island, N.Y.; Roanoke, Va.; El Paso, Tex.; Houston, Tex.; Jackson, Miss.; Nashville, Tenn.; Orlando, Fla.; Pensacola, Fla.; Texarkana, Ark.; LaGrange (Goshen) Ind.; Fresno, Calif.; Klamath Falls, Oreg.; Las Vegas, Nev.; Needles, Calif.; Paso Robles, Calif.; Salem, Oreg.; Sacramento, Calif.

These facilities are required to provide positive identification of aircraft and maximum safety.

Terminal radars

The 19 additional terminal radar facilities requested for fiscal year 1960, which are not provided for under the House allowance, are located at the following sites: Atlantic City, N.J. (2); Pittsburgh, Pa.; Oakland, Calif.; Kansas City, Mo.; Dallas, Tex.; Houston, Tex.; Seattle, Wash.; Lincoln, AFB, Nebr.; Robbins, Macon, Ga.; Little Rock, Ark.; Detroit, Mich.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Portland, Oreg.; San Francisco, Calif.; St. Louis, Mo.; Beaufort, Morehead, N.C.; Dyess, Abilene, Tex.; Mather, Sacramento, Calif.

These facilities are needed to provide positive identification and maximum safety at high density airports.

Airport traffic control towers

The 28 additional airport traffic control towers requested for fiscal year 1960, which were not provided for under the House allowance, are located at the following sites: Atlantic City, N.J.; Cleveland, Ohio (lake front); Huntington, W. Va.; Trenton, N.J.; Williamsport, Pa.; Hot Springs, Ark.; Key West, Fla.; Oklahoma City, Okla. (Tulakes); Plainview, Tex.; Sarasota, Fla.; Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Champaign, Ill.; Green Bay, Wis.; Kalamazoo, Mich.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Milwaukee, Wis. (Curtis Wright); Oshkosh, Wis.; Concord, Calif.; Fresno, Calif. (Chandler); Fullerton, Calif.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Ogden, Utah (municipal); Oxnard-Ventura, Calif.; Roswell, N. Mex.; Santa Ana, Calif.; Santa Rosa, Calif.; Spokane, Wash. (Felts); Torrence, Calif.

These facilities are needed to provide improved safety at locations where activity has reached the standards established for such service.

Short-range navigation facilities

The 166 short-range navigation facilities requested for fiscal year 1960, which were not provided for under the House allowance, are located at the following sites:

Akron (Wellington), Ohio; Atlantic City, N.J. (2); Attica, Ohio; Blackford, Va. (2); Bradford, Pa.; Brushy Run, W. Va. (2); Cameron, Pa. (2); Central City, Ky.; Colts Neck, N.J.; Commack, N.Y. (2); Craigsville, Va. (2); Elmira, N.Y.; Findlay, Ohio; Franklin, Va. (2); Garrett, Pa. (2); Hartford, Conn.; Johnstown, Pa.; Linden, Va. (2); Nantucket, Mass.; New Haven, Conn. (2); Presque Isle, Maine; Robbinsville, N.J. (2); St. Thomas, Pa. (2); Patuxent, Md. (2); Pulaski, Va.; Thornhurst (Caldwell), Pa.; Tidioute, Pa.; Tower City, Pa.; Tyrone, Pa.; Washington, D.C. (2); Worcester, Mass. (2); Zanesville, Ohio; Abilene, Tex.; Alice, Tex.; Alma, Ga.; Ardmore, Okla.; Athens, Ga.; Baton Rouge, La.; Big Springs, Tex.; Bristol (Tri-City), Tenn.; Columbia, S.C.; Columbus, Miss.; El-Dorado, Ark.; El Paso, Tex.; Fayetteville, Ark.; Kingfisher, Okla.; Longview (Gregg County), Tex.; McDonough, Ga.; Mobile, Ala.; Muscle Shoals, Ala.; Orlando, Fla.; Raleigh, N.C.; Rock Springs, Tex.; Savannah, Ga.; Spartanburg, S.C.; Sulphur Springs, Tex.; Taccoa, Ga. (2); Tallahassee, Fla.; Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Tuskeegee, Ala.; Vienna, Ga.; Columbia, Mo.; Dupree, S. Dak.; Grand Island, Nebr.; Huron, S. Dak.; Iowa City, Iowa; Knox, Ind.; Lafayette, Ind.; Liberal, Kans.; Lone Rock, Wis.; Mankato, Kans.; Maples, Mo.; Marquette, Mich. (2); Minneapolis, Minn.; Naperville, Ill.; Nodine, Minn.; Rochester, Minn.; Sioux City, Iowa; Smithwick, S. Dak. (2); Westpoint, Ind.; Winner, S. Dak.; Wolbach, Nebr.; Alamosa, Colo.; Arlington, Calif.; Billings, Mont.; Blythe, Calif.; Bonneville, Utah; Cherokee, Wyo.; Cochise, Ariz.; Dunoir, Wyo.; Tobe, Colo.; Beulahville, Va.; Church, Iowa; Buckeye, W. Va.; Kinston, N.C.; Oxnard, Calif.; Swainsboro, Ga.; Yuba Pass, Calif.; Keating, Pa.; Mystic, Ky.; Ricker Island, N.Y.; South Kaui, T.H.; Gaviota, Calif; Gila Bend, Ariz.; Gunnison, Colo.; Hermosa, Calif. (2); Monterey, Calif.; Newberg, Oreg.; Olympia, Wash.; Ontario, Calif.; Fresno, Calif.; Slate Run, Pa.; Grand Marsh, Wis.; Bimini, West Indies; Idaho Falls, Idaho; McAllen, Tex.; Port Angeles, Wash.; Hyannis, Mass.; Kennebunk, Maine; Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Houghton, Mich.; Shadyside, Md.; Anchorage, Alaska; Bethel, Alaska (2); Cold Bay, Alaska (2); Fairbanks, Alaska (2); King Salmon, Alaska (2); Sisters Islands, Alaska (2); Kenai, Alaska (2); El Centro, Calif.; Ukiah, Calif.; Garrison, Mo.; Danville, Ill.; Cincinnati (Lunken), Ohio; Liberty, N.C.; Pasco, Wash.; Talladega, Ala.; Taylor, Fla.; Toledo, Iowa; Grand Marais, Mich.; Kansas City, Mo.

These facilities are required to improve the safety and reliability of the total airways system.

Approach lights systems

The 44 approach lights systems requested for fiscal year 1960, which were not provided for under the House allowance, are located at the following sites: Allentown, Pa.; Rochester, N.Y.; Washington, D.C. (second facility); Wheeling, W. Va.; Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; Amarillo, Tex.; Atlanta, Ga. (second facil-

ity); Baton Rouge, La.; Fort Smith, Ark.; Greenville, S.C.; Lafayette, La.; Albany, N.Y.; South Bend, Ind.; Wilmington, Del.; Nashville, Tenn.; Fairbanks, Alaska; Macon, Ga.; Spartanburg, S.C.; St. Petersburg, Fla.; Tyler, Tex.; Wichita Falls, Tex.; Wilmington, N.C.; Battle Creek, Mich.; Evansville, Ind.; Green Bay, Wis.; Muskegon, Mich.; Peoria, Ill.; Des Moines, Iowa; Reading, Pa.; Portland, Oreg.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; Rochester, Minn.; Bakersfield, Calif.; Cheyenne, Wyo.; Eugene, Oreg.; Monterey, Calif.; Reno, Nev.; Seattle-Tacoma, Wash. (second facility); King Salmon, Alaska; Honolulu, T.H.; Charleston, W. Va.; Boise, Idaho; El Paso, Tex., and San Antonio, Tex.

These approach lights extend outward from a runway to aid pilots during landings.

Instrument landing systems

The 24 instrument landing systems requested for fiscal year 1960, which were not provided for under the House allowance, are located at the following sites: Akron (Mun), Ohio; Atlantic City, N.J.; Boston, Mass. (second facility); Cleveland, Ohio (second facility; Reno, Nev.; San Diego, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif.; Abilene, Tex.; Cold Bay, Alaska; St. Petersburg, Fla.; Spartanburg, S.C.; Waco, Tex.; Muskegon, Mich.; Peoria, Ill.; Waterloo, Iowa; Columbus, Ohio (second facility); Mansfield, Ohio; Washington, D.C.; Seattle (Tacoma), Wash.; Atlanta, Ga. (second facility); Columbus, Ga.; Honolulu, T.H.; Springfield, Mo., and Wichita Falls, Tex.

These facilities provide pilots with direction, distance, and glide slope information for making an approach to a runway under conditions of poor visibility.

I ask you to consider these facts and urge your support of this important program.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question. On page 6, under the heading, "Investigations of United States citizens for employment by international organizations," there is an appropriation of $400,000. May I ask the gentleman whether those Government employees who provide the United Nations and other international organizations with information are exempt from paying Federal income taxes as are the employees of the United Nations?

Mr. THOMAS. Frankly, I cannot answer that question. That is a tax matter.

Mr. GROSS. I just wondered if any part of the $400,000 would be used for the purpose of tax reimbursement?

Mr. THOMAS. I have heard, that they are exempt. But, I will give it to you for what it is worth. It is hearsay with me.

Mr. GROSS. Who is exempt?

Mr. THOMAS. Our employees.

Mr. GROSS. Of the United Nations. Of course, they are. There is no question about that. I just wonder if the people who work for them are likewise exempt.

Mr. THOMAS. No, no.

Mr. GROSS. And whether this $400,000 is to reimburse them.

Mr. THOMAS. We all pay.

The Clerk read as follows:

SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, $25 million, to remain available until expended, and this amount shall be expended for projects at such additional locations as may be selected by the Administrator of General Services and in amounts he deems necessary.

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

CAMDEN, ARK.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for the inclusion of $25 million for the purchase of sites and planning of public buildings for the next fiscal year.

I observe from the reading of the hearings that among others to be included for this purpose is a post office Federal all-purpose building for Camden, Ark.

I want to thank the committee, not only for myself but for the people of Camden and those to be served by this facility. There is no community, anywhere in the country, in my opinion, that is in greater need for such a facility than is Camden, Ark.

As brought out in the hearings, the General Services Administration is "operating under the old 1926 act." There were some questions raised as to the limitation but on further discussion and consideration, it is made clear that the authority that was given in the old act was unlimited.

For this and the other three projects, the Administrator of General Services Administration, stated that they would not need construction money for this year.

The question was asked by the chairman of Mr. Macomber and Mr. Floete, the Administrator of General Services Administration, if they could "take care of these four projects without any language changed, and so forth?"

Mr. Macomber replied: "I think probably that could be done with just an appropriation for sites and expenses."

Mr. Floete, the Administrator, then agreed by stating "without designating what?" and Mr. Macomber further stated "or by designating," and the chairman, Mr. THOMAS said: "It could be done with some sites and planning money because you have the authority."

This is clear, Mr. Chairman, that of the $25 million appropriated for this purpose, the site is to be acquired and planning for such a public building at Camden, Ark.

The hearings further revealed that the total cost would be some $795,000.

Again, I am grateful for the committee and this House for including this project. I am sure the General Services Administration will proceed as expeditiously as possible toward the acquisition of a site for the Federal building in Camden, Ark., and planning for its construction at such future time as construction funds will be made available, which I hope will be the following year.

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

SALARIES AND EXPENSES FOR SEC

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the committee in its wisdom reduced the budget request for the operation of the Securities and Exchange Commission in the sum of $475,000. It is true this is some $127,000 above the current year.

Too often the work of the Securities and Exchange Commission is not fully understood and appreciated by the average American citizen. The committee has done an excellent job in connection with the overall budget included in this bill for the independent offices or agencies of the Government. I do raise a question, however, as to the wisdom of this reduction for the operation of the Securities and Exchange Commission during the next fiscal year.

There is nothing sacrosanct about a budget estimate. It is, as we know, arrived at in an effort to provide an adequate service, as in this agency for an example. It is usually arrived at on the basis of the actual needs. At least, an effort is made toward this objective.

No one has been more critical of some of the actions of the Securities and Exchange Commission that I and our committee. It was so during the course of our investigation during the last Congress. You are familiar with some of the problems that we developed. I am convinced that a part of the trouble has been the lack of personnel to do the effective job that we expect this agency to do.

No one knows better than our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the tremendous workload of this agency. Registrations increased 29 percent over the last year, and this is one of the services performed by this agency which is most important and which, as we found in our investigation last year, was to a great extent responsible for some of the trouble that we uncovered.

The increased workload of cases referred to the Department of Justice for criminal action over last year is 167 percent. This requires a lot of work and personnel to prepare the cases and determine whether or not such action should be taken.

And I could go on enumerating the increased demands made of this agency. I will have included with this statement an outline showing the status as of now as compared with last year and what will be expected in the future.

The committee provided only for 10 additional personnel for the agency. These are all in the field. Much of this work is performed here in Washington. If we are going to expect this agency to perform its duty, then we should give them sufficient funds for personnel that will be effective. If we are not, we have no right to criticize the agency for the lack of a service which is demanded by the public in this field.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that in the light of this information which I am giving to the House, the full amount of

the budget request will be approved. The following outline shows the exact situation which the Congress should very well take note in its final decision.

Securities and Exchange Commission

	Total amount	Positions		
		Department	Field	Total
1959 appropriation	[1] $7,737,000	562	391	953
1960 estimate	8,275,000	592	426	1,018
1960 estimate proposed by House Committee on Appropriations	7,800,000	562	401	963

[1] Includes supplemental request of $637,000 to finance cost of pay increase for the Commission.

Securities and Exchange Commission—statement of certain principal workload items for the 10-month period ending Apr. 30, 1959 and 1958

Principal workload item	10-month period ending—		Percent of increase, 1959 over 1958
	Apr. 30, 1959	Apr. 30, 1958	
1. Registration statements filed	941	731	29
Dollar value of registration statements filed, in billions	$14.3	$13.5	6
2. Regulation A filings	703	602	17
Dollar value of regulation A filings, in millions	$139.5	$110.8	26
3. Preliminary proxy statements filed	1,879	1,821	3
4. Cases referred to the Department of Justice for criminal action	40	15	167
5. Pending investigations:			
Beginning of period	937	978	(4)
Opening during period	410	377	9
Subtotal	1,347	1,355	(1)
Closed during period	345	387	(1)
Pending, end of period	1,002	968	4
6. Broker-dealer inspections	1,066	1,045	2

[1] Investigations closed during the 10-month period ending Apr. 30, 1959, required far more time and effort than those investigations experienced in the past. Specifically, approximately 75 percent of all investigations opened for the 10 months ending Apr. 30, 1959, represented full-scale investigations as compared to approximately 64 percent of all investigations opened for the 10-month period ending Apr. 30, 1958.

Securities and Exchange Commission—statement of certain principal workload items for the 10-month period ending Apr. 30, 1959, and 1958

Principal workload item	10-month period ending—		Percent of increase 1959 over 1958
	Apr. 30, 1959	Apr. 30, 1958	
7. Number of registered investment companies	502	449	12
8. Registration of new investment companies	58	34	71
9. Review of filings for compliance with regulatory provisions of Investment Company Act of 1940	944	819	15
10. Regulation of financing transactions under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935	219	186	18

Securities and Exchange Commission—statement of certain principal workload items for the 10-month period ending Apr. 30, 1959, and 1958—Continued

Principal workload item	10-month period ending—		Percent of increase 1959 over 1958
	Apr. 30, 1959	Apr. 30, 1958	
11. Regulation of acquisitions of securities, utility assets and other assets under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935	131	94	39
12. Number of reorganization petitions filed in courts under ch. X of the National Bankruptcy Act	79	58	36

Securities and Exchange Commission

	Calendar year 1958	Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1959
Transactions on stock exchanges:	*Billions*	
Number of shares	1.4	507 million.
Dollar value	$38.4	$14.1 billion.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

General operating expenses

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans, uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed $3,500 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed $67,000 for preparation, shipments, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures, and other visual education information and descriptive material, including purchase or rental of equipment; $160,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: On page 26, line 2, strike out "$160,000,000" and insert "$163,373,000."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the committee has cut from the appropriation for the Veterans Adminstration an amount of $3,373,000 in general operating expenses; $9,279,000 in in-patient care; $866,000 from out-patient care; $85,000 in maintenance and operation of supply depots; $7 million in pensions, and $3 million in readjustment benefits.

Mr. Chairman, amendments will be offered to restore the cuts in operating expenses, in-patient care, and out-patient care.

Mr. Chairman, the Veterans Administration asked for $168,918,220 for this item. The Bureau of the Budget cut that to $163,373,000. The Appropriations Committee cut it to $160 million.

This morning, from the Veterans Administration, we are told that this amount of money is paid from the operating cost of the Department of Veterans Benefits, the Department of Insurance. The reductions would require the elimination of approximately 500 positions for the next fiscal year below the amount now projected, and that this would have to be accomplished mostly at the expense of operations in the field.

The gentleman from Illinois mentioned 2,500 pages of testimony. Here are 4,700 pages of information that our committee has on veterans' affairs. We feel that each year we have cut and cut the veterans' benefits until we have reached a point that is dangerous. That is the reason the committee this year is so interested and is doing everything it can to restore this money.

I hope the committee will adopt my amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I believe the Committee and the House will restore this money. If you go back over the years you will realize that many of these men would not be in the condition they are in today if they had had the proper equipment, the proper medical care when they needed it. That goes back to World War I days, when we did not have an airplane that was fit for anyone to ride in. It goes back to World War II when they were not properly equipped. It goes back to the Korean days when our men were not properly trained and did not have the proper equipment or care. We were unprepared. They suffered frozen feet and many other disabilities because they did not have proper clothing.

Perhaps the committee does not realize these things, it does not go into the hospitals enough to realize what these cuts mean. In my personal mail today I have several cases that have waited a year to be rerated due to shortage of personnel in the Veterans' Administration. Veterans have died because they were not seen in the outpatient clinics or they were sent back to wait for hospitalization. Lack of personnel in hospitals, accidents, even hangings—and murders—but it is not necessary to argue because I know the Committee will restore these cuts.

I have been told that the House committee reported a total of $5,002,226,000 as compared to the budget request of $5,029,485,000, a net reduction of $9,259,000. This does not tell the story. The committee added $10 million for construction over and above the budget request and $4,344,000 for medical research so that the cut, aside from the re-

ductions, totals $23,603,000. Of this amount $10 million was in the direct benefit areas and $13,603,000 was in the operating appropriations where the cut will hurt.

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

The reduction in general operating expenses is $3,373,000. From this appropriation are paid the operating costs of the Department of Veterans' Benefits, the Department of Insurance, and the Central Office staff exclusive of the Department of Medicine and Surgery. This reduction would require the elimination of approximately 500 positions for the fiscal year 1960 below the amount now projected. This would have to be accomplished largely in the 67 Department of Veterans' Benefits field stations.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

The committee added $4,344,000 to this appropriation and earmarked it for medical research. This would bring the total available for medical research for 1960 to $15,344,000 which is the 1959 level. The Veterans' Administration can use profitably the medical research money but not at the expense of the operating appropriations, particularly the care of patients.

INPATIENT CARE

The reduction in inpatient care is $9,279,000. In addition the committee report earmarks $2,900,000 of the appropriation to be spent for additional deferred maintenance which was not requested. This, in effect, means a total cut of $12,179,000 in the inpatient appropriation for patient care and provides an increase over 1959 of only $6,478,000. The budget request anticipated an additional employment of about 2,600 people for improved patient care. Due to within-grade salary increases and other rising costs the $6,478,000 will be more than absorbed so that the net effect will be less employment for 1960 than was experienced for 1959.

OUTPATIENT CARE

The committee reduced the outpatient care request by $866,000. The outpatient load has continued to increase throughout the current fiscal year and indications are that it will continue to increase in fiscal year 1960. This reduction will result in backlogging of physical examinations for compensation and pension purposes. This is an area where much difficulty was experienced during the early part of the current year. This appropriation covers only service-connected disability cases.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF SUPPLY DEPOTS

The committee reduced this appropriation request by $85,000. While this is a small amount, it is related to a small appropriation and the increase is necessary because of Wage Board increases which have already been approved. The reduction of $85,000 will require a reduction of appoximately 15 people.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS AND READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

The committee reduced compensation and pensions $7 million and readjustment benefits $3 million. These are rounded off figures and the reductions are not significant in view of the magnitude of the appropriation and the fact that the Congress will provide through supplemental appropriations such additional funds as may be found necessary to meet statutory benefit provisions.

CONSTRUCTION

The committee added $10 million for construction. This amount certainly can be used profitably by the Veterans' Administration but the increase at the expense of the operating appropriations does produce very serious results.

I am sure that the Veterans' Administration will verify this.

The American Legion has asked me to do everything possible to restore VA cuts.

MAY 11, 1959.

Three important areas of the VA 1960 budget have just been slashed by the Appropriations Committee: $9¼ million slash in inpatient care: $3⅓ million cut in general operating expenses; and a slash of over $800,000 in outpatient care. These three funds have to do primarily with care of the sick and disabled. These cuts will substantially reduce treatment for paraplegics, blind, and mentally afflicted, and other disabled. The DAV believes that heavily reducing these vital funds below amounts already approved even by the Bureau of the Budget is poor economy; this will result in fewer doctors and nurses; service-connected veterans will have to wait for treatment and examination in outpatient clinics. The DAV earnestly requests restoration of these funds.

Judge DAVID B. WILLIAMS,
National Commander, DAV.

The above telegram came to me from the DAV.

Mr. Omar Ketchum of the Veterans of Foreign Wars telephoned a vigorous protest to the cuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, my reason for rising at this time in support of the pending amendment is to say that I have today discussed this matter with the representatives of big veterans organizations with offices in Washington. They tell me that this, and amendments immediately to follow, are extremely important, that during next year we are going to need this money; otherwise they are going to have to cut services where it hurts. I do not think we ought to cut the service in the hospitals where they are needed.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore support the amendment by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, let me talk a little common, everyday horse sense about this program.

First, let us see what the amendment does. This has nothing to do with medicine, not a thing in the world. This is general administration. It covers benefits, programs, insurance, housing, housekeeping, publicity—everything but medicine.

It is time, in my humble judgment, for this House to use some good old common everyday horse sense relative to veterans. We do not have to get frightened when we hear the word "veteran" mentioned. We are all veterans. Lord knows, if this cold war keeps on much longer every male in this country under 30 years of age in another 10 years will almost be a veteran. So everybody is affected.

This covers general operating expenses, the bookkeepers, accountants, housekeepers, everybody except the nurses and doctors, and it has nothing to do with medicine.

Do you know how much money is involved here? One hundred and sixty-three million dollars. We cut it $3 million, and you just rise up in holy horror. Do you know what our information is? They have 350 jobs over there unfilled out of a personnel load of 23,000 or 24,000. Think of it. There is $160 million involved, and we are asking for a 2-percent cut here. Now, be frank about it. If it was any other agency, you would not mention it; you would not even turn on your heels about it. You are not dealing with medicine here. That is coming up a little bit later. And, I am going to oppose that addition, too. Now, gentlemen, think about it. Just 2 percent, and you are having high blood pressure. It has reached the point in the House of Representatives, where under the Constitution money bills are supposed to originate, if you touch anything that affects the veteran, you have committed a sin. I am a veteran, yes, and most of you folks are veterans. Who wants to hurt the veteran? Not a man; not a soul.

I think we have one of the finest administrators we ever had. And as far as the chairman and the former chairman are concerned, my lovable friend, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. TEAGUE, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, there are just no finer. Let us vote this down. We are not hurting anybody. Let us go to conference, and when we get through, we will do the right thing as we have always done for the veterans. Nobody wants to hurt them. You are dealing with a very large amount of money, and the cut is very, very trivial. Think about it—2 percent.

I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS) there were—ayes 50, noes 37.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 70, noes 55.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INPATIENT CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Ad-

ministration in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration as authorized by law, includng the furnishing of recreational articles and facilities; maintenance and operation of farms; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; purchase of fifty-two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State or Territorial homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38, United States Code, for the support of veterans eligible for admission to Veterans Administration facilities for hospital or domiciliary care; $777,500,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided,* That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments, for disbursement by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration: *Provided further,* That the foregoing appropriation is predicated on furnishing inpatient care and treatment to an average of 140,846 beneficiaries during the fiscal year 1960, including members in State or Territorial homes, and if a lesser number is experienced such appropriation shall be expended only in proportion to the average number of beneficiaries furnished such care and treatment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: On page 27, line 14, strike out "$777,500,000, plus reimbursements" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$792,079,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided,* That $8,400,000 of such sum shall be for deferred maintenance" and on page 28, line 9, after the semicolon strike out "$83,000,000" and insert "$83,866,000".

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if I were half as able as my good colleague from Texas, I would try to put back all this money; but I am not, and I am merely trying to put back that money that I think is absolutely essential for the benefit of our veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be asked to read again the first part of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the first part of the amendment.)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as I said before, we have about 4,700 pages of data on our hospitals. There is an item in one of these amendments that includes $8,400,000 for deferred maintenance, on which other members of my committee will speak; but I merely wish to speak about the inpatient and outpatient care.

As far as our outpatient care is concerned, this pertains only to service-connected disability. I should like to read what the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs gave me this morning, and I quote:

The committee reduced the outpatient care request by $866,000. The operation load has continued to increase throughout the current fiscal year, and indications are that it will continue to increase in the fiscal year of 1960. This reduction will result in backlogging of physical examinations for compensation and pension purposes. This is an area where much difficulty was experienced during the early part of the current year. This appropriation covers only service-connected disability cases.

I should like to read what we received from the Administrator on inpatient care, and again, I quote:

The reduction in inpatient care is $9,279,000. In addition, the committee report earmarks $2,900,000 of the appropriation to be spent for additional deferred maintenance, which was not requested. This, in effect, means a total cut of $12,179,000 in the inpatient appropriation for patient care and provides an increase over 1959 of only $6,478,000. The budget request anticipated an additional employment of about 2,600 people for improved patient care. Due to within-grade salary increases and other rising costs the $6,478,000 will be more than absorbed so that the net effect will be less employment for 1960 than was experienced for 1959.

In the 83d, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has carefully surveyed the VA medical system by individual stations. The present survey is nearing completion and the tables below give the net cost of operation of VA hospitals for 1955–59 fiscal years:

Net cost of operation of VA hospitals, fiscal years 1955–59

Hospital	Fiscal year	Elements of cost									Cost per patient discharged
		Total	Salaries of staff	Patient travel	Communications	Utilities	Raw foods	Drugs and medicines	Medical and dental supplies	Asset acquisitions	
Alabama:											
Birmingham (G.M. & S.)	1955	$2,904,245	$2,226,850	$64,054	$18,049	$78,212	$118,119	(1)	$203,827	$47,775	$704
	1956	2,805,790	2,214,316	25,501	18,546	77,915	122,967	$90,915	95,040	27,074	708
	1957	2,892,338	2,336,387	26,612	18,111	77,812	127,310	99,810	91,428	10,700	755
	1958	3,238,094	2,568,766	20,441	14,333	85,339	140,458	126,967	110,266	45,797	729
	1959	3,429,603	2,758,536	22,300	13,372	88,267	175,733	127,021	115,075	21,734	752
Montgomery (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,763,785	1,373,172	28,544	7,154	33,344	109,327	43,085	29,284	34,095	528
	1956	1,857,645	1,460,950	27,139	7,358	36,025	106,929	41,849	37,166	28,531	565
	1957	1,837,361	1,466,067	25,404	7,804	37,101	103,610	41,952	39,475	21,842	590
	1958	1,984,123	1,622,329	22,430	7,887	40,299	101,573	47,747	36,981	11,495	665
	1959	2,058,067	1,692,212	23,779	8,109	38,092	102,806	47,401	41,444	8,440	667
Tuscaloosa (NP)	1955	3,201,722	2,612,689	12,879	9,208	51,164	314,071	33,697	21,836	24,370	1,492
	1956	3,305,494	2,691,626	10,217	9,257	50,771	315,039	38,818	28,716	34,249	1,340
	1957	3,334,948	2,724,489	7,869	9,389	49,088	319,193	42,598	37,265	38,084	1,007
	1958	3,686,249	2,981,926	9,727	9,294	52,777	325,781	52,174	44,256	78,035	1,108
	1959	3,835,292	3,231,884	9,270	9,385	60,176	333,956	48,499	33,142	6,231	1,197
Tuskegee (NP)	1955	7,102,688	5,612,639	56,260	19,140	79,865	748,572	92,177	79,300	41,613	145
	1956	7,650,228	6,055,368	53,531	20,105	94,512	702,002	98,602	131,610	113,567	135
	1957	7,561,810	6,031,157	48,731	20,036	92,690	650,508	128,412	154,147	128,784	194
	1958	7,859,972	6,498,510	41,291	20,891	85,194	655,124	122,040	132,721	20,810	137
	1959	8,257,512	6,917,226	41,547	20,727	84,680	634,833	113,464	114,111	28,049	165
Arizona:											
Phoenix (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,597,095	1,235,110	10,455	13,893	68,384	78,043	53,996	42,426	18,733	587
	1956	1,651,678	1,331,716	10,018	11,195	52,716	73,875	56,410	45,471	14,199	583
	1957	1,653,640	1,339,140	8,704	10,159	53,206	72,593	63,735	40,848	14,018	639
	1958	1,820,354	1,491,939	10,963	9,949	55,846	75,669	58,750	41,612	25,056	745
	1959	1,896,935	1,588,932	11,165	10,247	57,828	78,526	60,485	39,181	6,648	722
Tucson (TB)	1955	2,520,536	1,994,836	8,668	5,397	39,582	178,351	66,776	36,104	54,227	1,376
	1956	2,659,418	2,155,270	9,171	6,212	38,478	171,137	76,190	46,965	37,918	1,186
	1957	2,848,047	2,190,072	13,952	6,694	37,662	168,298	78,224	55,110	126,654	1,279
	1958	2,825,912	2,301,917	6,832	9,044	43,915	166,621	64,424	45,290	22,840	1,377
	1959	2,966,168	2,413,230	6,684	18,647	53,566	166,327	68,374	48,548	22,806	1,433
Whipple (TB)	1955	2,030,434	1,597,296	10,636	8,706	55,764	161,390	49,657	31,721	38,447	1,479
	1956	2,125,335	1,673,433	12,099	8,769	56,679	157,708	49,612	38,088	21,461	1,450
	1957	2,202,502	1,726,061	11,952	8,972	55,143	148,268	60,077	40,243	50,470	1,346
	1958	2,513,801	1,937,017	10,816	9,137	58,367	150,734	51,141	36,093	39,622	1,339
	1959	2,453,699	1,99,6651	9,587	11,369	63,000	144,687	53,952	32,451	46,822	1,188

Footnotes at end of table.

Net cost of operation of VA hospitals, fiscal years 1955–59—Continued

Hospital	Fiscal year	Elements of cost: Total	Salaries of staff	Patient travel	Communications	Utilities	Raw foods	Drugs and medicines	Medical and dental supplies	Asset acquisitions	Cost per patient discharged
Arkansas:											
Fayetteville (G.M. & S.)	1955	$1,474,569	$1,206,191	$8,728	$4,813	$17,741	$81,217	$46,000	$22,452	$40,202	$544
	1956	1,549,419	1,270,372	12,466	5,037	18,947	76,642	52,752	27,307	47,780	579
	1957	1,543,888	1,279,867	17,141	4,842	19,464	77,138	53,356	30,412	37,755	587
	1958	1,680,717	1,415,626	16,363	5,168	20,155	80,875	54,409	32,030	26,285	617
	1959	1,755,943	1,496,828	16,768	5,592	24,424	79,217	55,618	35,086	14,181	656
Little Rock (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,884,833	2,395,944	22,339	15,382	43,248	161,820	81,435	60,101	16,705	530
	1956	3,066,229	2,564,190	21,211	14,986	51,809	154,447	95,688	58,243	6,312	542
	1957	3,161,888	2,617,331	19,895	13,970	51,091	165,162	80,501	74,626	40,727	479
	1958	3,423,133	2,863,520	18,424	13,287	61,622	171,956	103,043	73,030	15,650	541
	1959	3,583,039	3,011,991	20,000	13,770	61,156	171,335	80,482	93,015	5,811	568
North Little Rock (NP)	1955	6,436,356	5,012,780	10,645	19,407	109,286	708,126	60,694	55,852	91,241	2,592
	1956	6,730,442	5,359,709	10,545	17,879	118,163	634,462	84,401	81,006	110,585	4,288
	1957	6,791,431	5,464,498	11,801	18,836	114,317	654,642	104,178	89,137	92,642	2,516
	1958	7,367,154	5,969,674	14,946	18,913	121,289	674,296	144,218	99,992	81,999	4,720
	1959	7,716,920	6,299,645	13,621	18,965	120,798	690,428	136,898	96,330	57,458	4,326
California:											
Fresno (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,642,791	1,300,502	4,432	9,969	38,171	89,207	65,163	33,300	10,449	741
	1956	1,798,086	1,430,827	4,054	9,750	41,125	88,157	55,858	41,206	27,195	669
	1957	1,846,547	1,472,186	3,535	8,718	39,849	85,787	46,107	44,749	56,768	673
	1958	1,997,261	1,635,529	3,032	8,380	39,411	90,008	53,899	43,391	19,664	746
	1959	2,098,822	1,758,071	3,505	8,495	44,061	90,891	52,807	47,202	2,450	794
Livermore (TB)	1955	2,716,677	2,085,052	17,809	9,048	60,119	232,692	39,073	34,949	39,456	2,929
	1956	2,765,150	2,197,597	11,439	8,704	63,627	198,450	41,974	38,849	45,561	3,353
	1957	2,883,898	2,281,277	8,392	9,117	62,181	211,451	39,133	33,411	65,891	3,575
	1958	3,150,042	2,560,593	8,561	9,016	59,602	197,946	57,507	40,797	42,781	3,984
	1959	3,341,437	2,682,277	3,150	9,950	72,600	189,489	48,215	37,302	51,552	3,964
Long Beach (G.M. & S.)	1955	8,746,438	7,040,353	49,407	22,752	115,117	614,954	215,212	187,356	93,827	807
	1956	9,004,778	7,298,475	48,725	22,901	97,227	555,102	231,251	209,339	124,106	860
	1957	8,514,502	6,913,110	47,072	22,946	104,684	499,711	247,940	220,333	99,999	965
	1958	9,577,332	7,852,031	45,678	25,618	119,430	506,486	272,670	248,826	80,268	1,146
	1959	10,565,336	8,664,141	57,160	34,914	136,850	534,000	294,693	262,956	50,000	1,263
Los Angeles (G.M. & S. and NP divisions)	1955	15,524,858	12,536,859	21,871	69,248	246,277	1,107,257	267,772	216,178	278,167	3,873
	1956	16,567,228	13,181,081	15,756	75,134	234,884	1,090,126	392,042	322,396	160,566	4,227
	1957	16,565,611	13,470,794	15,600	61,070	224,074	1,074,995	411,977	317,097	238,838	3,838
	1958	18,130,534	14,958,022	15,569	59,309	240,024	1,020,924	464,251	315,770	221,024	4,283
	1959	19,338,686	16,044,636	15,658	90,126	261,493	1,037,147	497,967	324,497	163,935	5,140
Oakland (G.M. & S.)	1955	4,404,146	3,320,267	26,435	18,760	48,934	263,468	131,800	145,000	104,968	(3)
	1956	4,663,038	3,554,639	21,379	19,216	51,319	259,441	132,408	146,327	128,092	(3)
	1957	4,778,576	3,701,948	19,520	19,266	49,821	258,076	131,950	136,672	103,849	(3)
	1958	5,185,960	4,159,137	16,013	19,605	50,802	254,871	135,173	156,154	76,033	(3)
	1959	5,464,369	4,484,062	17,052	19,441	50,009	241,529	142,664	155,752	18,635	(3)
Palo Alto (NP)	1955	4,483,681	3,677,652	1,347	8,014	97,014	506,538	34,605	51,811	40,754	4,493
	1956	4,796,567	3,945,713	2,134	7,900	97,876	495,534	40,958	53,390	61,926	7,163
	1957	5,163,538	4,065,528	3,842	11,767	96,656	490,807	53,706	46,923	64,222	7,238
	1958	5,675,058	4,719,771	2,671	19,030	98,025	468,979	72,456	48,609	56,984	9,052
	1959	5,930,016	5,075,389	1,644	20,715	99,789	465,663	74,804	56,947	49,496	9,492
San Fernando (TB)	1955	2,875,103	2,277,813	8,540	10,403	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	79,582	4,056
	1956	3,030,013	2,466,969	10,189	10,910	59,835	229,813	72,782	63,182	37,623	4,181
	1957	3,134,115	2,552,701	6,589	10,720	59,584	235,729	79,149	59,498	45,694	4,198
	1958	3,419,386	2,815,573	7,347	10,591	62,011	238,245	74,493	57,752	70,854	4,155
	1959	3,597,824	3,004,800	7,163	11,120	65,931	236,748	75,924	62,608	48,340	3,577
San Francisco (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,087,893	2,484,099	28,082	14,918	50,398	174,848	90,386	77,064	36,811	691
	1956	3,285,517	2,683,761	25,476	14,959	51,831	162,549	88,843	78,024	49,037	698
	1957	3,391,616	2,766,005	26,241	15,783	52,153	160,010	86,809	76,292	14,568	776
	1958	3,718,711	2,988,299	20,080	17,209	52,088	164,691	95,111	82,721	69,080	796
	1959	4,023,328	3,157,801	21,848	16,291	54,946	170,098	98,795	85,821	127,700	864
Sepulveda (NP)[4]	1956	3,473,924	2,784,800	596	19,736	72,265	213,586	35,847	82,485	35,644	----------
	1957	4,838,108	3,922,596	3,689	24,037	93,454	326,691	85,319	73,620	69,070	1,706
	1958	5,555,147	4,698,693	4,228	24,438	111,279	317,487	103,013	73,051	21,749	1,609
	1959	5,906,191	5,079,851	4,825	25,345	100,720	305,668	92,685	76,978	6,779	1,853
Colorado:											
Denver (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,240,947	2,554,741	26,209	15,524	38,269	189,336	101,475	76,441	15,499	493
	1956	3,467,202	2,768,518	25,464	13,834	40,742	187,076	108,774	78,453	20,399	544
	1957	3,545,953	2,822,884	24,910	15,253	30,905	200,705	127,009	93,423	24,702	579
	1958	3,870,195	3,118,397	22,760	13,295	47,345	205,674	124,933	106,362	36,521	623
	1959	4,076,567	3,352,643	24,920	12,718	46,677	196,629	128,149	103,117	5,122	690
Fort Lyon (NP)	1955	2,571,484	1,880,278	3,365	2,357	71,690	248,758	9,289	16,348	90,077	6,259
	1956	2,502,269	1,883,812	2,518	2,580	83,334	210,502	28,652	34,280	56,163	9,691
	1957	2,585,718	1,943,648	5,349	2,731	78,275	216,242	39,080	27,981	65,139	9,490
	1958	2,804,002	2,162,912	4,313	2,405	85,152	226,067	55,976	28,800	79,923	13,625
	1959	2,965,525	2,389,144	3,847	2,717	88,361	227,000	51,002	27,750	33,451	12,013
Grand Junction (G.M. & S.)	1955	969,647	774,721	3,033	7,091	13,700	45,258	22,671	12,814	17,034	571
	1956	1,011,477	821,595	3,155	6,865	25,681	45,505	23,795	13,447	9,130	740
	1957	1,056,589	841,466	4,614	6,943	28,923	44,677	29,755	14,445	18,105	700
	1958	1,155,405	925,403	5,367	6,451	30,763	47,712	31,340	18,015	29,635	672
	1959	1,181,948	979,823	7,455	6,515	31,414	48,924	31,012	16,466	7,582	666
Connecticut:											
Newington (G.M. & S.)[5]	1956	1,968,767	1,644,219	1,995	6,727	47,407	65,463	42,578	36,776	21,785	677
	1957	2,051,158	1,602,732	1,710	7,945	50,743	74,928	42,724	42,247	35,248	791
	1958	2,236,490	1,814,142	962	7,982	52,599	74,793	46,742	47,885	32,865	886
	1959	2,293,078	1,893,585	1,895	9,050	19,792	76,650	48,833	47,517	17,274	887
West Haven (G.M. & S.)	1955	4,182,656	3,175,842	2,107	12,752	186,909	254,553	104,392	85,706	26,445	1,355
	1956	4,591,176	3,664,441	2,371	13,339	190,574	262,685	106,505	80,047	37,820	1,205
	1957	4,572,030	3,655,169	2,196	13,465	194,302	265,237	105,842	105,390	36,147	1,227
	1958	5,264,977	4,248,734	5,090	15,714	204,393	285,268	114,401	108,565	20,423	1,375
	1959	5,472,191	4,450,633	4,950	15,400	201,560	305,733	117,008	120,339	10,000	1,215
Delaware: Wilmington (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,833,450	1,518,880	4,935	7,397	62,191	96,482	52,560	26,954	4,700	813
	1956	1,857,460	1,525,954	3,437	7,192	63,305	100,341	50,378	23,024	8,542	673
	1957	1,876,892	1,532,272	3,400	8,401	65,906	100,316	48,133	25,935	12,736	913
	1958	2,055,888	1,705,613	1,896	7,554	68,236	104,254	50,504	37,084	12,164	1,075
	1959	2,130,652	1,782,549	2,104	9,848	69,440	104,608	51,800	32,828	9,314	1,092
District of Columbia: Washington (G.M. & S.)	1955[6]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	587
	1956	3,144,605	2,523,197	3,673	10,455	18,062	119,076	90,321	88,819	110,426	605
	1957	3,327,399	2,717,742	2,574	10,977	20,471	132,909	103,759	79,741	50,555	698
	1958	3,678,683	3,004,997	2,274	11,490	22,063	131,765	105,833	95,681	123,296	771
	1959	3,891,396	3,285,243	2,300	11,600	24,600	129,236	103,330	89,455	51,084	793

Footnotes at end of table.

Net cost of operation of VA hospitals, fiscal years 1955–59—Continued

Hospital	Fiscal year	Elements of cost: Total	Salaries of staff	Patient travel	Communications	Utilities	Raw foods	Drugs and medicines	Medical and dental supplies	Asset acquisitions	Cost per patient discharged
Florida:											
Bay Pines (G.M. & S.)	1955	$3,224,402	$2,520,921	$36,225	$13,130	$35,654	$225,085	$113,506	$64,893	$29,185	$762
	1956	3,479,868	2,718,631	41,860	13,161	45,080	219,717	136,412	62,478	52,122	859
	1957	3,565,824	2,811,350	44,791	14,914	43,809	213,169	143,296	71,334	30,813	877
	1958	3,845,950	3,104,507	32,190	17,785	56,850	203,763	137,421	69,131	34,159	851
	1959	3,949,519	3,232,841	33,539	16,659	45,396	206,688	127,600	66,219	29,272	931
Coral Gables (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,130,931	2,409,573	47,850	10,608	54,575	196,062	95,779	123,164	33,990	653
	1956	3,355,749	2,598,258	20,899	11,695	54,729	196,157	108,012	120,694	35,996	679
	1957	3,409,093	2,669,326	20,638	13,717	56,362	186,787	110,493	113,235	26,912	653
	1958	3,636,002	2,891,518	19,495	14,240	60,664	183,263	122,883	116,065	23,540	716
	1959	3,902,804	3,123,651	18,516	15,262	64,811	189,009	130,000	118,000	40,000	753
Lake City (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,173,871	1,693,055	29,827	4,416	45,021	127,890	67,554	48,581	12,581	919
	1956	2,284,574	1,788,109	31,112	9,326	64,661	129,895	76,415	46,930	9,837	900
	1957	2,333,561	1,797,900	27,424	10,562	59,086	130,913	74,518	43,412	27,601	864
	1958	2,524,161	1,995,788	29,760	11,129	73,554	128,435	84,887	45,812	19,147	981
	1959	2,625,754	2,090,872	34,249	10,579	64,750	133,796	90,820	58,512	10,266	951
Georgia:											
Atlanta (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,300,764	1,897,274	21,617	10,710	37,330	118,351	62,160	59,200	26,114	518
	1956	2,408,786	2,013,865	23,905	9,573	38,270	114,527	68,603	63,716	19,853	547
	1957	2,480,021	2,089,621	22,784	9,890	40,478	114,738	70,682	61,999	20,093	700
	1958	2,870,377	2,476,717	19,258	9,626	43,436	114,521	85,576	62,666	14,598	663
	1959	3,034,944	2,627,770	20,247	9,740	45,936	114,788	84,966	68,024	10,000	656
Augusta combined (G.M. & S.)	1955	6,474,642	5,148,026	24,368	25,355	160,673	561,335	77,560	84,559	62,125	1,390
	1956	7,266,919	5,812,254	33,145	27,576	156,213	577,111	105,962	92,774	92,684	1,378
	1957	7,351,132	5,909,110	38,586	28,454	166,954	582,264	110,281	110,471	69,358	2,876
	1958	7,741,859	6,260,891	31,133	28,650	176,594	573,441	146,746	135,514	74,174	2,042
	1959	8,063,323	6,645,751	36,800	28,600	173,392	592,962	160,900	145,436	20,000	2,139
Dublin (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,307,606	1,866,688	26,746	8,578	63,971	146,444	69,437	27,817	32,984	576
	1956	2,432,623	1,931,825	17,049	9,645	71,380	142,665	87,425	37,444	38,159	629
	1957	2,958,277	2,327,261	17,155	10,960	76,465	192,868	107,289	55,632	49,562	708
	1958	3,263,001	2,617,260	11,149	11,337	85,727	187,873	95,520	54,866	70,359	779
	1959	3,417,860	2,818,833	11,200	12,800	82,000	190,900	97,312	57,200	18,200	1,055
Idaho: Boise (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,493,394	1,119,718	11,325	283	32,558	58,039	31,142	24,065	77,818	624
	1956	1,495,767	1,163,554	12,615	679	33,966	61,412	31,749	24,420	25,648	623
	1957	1,533,494	1,203,994	9,073	763	36,377	62,769	30,323	26,703	15,722	629
	1958	1,628,623	1,313,161	8,478	991	34,972	63,750	29,978	27,086	12,635	743
	1959	1,712,776	1,370,947	9,295	1,007	35,540	70,738	30,028	25,964	6,766	781
Illinois:											
Chicago (West Side) (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,362,972	2,672,914	2,216	17,931	82,486	178,128	98,835	81,052	42,022	510
	1956	3,633,041	2,949,394	3,277	15,888	95,139	175,568	103,716	81,980	30,374	547
	1957	3,752,213	3,041,066	5,473	18,360	71,690	181,673	101,964	100,492	69,063	599
	1958	4,107,087	3,380,923	4,749	17,336	83,207	191,798	97,587	101,942	30,730	732
	1959	4,210,761	3,510,711	4,900	16,000	95,000	208,000	100,104	87,000	19,046	802
Chicago (research) (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,978,769	2,202,411	7,673	17,933	99,752	129,885	52,000	55,000	127,207	976
	1956	3,853,879	3,056,499	7,411	20,064	111,455	191,744	117,055	126,267	73,773	897
	1957	3,929,072	3,141,053	7,616	21,871	127,854	211,952	129,133	125,882	29,638	820
	1958	4,305,969	3,462,043	8,695	23,867	121,828	228,065	138,056	128,354	48,755	902
	1959	4,569,072	3,782,396	7,305	22,022	122,824	217,493	126,665	109,766	24,492	955
Danville (NP)	1955	4,903,212	3,774,281	3,156	12,513	104,870	543,073	39,183	35,456	73,098	3,837
	1956	5,474,054	4,114,361	2,640	13,406	98,931	526,366	36,509	82,985	132,908	3,281
	1957	5,592,126	4,379,489	2,824	14,334	95,520	547,278	46,380	62,111	178,985	4,529
	1958	6,151,690	4,900,395	2,213	13,935	106,167	544,308	60,769	66,821	62,890	5,215
	1959	6,292,617	5,169,738	2,946	14,118	109,917	566,835	58,838	69,760	72,032	5,870
Downey (NP)	1955	8,120,507	6,377,705	2,688	27,370	32,768	675,238	62,353	34,292	196,274	6,965
	1956	9,025,060	7,141,070	2,831	27,212	316,965	665,452	104,061	67,188	175,625	7,130
	1957	9,161,275	7,363,398	1,259	26,835	363,861	699,461	129,344	84,977	108,609	8,293
	1958	9,827,694	7,904,064	1,296	29,304	401,359	684,010	134,590	85,524	120,810	9,356
	1959	10,164,417	8,316,228	1,674	28,822	488,616	698,441	132,031	111,484	20,621	11,134
Dwight (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,370,545	1,058,887	11,447	6,295	13,246	84,078	29,399	24,710	31,187	611
	1956	1,486,527	1,141,358	11,384	6,502	15,492	83,863	31,913	25,033	20,467	674
	1957	1,443,513	1,159,259	10,204	6,678	16,440	75,472	32,420	25,267	12,142	650
	1958	1,654,927	1,306,516	10,261	7,022	15,638	76,340	35,625	28,185	23,291	766
	1959	1,700,543	1,373,838	10,200	7,000	18,140	85,089	39,158	29,483	23,490	806
Hines (G.M. & S.)	1955	14,986,050	11,606,552	81,785	48,864	326,871	957,954	261,690	272,313	463,564	1,235
	1956	15,357,304	12,342,909	77,746	54,588	283,888	894,346	241,662	303,286	293,549	1,314
	1957	15,487,740	12,683,858	79,148	56,374	300,459	890,617	243,884	333,950	149,459	1,392
	1958	16,752,407	13,753,512	79,936	59,426	324,071	871,599	260,950	338,820	194,869	1,431
	1959	17,640,696	14,787,642	83,452	59,833	317,990	878,115	270,666	320,410	199,144	1,531
Marion (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,126,978	911,751	12,570	4,671	30,074	65,766	19,674	8,328	16,077	577
	1956	1,227,452	1,000,737	13,303	4,633	29,152	65,084	21,998	13,766	29,456	524
	1957	1,242,838	1,024,226	17,249	4,553	28,737	68,233	21,564	18,366	16,097	534
	1958	1,409,738	1,133,891	12,494	5,810	30,989	72,761	26,832	23,059	39,762	783
	1959	1,451,145	1,214,746	11,916	6,818	30,924	72,934	26,370	26,951	1,380	716
Indiana:											
Fort Wayne (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,298,315	1,009,611	2,973	5,326	24,563	66,394	27,295	21,937	62,344	715
	1956	1,345,841	1,113,466	3,414	6,037	22,356	66,946	30,050	21,597	22,574	756
	1957	1,343,996	1,128,438	3,015	6,510	20,500	66,230	31,115	22,803	12,485	765
	1958	1,493,735	1,249,184	2,370	6,499	21,685	70,326	41,629	22,691	24,751	957
	1959	1,554,390	1,306,033	2,682	6,763	21,754	74,291	36,752	23,558	7,447	1,121
Indianapolis (G.M. & S.)	1955	4,574,991	3,681,578	22,022	23,406	154,117	279,275	135,950	96,576	70,704	----------
	1956	4,755,769	3,792,860	18,903	24,469	159,452	257,451	115,552	104,422	48,336	----------
	1957	4,661,723	3,720,652	20,229	24,344	162,154	256,569	111,351	95,318	42,523	----------
	1958	5,065,822	4,038,664	16,915	26,514	164,670	262,285	129,397	104,134	78,865	----------
	1959	5,311,853	4,304,463	18,840	27,008	174,717	283,627	147,232	111,225	11,342	----------
Marion (NP)	1955	5,218,029	4,230,229	373	9,354	101,756	549,414	16,773	34,754	94,892	14,137
	1956	5,474,321	4,487,427	282	9,346	108,348	518,197	28,179	56,749	77,759	14,738
	1957	5,555,428	4,520,717	562	9,718	106,036	520,883	45,344	63,824	111,019	14,989
	1958	5,875,075	4,804,662	743	9,783	128,529	536,778	60,311	54,309	100,024	16,459
	1959	6,294,585	5,281,009	1,189	11,000	134,891	514,892	69,735	58,925	36,800	18,465
Iowa:											
Des Moines (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,493,925	2,016,916	16,502	11,275	45,552	121,909	129,161	61,210	29,058	482
	1956	2,692,963	2,032,777	17,680	10,068	49,653	128,770	118,697	59,390	24,554	593
	1957	2,753,864	2,161,814	14,875	8,988	50,036	137,971	107,749	64,379	56,500	589
	1958	2,962,327	2,413,962	13,149	9,792	50,831	139,629	129,556	65,655	20,502	549
	1959	3,021,624	2,501,736	9,384	9,792	50,232	140,929	126,474	65,191	16,371	559
Iowa City (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,133,998	2,340,455	22,313	14,941	92,068	165,712	118,489	86,593	39,210	827
	1956	3,384,458	2,635,726	26,176	14,631	98,914	168,173	103,044	90,859	32,803	781
	1957	3,437,955	2,688,636	30,174	14,709	96,931	176,490	94,182	92,532	54,873	788
	1958	3,764,861	2,976,944	21,921	15,349	104,381	184,277	120,607	98,526	31,257	918
	1959	3,883,003	3,143,607	21,698	15,860	105,218	190,727	112,769	90,691	19,381	938
Knoxville (NP)	1955	4,443,800	3,479,316	4,862	10,113	101,005	506,421	27,981	17,708	68,609	10,555
	1956	4,625,895	3,723,497	3,746	9,856	95,332	428,321	46,431	47,227	70,276	13,390
	1957	4,972,787	3,939,018	4,477	9,647	95,308	423,905	54,155	63,037	77,726	11,933
	1958	5,142,225	4,159,336	3,725	9,647	95,439	435,779	63,348	48,009	102,224	12,815
	1959	5,506,089	4,530,834	3,818	9,730	102,096	421,442	63,452	69,989	122,247	14,138

Net cost of operation of VA hospitals, fiscal years 1955–59—Continued

Hospital	Fiscal year	Elements of cost: Total	Salaries of staff	Patient travel	Communications	Utilities	Raw foods	Drugs and medicines	Medical and dental supplies	Asset acquisitions	Cost per patient discharged
Kansas:											
Topeka (NP)	1955	$6,252,950	$5,342,341	$18,159	$21,439	$122,144	$359,533	$76,753	$55,599	$22,906	$1,871
	1956	6,506,418	5,605,118	15,937	20,970	123,986	351,271	74,451	55,538	41,023	2,014
	1957	6,576,045	5,693,186	21,100	21,284	133,280	350,177	97,399	51,934	19,392	1,939
	1958	6,892,940	5,975,803	14,993	21,159	136,819	352,512	92,247	51,006	12,618	2,167
	1959	6,736,717	5,911,005	15,665	21,087	119,999	320,614	104,985	59,983	1,072	2,762
Wadsworth (G.M. & S.)	1955	4,147,898	3,423,121	16,677	12,657	61,868	281,542	93,880	69,148	93,253	1,108
	1956	4,394,021	3,620,714	13,965	12,436	70,044	281,314	85,022	80,743	79,853	1,232
	1957	4,404,648	3,644,557	11,563	12,262	60,811	283,397	91,450	84,807	78,831	1,159
	1958	4,676,279	3,929,167	9,286	13,194	56,223	299,528	110,011	69,022	79,599	1,365
	1959	5,066,014	4,182,859	8,685	14,921	81,206	300,444	121,590	94,817	62,959	1,552
Wichita (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,634,579	1,296,199	20,881	7,927	35,448	90,331	36,444	15,165	47,071	677
	1956	1,722,666	1,416,183	23,271	6,646	40,892	86,389	34,074	31,247	28,958	774
	9157	1,750,438	1,421,468	18,596	8,175	30,660	81,686	43,079	38,147	34,134	789
	1958	1,908,941	1,613,091	15,683	7,683	31,748	82,200	37,788	35,367	13,691	841
	1959	1,978,416	1,678,041	16,360	9,710	30,770	81,545	38,755	37,626	18,500	875
Kentucky:											
Lexington (NP)	1955	3,585,854	2,903,184	2,833	9,417	78,921	366,249	20,029	23,113	56,156	2,500
	1956	3,764,762	3,031,975	2,778	10,080	75,029	339,622	41,299	25,343	86,753	4,483
	1957	3,872,125	3,089,956	3,824	10,835	87,249	357,689	55,251	49,515	67,557	3,123
	1958	4,188,167	3,390,919	3,123	10,909	101,004	360,083	71,614	40,699	51,548	5,678
	1959	4,496,780	3,697,218	3,544	10,909	99,958	367,778	77,213	51,258	24,427	5,611
Louisville (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,465,781	2,865,698	32,143	19,358	66,457	193,273	100,415	59,572	10,345	836
	1956	3,623,140	3,005,304	28,348	19,170	71,528	189,013	101,923	68,139	17,144	890
	1957	3,630,028	2,998,683	23,810	18,827	79,683	188,825	100,924	77,784	13,052	947
	1958	3,912,198	3,265,237	26,629	18,134	86,660	190,638	100,280	78,859	23,572	959
	1959	4,092,534	3,422,466	29,250	19,000	87,600	195,990	102,541	79,190	16,086	967
Outwood (TB)	1955	1,083,096	884,468	6,162	2,335	13,290	76,683	8,056	7,630	49,389	2,700
	1956	1,123,916	928,216	5,652	2,102	12,867	71,771	11,586	12,535	39,783	2,601
	1957	1,105,435	930,720	6,098	1,978	13,292	67,449	12,054	11,322	28,020	2,279
	1958	1,263,950	1,004,152	5,144	2,006	14,838	66,707	12,656	12,304	26,958	2,507
	1959	1,152,636	968,555	5,301	1,849	15,184	55,908	10,556	11,248	23,397	2,938
Louisiana:											
Alexandria (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,870,038	2,358,832	16,500	9,430	48,606	174,506	54,438	42,757	36,145	793
	1956	3,153,524	2,580,505	18,144	10,795	51,914	176,645	59,655	56,151	66,183	867
	1957	3,110,921	2,580,666	18,021	10,904	53,733	175,709	61,032	57,597	47,773	971
	1958	3,343,931	2,806,408	18,116	10,695	58,522	169,838	61,684	56,705	51,021	922
	1959	3,430,656	2,877,189	18,293	10,157	59,653	154,899	73,306	63,238	50,735	907
New Orleans (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,287,089	2,672,162	7,876	11,713	53,996	174,725	103,200	68,000	24,140	740
	1956	3,456,999	2,780,318	8,668	12,246	56,821	183,835	108,422	73,890	24,829	798
	1957	3,526,951	2,808,013	8,762	11,396	59,939	182,356	120,202	79,596	57,807	768
	1958	3,834,211	3,073,959	7,621	12,307	64,663	187,728	133,548	77,689	69,819	806
	1959	4,032,440	3,279,612	10,481	13,048	65,947	192,769	133,124	76,833	13,540	893
Shreveport (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,968,989	1,633,381	26,657	13,518	34,861	110,366	45,302	54,406	1,997	520
	1956	2,379,001	1,887,114	28,616	10,355	44,755	141,735	51,665	62,253	25,149	603
	1957	2,595,908	2,100,156	27,321	7,028	48,537	147,544	55,919	69,740	40,763	673
	1958	2,906,397	2,344,707	26,767	13,282	53,720	166,114	59,484	66,749	68,820	752
	1959	3,099,653	2,576,228	27,760	13,572	60,141	166,800	60,917	67,967	24,000	802
Maine: Togus (NP)	1955	3,653,778	2,852,967	24,227	6,536	85,237	255,125	102,099	43,228	38,778	667
	1956	3,795,839	2,968,788	19,649	10,800	120,330	248,649	90,108	54,159	64,852	1,105
	1957	4,128,087	3,072,122	17,650	12,764	132,069	268,636	94,453	71,067	145,991	1,604
	1958	4,484,511	3,487,561	17,451	13,860	128,418	261,558	106,723	71,785	57,619	1,888
	1959	4,587,476	3,555,411	17,625	13,860	131,893	259,035	96,093	68,542	30,279	2,073
Maryland:											
Baltimore (TB)	1955	1,755,378	1,473,722	3,024	8,773	25,800	122,509	81,446	(6)	15,759	3,616
	1956	1,959,037	1,590,336	6,098	10,722	26,723	114,676	36,966	22,542	6,495	3,297
	1957	1,965,655	1,599,373	6,356	9,775	26,919	113,376	43,472	30,118	16,611	3,165
	1958	2,121,980	1,770,724	2,087	10,298	27,962	114,146	37,622	28,348	26,983	3,068
	1959	2,219,111	1,838,089	2,100	10,240	28,460	113,251	37,207	31,541	7,028	2,396
Fort Howard (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,754,523	2,273,779	3,364	6,536	45,378	164,918	65,479	56,375	74,155	720
	1956	2,886,616	2,327,600	3,235	7,031	50,551	154,776	66,355	57,905	74,963	777
	1957	2,941,443	2,432,370	5,883	8,015	46,210	141,778	61,208	54,637	100,018	914
	1958	3,215,594	2,700,395	4,084	8,878	55,826	143,401	66,127	57,440	74,471	1,042
	1959	3,271,231	2,761,616	3,916	9,301	59,786	135,813	67,029	57,022	18,944	1,042
Perry Point (NP) [5]	1956	6,156,741	4,779,198	7,070	16,407	54,300	557,501	96,230	93,645	110,786	1,763
	1957	6,555,299	4,924,168	6,043	15,937	54,530	566,588	115,022	123,962	125,505	1,683
	1958	6,609,251	5,234,665	3,726	17,873	53,880	545,693	94,851	87,131	102,650	2,288
	1959	6,970,760	5,577,657	3,907	18,027	54,790	556,493	122,479	80,632	42,959	2,489
Massachusetts:											
Bedford (NP)	1955	5,130,654	3,988,868	118	13,863	164,049	614,088	31,342	99,249	5,942	8,940
	1956	5,485,743	4,305,230	199	15,062	159,159	626,193	46,656	64,139	26,851	7,426
	1957	5,535,458	4,362,284	85	14,358	176,562	630,225	49,435	90,637	18,131	8,158
	1958	6,199,760	4,876,829	210	15,022	183,336	646,136	81,630	92,017	65,276	11,022
	1959	6,498,608	5,171,512	525	16,200	195,830	627,905	87,941	110,576	44,417	11,623
Boston (G.M. & S.)	1955	8,696,036	7,027,179	21,693	42,423	259,390	435,895	231,462	225,347	77,272	605
	1956	9,115,495	7,473,685	19,210	42,590	254,800	422,084	221,880	289,656	72,350	746
	1957	9,173,965	7,558,112	14,664	44,442	251,472	424,256	233,719	299,287	31,976	726
	1958	9,979,130	8,302,426	14,241	45,224	261,860	434,258	252,909	315,326	38,992	794
	1959	10,448,746	8,759,351	15,283	46,428	286,876	442,899	245,355	301,956	24,554	840
Brockton (NP)	1955	4,182,094	3,152,830	189	15,259	123,322	271,629	35,071	30,666	218,916	1,310
	1956	5,136,431	4,185,764	311	17,018	143,045	339,669	65,975	61,622	69,953	2,528
	1957	5,402,044	4,398,575	1,006	18,250	154,063	353,321	99,362	65,116	63,675	3,766
	1958	6,293,455	5,304,855	976	18,325	144,129	357,986	128,701	60,589	41,152	6,066
	1959	6,652,774	5,747,387	864	16,904	139,932	355,836	124,409	58,679	14,619	6,781
Northampton (NP)	1955	3,340,787	2,653,825	344	6,895	112,265	367,115	38,182	22,085	31,451	7,015
	1956	3,563,440	2,878,900	341	7,146	114,142	354,662	45,886	41,309	25,495	8,045
	1957	3,611,169	2,908,692	314	7,071	120,551	349,208	40,209	44,005	39,433	6,579
	1958	3,926,259	3,182,654	140	7,701	118,482	362,108	44,304	45,450	60,125	7,758
	1959	4,178,526	3,439,145	256	8,596	121,984	376,115	46,314	47,359	29,892	9,029
Rutland Heights (TB)	1955	2,873,459	2,302,668	2,642	9,425	88,800	276,924	79,861	(6)	51,816	4,108
	1956	3,003,222	2,446,798	2,645	9,685	91,471	268,236	52,082	52,386	31,028	3,844
	1957	3,010,861	2,453,251	1,470	9,765	95,197	250,157	55,858	50,852	37,873	3,814
	1958	3,313,074	2,722,950	1,512	10,004	92,974	257,480	68,736	56,813	65,333	4,351
	1959	3,306,222	2,737,726	1,608	10,304	95,494	240,614	64,788	54,603	39,745	4,762
Michigan:											
Ann Arbor (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,444,083	1,885,935	32,554	14,788	80,719	121,432	85,997	91,081	13,896	873
	1956	3,070,355	3,400,770	45,573	16,158	81,282	155,189	98,803	84,243	28,749	888
	1957	3,206,304	2,556,237	42,278	16,447	91,111	162,008	92,603	89,202	19,759	879
	1958	3,260,844	2,646,912	31,329	16,346	95,849	148,372	93,172	89,908	15,363	843
	1959	3,442,236	2,791,322	32,000	16,389	97,205	149,303	107,130	97,772	10,387	905
Battle Creek (NP)	1955	5,723,249	4,486,808	1,780	10,134	154,502	684,337	27,340	48,669	131,582	4,970
	1956	6,002,986	4,841,992	3,116	9,953	154,948	599,169	31,052	51,589	155,725	3,646
	1957	6,088,602	4,876,828	1,276	10,142	172,547	630,974	45,602	62,811	140,538	5,031
	1958	6,804,875	5,549,203	1,509	10,574	179,348	664,908	59,500	52,930	120,829	(2)
	1959	7,188,623	5,963,381	1,808	10,663	177,889	659,171	74,506	52,325	78,380	(2)

Footnotes at end of table.

Net cost of operation of VA hospitals, fiscal years 1955–59—Continued

Hospital	Fiscal year	Elements of cost: Total	Salaries of staff	Patient travel	Communications	Utilities	Raw foods	Drugs and medicines	Medical and dental supplies	Asset acquisitions	Cost per patient discharged
Michigan—Continued											
Dearborn (G.M. & S.)	1955	$5,258,597	$4,309,779	$13,280	$17,847	$56,638	$337,002	$126,045	$113,219	$18,547	$849
	1956	5,887,158	4,811,563	14,360	18,011	51,943	358,675	136,416	141,324	59,384	834
	1957	6,035,637	4,955,294	12,337	17,555	58,163	349,736	161,478	131,243	73,946	842
	1958	6,317,709	5,285,408	11,191	17,712	59,173	354,110	196,621	135,179	68,249	985
	1959	6,609,576	5,538,995	11,900	17,660	59,970	354,526	201,150	138,930	3,200	1,048
Iron Mountain (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,202,160	965,277	15,564	8,840	50,006	59,380	23,021	22,996	7,839	710
	1956	1,556,260	1,217,776	20,614	8,990	58,092	88,233	30,588	41,198	13,751	609
	1957	1,630,207	1,285,249	19,085	8,870	59,406	91,390	31,292	41,492	35,994	724
	1958	1,810,975	1,458,716	22,157	8,596	63,801	96,488	41,358	43,986	16,317	824
	1959	1,895,143	1,548,624	22,395	8,421	64,202	99,615	43,085	38,503	12,148	730
Saginaw (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,259,587	1,032,528	7,192	6,928	44,627	69,772	34,037	18,998	13,120	696
	1956	1,450,070	1,167,229	7,178	8,217	47,743	82,881	34,418	28,252	31,342	674
	1957	1,471,567	1,201,827	6,968	7,545	49,871	84,074	31,214	29,888	16,439	808
	1958	1,623,222	1,338,860	5,963	7,538	50,471	88,361	34,191	26,379	26,045	880
	1959	1,691,174	1,420,765	6,636	7,514	52,092	84,165	33,952	26,691	11,674	1,027
Minnesota:											
Minneapolis (G.M. & S.)	1955	6,638,114	5,382,738	66,064	23,618	157,375	309,871	192,321	158,277	13,089	834
	1956	7,130,759	5,788,371	73,260	26,096	216,594	308,423	202,730	205,371	71,819	828
	1957	7,302,182	6,062,070	75,208	28,815	125,833	316,000	222,275	217,484	36,329	846
	1958	8,499,715	7,079,638	80,424	31,942	142,193	328,092	261,334	243,259	65,399	673
	1959	8,880,640	7,344,794	76,300	33,253	188,723	327,802	248,364	273,089	32,875	593
St. Cloud (NP)	1955	3,571,746	2,733,828	4,624	2,157	97,049	432,096	20,628	34,452	44,733	7,097
	1956	3,816,344	2,967,763	4,115	2,413	104,298	415,957	22,867	32,687	59,524	7,800
	1957	4,051,341	3,181,800	3,637	2,208	111,197	406,986	46,845	35,977	79,503	17,492
	1958	4,385,660	3,527,994	3,350	2,672	115,314	413,909	66,578	35,814	51,830	11,632
	1959	4,773,490	3,896,945	3,907	3,060	125,268	420,054	66,389	35,878	12,060	9,070
Mississippi:											
Biloxi (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,598,400	1,147,756	9,360	5,146	7,379	103,966	49,326	23,479	168,342	608
	1956	1,573,210	1,200,768	8,726	7,484	8,627	105,846	54,067	25,365	41,600	675
	1957	1,559,672	1,227,755	8,598	7,744	9,451	102,106	58,312	29,826	42,792	758
	1958	1,633,191	1,327,181	5,953	7,811	10,369	90,606	55,882	27,878	39,609	890
	1959	1,700,870	1,352,669	8,835	8,178	11,449	93,162	54,683	30,598	26,869	941
Gulfport (NP)	1955	3,179,226	2,518,536	9,442	7,382	33,457	364,208	19,256	28,629	31,033	8,104
	1956	3,503,698	2,707,056	10,269	7,564	36,190	339,908	30,693	32,447	154,326	8,516
	1957	3,421,767	2,818,509	9,909	8,540	39,501	285,688	29,953	29,641	45,921	1,054
	1958	3,719,121	3,069,116	7,096	8,861	43,863	277,049	51,447	31,984	46,555	7,725
	1959	3,996,890	3,268,007	7,645	9,175	54,066	287,039	60,471	30,960	55,394	3,754
Jackson (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,298,435	2,671,984	52,303	13,382	59,782	168,701	103,989	94,250	38,873	620
	1956	3,444,302	2,785,385	51,780	13,480	61,335	172,962	95,521	71,995	68,216	692
	1957	3,439,985	2,825,053	50,883	13,452	66,882	172,817	103,313	86,622	38,978	752
	1958	3,721,658	3,075,258	42,489	15,612	84,727	173,777	117,167	98,398	33,885	793
	1959	3,962,209	3,329,708	38,496	15,612	90,392	178,280	124,875	92,536	2,320	860
Missouri:											
Excelsior Springs (TB)	1955	1,299,249	1,018,829	2,991	3,971	29,367	99,490	14,168	9,198	55,400	3,856
	1956	1,321,099	1,074,728	3,324	3,704	32,141	91,305	10,828	14,650	33,549	3,300
	1957	1,279,839	1,073,653	3,339	3,691	32,491	83,904	11,197	13,752	21,391	3,007
	1958	1,286,573	1,098,643	2,214	3,594	32,912	72,213	12,372	15,609	22,047	3,823
	1959	1,189,331	996,983	1,721	3,419	32,938	60,014	10,524	11,932	36,529	5,363
Jefferson Barracks (NP)	1955	2,416,873	1,893,138	4,742	14,337	65,567	183,662	38,195	40,472	37,781	2,354
	1956	2,994,024	2,385,109	2,693	13,775	89,899	206,080	55,660	36,525	93,206	2,824
	1957	3,117,042	2,525,984	2,567	13,940	99,100	206,049	42,926	32,951	53,059	5,011
	1958	4,075,543	3,349,997	6,257	14,895	135,402	258,640	52,834	55,709	33,134	2,184
	1959	4,713,652	3,817,221	5,773	15,510	131,146	301,760	62,321	52,192	35,568	2,158
Kansas City (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,152,579	2,461,232	14,894	12,912	53,843	163,119	109,480	132,688	47,013	632
	1956	3,391,007	2,694,361	15,409	12,862	52,464	172,547	101,586	145,143	45,306	1,128
	1957	3,470,584	2,799,031	19,313	12,510	54,688	177,151	114,357	126,648	20,747	711
	1958	3,732,274	3,053,456	13,194	12,442	52,381	174,123	138,635	135,273	17,072	904
	1959	3,881,611	3,183,133	15,803	12,589	53,191	181,158	139,900	148,284	10,266	807
Poplar Bluff (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,054,235	875,367	9,695	6,111	28,448	56,697	27,336	17,411	8,481	440
	1956	1,204,104	1,007,906	11,263	6,072	27,386	64,877	33,089	22,632	9,392	463
	1957	1,215,081	1,020,005	9,869	5,791	28,877	62,627	34,123	22,692	12,222	520
	1958	1,340,557	1,113,613	11,245	5,781	30,161	63,417	37,983	25,481	23,412	615
	1959	1,380,971	1,171,959	12,064	5,804	28,995	65,738	37,578	25,102	3,762	651
St. Louis (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,300,935	2,586,680	18,254	14,120	52,849	174,081	108,288	89,945	44,714	593
	1956	3,627,781	2,956,161	18,957	14,342	55,468	184,363	119,200	92,166	40,677	599
	1957	3,659,968	2,992,320	16,230	14,361	57,647	190,397	126,323	104,110	20,254	604
	1958	4,351,812	3,622,325	16,790	15,090	60,627	195,205	126,411	124,079	28,586	756
	1959	4,676,806	3,950,490	18,459	15,149	63,151	195,996	130,225	126,003	20,163	795
Montana:											
Fort Harrison (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,253,892	990,510	29,438	6,410	23,249	67,405	42,089	23,206	14,669	602
	1956	1,322,116	1,034,008	29,702	5,049	23,150	62,227	40,105	27,523	47,196	670
	1957	1,349,495	1,060,188	26,345	7,625	24,241	66,111	34,313	26,170	57,267	663
	1958	1,431,866	1,159,763	28,241	6,815	23,323	68,510	39,410	27,959	25,910	750
	1959	1,538,496	1,243,728	27,480	6,380	32,706	65,975	35,507	25,760	43,745	806
Miles City (G.M. & S.)	1955	666,175	515,996	7,237	3,979	34,160	33,187	9,936	7,315	8,880	527
	1956	686,377	548,837	6,558	3,874	33,728	30,204	9,749	7,969	4,950	604
	1957	693,827	552,546	7,053	3,719	29,200	29,618	10,239	9,143	11,878	605
	1958	746,461	621,836	5,416	3,826	28,936	28,505	12,053	8,574	1,315	579
	1959	794,323	655,171	5,825	3,843	29,214	27,465	12,334	10,423	10,641	670
Nebraska:											
Grand Island (G.M. & S.)	1955	959,457	792,004	10,448	6,906	25,878	44,615	19,586	14,232	1,592	631
	1956	1,012,768	845,526	8,947	6,853	27,693	42,732	18,760	13,668	4,873	658
	1957	1,240,676	990,592	8,958	7,434	26,684	61,075	22,638	20,315	43,532	622
	1958	1,371,470	1,153,509	8,326	7,716	28,378	67,509	26,866	24,056	7,990	829
	1959	1,443,828	1,219,607	9,214	7,709	29,036	68,622	27,844	23,832	5,175	707
Lincoln (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,606,654	1,328,894	6,977	5,920	30,034	84,781	50,582	49,671	17,748	796
	1956	1,630,571	1,364,006	7,582	5,658	30,961	78,226	47,313	44,711	21,486	775
	1957	1,692,756	1,386,025	9,277	4,985	28,817	82,719	49,024	49,978	28,361	939
	1958	1,905,527	1,570,430	7,597	5,995	32,097	88,047	57,004	44,885	48,154	886
	1959	2,047,422	1,711,212	7,927	6,334	32,533	92,329	63,570	42,304	39,875	1,005
Omaha (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,782,540	2,247,451	8,308	15,435	73,559	158,879	51,065	36,584	38,909	765
	1956	2,929,479	2,411,523	5,111	12,939	61,999	153,073	82,621	69,711	12,550	738
	1957	2,971,687	2,388,339	7,759	12,699	58,876	161,764	83,379	76,643	51,671	743
	1958	3,281,524	2,674,526	6,409	13,290	58,219	164,461	75,540	88,422	54,304	791
	1959	3,402,260	2,824,482	6,492	13,265	58,690	173,081	94,383	71,331	11,639	823

Net cost of operation of VA hospitals, fiscal years 1955–59—Continued

Hospital	Fiscal year	Elements of cost									Cost per patient discharged
		Total	Salaries of staff	Patient travel	Communications	Utilities	Raw foods	Drugs and medicines	Medical and dental supplies	Asset acquisitions	
Nevada: Reno (G.M. & S.)	1955	$1,004,332	$751,723	$6,713	$6,712	$25,882	$61,332	$43,804	$30,693	$10,926	$582
	1956	1,114,769	825,924	8,563	6,776	26,626	63,141	43,692	31,115	15,123	615
	1957	1,224,116	870,942	8,353	6,419	26,224	67,719	45,742	30,872	31,795	743
	1958	1,340,391	1,021,150	8,492	6,411	28,152	64,699	37,493	29,756	26,357	798
	1959	1,417,738	1,133,788	8,264	6,494	24,677	69,894	38,227	28,180	8,565	810
New Hampshire: Manchester (G.M. & S.).	1955	1,138,867	925,999	3,823	7,347	27,447	54,403	35,761	27,867	25,941	686
	1956	1,176,688	956,582	3,864	6,496	30,362	54,809	37,916	25,070	9,234	672
	1957	1,219,436	963,197	3,016	6,527	33,286	54,314	39,529	27,559	2,042	786
	1958	1,278,122	1,065,120	2,854	6,572	31,785	53,862	35,922	26,845	5,752	836
	1959	1,345,319	1,136,962	2,884	6,237	32,715	51,042	33,886	25,052	9,798	885
New Jersey: East Orange (G.M. & S.)	1955	5,177,430	4,174,993	4,745	19,549	172,886	307,802	158,250	85,567	31,399	1,444
	1956	5,472,355	4,482,227	5,188	18,803	162,204	314,578	129,823	137,614	42,328	1,342
	1957	5,656,709	4,608,146	4,362	18,943	170,755	330,603	156,807	149,006	57,720	1,287
	1958	6,657,365	5,473,750	3,979	20,718	183,844	371,778	164,302	176,863	96,938	1,416
	1959	7,182,998	5,978,421	4,615	22,816	189,262	387,311	157,560	161,198	72,555	1,381
Lyons (NP)	1955	6,987,949	5,245,746	176	18,383	267,331	763,580	78,987	58,910	112,862	14,994
	1956	7,445,776	5,590,466	178	18,427	237,209	729,929	129,241	111,801	218,084	15,195
	1957	7,522,262	5,752,389	129	18,745	221,965	747,861	139,321	91,428	188,582	14,301
	1958	8,290,232	6,531,073	204	20,383	264,542	737,276	149,382	81,818	126,138	15,525
	1959	8,749,732	7,043,069	231	20,588	277,099	732,327	137,674	95,760	85,338	16,509
New Mexico: Albuquerque (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,166,198	2,492,512	22,668	17,529	60,978	211,361	94,914	63,259	33,006	774
	1956	3,254,550	2,591,686	21,421	18,478	53,492	218,572	93,837	60,550	31,352	833
	1957	3,292,323	2,680,579	22,119	19,421	66,268	212,280	89,584	75,905	34,302	817
	1958	3,594,506	2,941,090	21,695	19,419	56,630	208,930	108,565	74,752	28,508	881
	1959	3,723,203	3,111,806	19,723	20,000	60,700	210,000	128,764	64,440	8,170	916
Fort Bayard (TB)	1955	1,355,042	1,070,222	10,988	10,488	40,648	90,008	27,839	19,142	51,837	1,620
	1956	1,356,376	1,078,389	11,725	10,661	40,013	76,601	27,193	21,374	59,142	1,703
	1957	1,374,310	1,103,682	10,561	10,748	39,460	75,685	28,137	20,402	63,604	1,521
	1958	1,506,350	1,243,166	10,704	10,361	40,983	83,569	28,941	22,894	33,863	1,458
	1959	1,547,013	1,296,429	11,209	7,697	43,322	79,329	30,583	22,818	35,570	1,681
New York: Albany (G.M. & S.)	1955	5,355,898	4,268,868	15,671	24,354	70,600	360,870	170,185	112,330	46,843	728
	1956	5,678,023	4,556,583	17,633	24,884	71,420	366,218	161,199	131,567	59,720	746
	1957	5,864,511	4,715,415	15,846	24,900	74,793	378,875	160,408	139,639	61,059	826
	1958	6,435,629	5,333,375	14,326	27,314	76,879	370,968	164,395	114,702	29,976	871
	1959	6,702,261	5,618,099	14,637	29,313	77,138	382,500	166,280	124,898	28,381	939
Batavia (TB)	1955	1,443,412	1,124,739	1,293	4,719	38,929	99,454	24,013	19,355	69,039	6,065
	1956	1,464,448	1,201,163	1,059	4,993	37,131	94,967	25,015	23,891	25,686	4,847
	1957	1,448,559	1,189,743	1,131	5,335	40,748	86,477	24,199	24,293	14,807	5,139
	1958	1,583,566	1,300,965	980	5,598	43,221	92,122	28,780	23,977	24,270	4,791
	1959	1,695,315	1,408,172	1,608	5,966	47,014	96,024	29,489	28,937	17,082	3,665
Bath (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,089,591	1,750,328	9,654	7,795	28,679	125,975	36,707	39,072	8,159	804
	1956	2,190,607	1,845,774	10,093	8,607	30,122	123,196	38,220	36,275	15,015	846
	1957	2,187,334	1,812,220	8,144	9,364	33,353	125,464	31,733	36,307	58,066	763
	1958	2,357,305	1,978,669	8,861	9,088	31,810	129,893	33,967	31,845	40,926	1,210
	1959	2,125,691	1,793,077	4,633	8,495	30,771	89,855	31,047	31,585	33,027	1,338
Bronx (G.M. & S.)	1955	9,739,795	7,843,815	10,183	30,540	232,707	556,105	289,087	229,987	203,516	803
	1956	9,963,990	8,258,991	12,430	30,212	188,537	535,388	261,728	269,058	143,186	914
	1957	10,013,490	8,207,192	9,895	36,022	243,773	547,891	305,097	293,020	122,387	860
	1958	10,874,852	8,930,638	9,708	38,247	221,591	575,360	324,645	323,473	175,306	1,141
	1959	11,680,439	9,555,787	10,125	41,256	229,012	553,775	304,804	348,897	174,277	1,229
Brooklyn (G.M. & S.)	1955	6,209,624	4,844,838	3,738	22,753	96,655	372,217	205,005	167,245	29,243	988
	1956	6,684,995	5,215,672	3,479	22,969	104,736	363,871	276,509	192,759	77,266	970
	1957	6,731,835	5,345,707	2,966	23,874	112,171	376,055	279,791	192,158	37,427	897
	1958	7,337,514	5,878,929	1,936	25,373	110,981	409,812	302,626	189,155	42,893	1,161
	1959	7,751,223	6,315,952	2,584	24,543	113,199	388,680	291,063	193,595	33,053	1,199
Buffalo (G.M. & S.)	1955	5,178,044	4,106,004	11,935	17,026	130,550	292,528	176,340	118,569	70,310	732
	1956	5,403,949	4,440,978	13,874	17,829	145,274	283,151	170,206	119,694	30,871	810
	1957	5,653,165	4,574,986	14,634	19,106	154,036	302,578	191,940	140,729	52,070	892
	1958	6,173,948	5,092,958	10,703	19,155	152,831	306,856	210,294	132,331	41,407	1,127
	1959	6,445,992	5,390,903	14,930	20,000	154,379	307,823	208,291	136,213	595	1,235
Canandaigua (NP)	1955	4,561,174	3,552,844	4,178	7,337	157,100	601,508	28,685	42,393	89,834	12,832
	1956	4,848,712	3,759,858	1,829	8,268	159,735	586,640	40,209	57,870	110,683	6,839
	1957	4,926,794	3,806,197	910	9,110	170,832	579,200	57,234	77,945	87,922	5,996
	1958	5,452,188	4,288,150	950	9,175	176,030	592,609	67,868	75,390	81,064	8,365
	1959	5,821,441	4,687,861	1,374	9,471	187,212	593,795	70,099	77,656	25,002	9,698
Castel Point (TB)	1955	2,745,927	2,058,364	2,633	9,751	76,487	233,556	51,789	41,503	132,611	5,027
	1956	2,464,527	1,960,133	1,588	9,206	78,129	184,780	41,207	36,079	14,394	6,671
	1957	2,345,515	1,807,419	1,419	9,578	80,748	157,841	33,681	36,216	28,140	6,430
	1958	2,508,816	2,022,190	1,561	10,835	85,455	159,954	33,066	34,162	59,394	6,353
	1959	2,259,666	1,932,931	2,936	10,763	81,559	138,081	26,558	33,305	4,804	7,352
Montrose (NP)	1955	5,912,573	4,511,566	1,575	14,011	158,994	647,724	68,059	42,079	41,971	6,229
	1956	6,164,855	4,843,412	414	15,737	171,018	651,045	92,015	70,372	49,594	6,024
	1957	6,381,335	5,062,774	494	16,790	182,834	635,049	89,385	86,306	73,281	7,126
	1958	0,661,539	5,274,403	327	17,888	187,530	679,890	102,795	92,090	79,033	7,918
	1959	7,022,472	5,689,516	670	18,089	198,743	675,987	100,900	90,992	13,339	5,789
New York (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,571,036	1,727,275	616	18,546	154,646	102,198	185,602	139,202	103,749	992
	1956	6,228,906	4,811,372	6,486	22,975	232,112	337,294	219,747	169,012	162,010	810
	1957	7,748,991	6,376,540	6,519	27,611	251,707	477,402	298,089	191,741	74,616	983
	1958	8,610,368	6,910,244	5,710	32,128	269,447	488,625	333,273	221,284	68,906	1,097
	1959	9,310,099	7,487,252	6,451	31,464	274,538	479,431	326,446	227,840	27,585	1,099
Northport (NP)	1955	6,411,830	5,036,990	1,961	13,875	169,810	760,553	60,250	84,549	57,138	6,507
	1956	6,905,336	5,488,209	630	14,873	176,408	855,136	63,586	87,619	127,139	7,097
	1957	7,530,076	5,931,668	386	17,448	209,440	885,196	73,546	95,305	227,340	6,292
	1958	8,215,561	6,700,410	519	18,821	204,206	905,379	90,804	71,031	119,933	6,458
	1959	8,650,604	7,056,583	400	20,400	206,725	919,118	93,200	81,444	91,235	7,956
Sunmount (TB)	1955	2,625,910	1,959,633	17,020	9,910	90,753	216,811	72,104	61,324	32,723	2,821
	1956	2,691,240	2,019,863	16,172	10,107	101,987	227,521	61,723	63,495	54,441	2,563
	1957	2,709,106	2,056,350	13,586	11,053	107,783	214,917	55,971	64,454	29,464	2,891
	1958	2,919,695	2,287,254	14,367	11,661	114,075	201,253	62,524	55,729	34,192	2,848
	1959	2,815,104	2,236,231	14,494	11,740	107,164	189,460	51,841	54,750	26,907	2,712
Syracuse (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,526,698	1,985,620	11,550	13,264	100,233	139,973	78,356	74,879	12,587	773
	1956	2,926,888	2,339,401	11,592	15,075	98,502	157,005	99,032	76,615	14,254	791
	1957	3,272,373	2,543,717	12,579	17,060	91,430	181,943	116,267	106,358	37,020	804
	1958	3,568,779	2,830,178	12,323	18,640	100,146	185,376	131,995	116,277	32,798	859
	1959	3,794,493	3,055,233	13,728	19,811	105,532	186,275	121,448	132,674	8,554	920

Net cost of operation of VA hospitals, fiscal years 1955–59—Continued

Hospital	Fiscal year	Elements of cost: Total	Salaries of staff	Patient travel	Communications	Utilities	Raw foods	Drugs and medicines	Medical and dental supplies	Asset acquisitions	Cost per patient discharged
North Carolina:											
Durham (G.M. & S.)	1955	$3,073,295	$2,447,851	$27,273	$13,393	$70,857	$161,678	$111,721	$106,015	$7,060	$563
	1956	3,316,844	2,601,837	22,751	13,067	74,717	172,747	107,069	99,596	48,185	592
	1957	3,497,851	2,734,619	24,146	13,381	80,969	179,189	110,025	110,673	75,742	608
	1958	3,810,376	3,084,288	21,938	13,406	89,240	177,759	126,219	111,434	34,076	610
	1959	4,052,070	3,301,380	33,430	15,008	93,660	181,171	142,912	106,665	14,000	668
Fayetteville (G.M & S.)	1955	1,972,017	1,573,881	17,628	8,520	36,216	134,626	45,396	43,294	33,307	507
	1956	2,186,157	1,770,053	16,282	8,869	41,185	138,041	48,579	41,628	27,002	470
	1957	2,300,176	1,849,334	14,779	8,989	45,594	143,957	50,984	48,820	40,433	538
	1958	2,584,551	2,072,477	15,926	9,120	51,347	147,349	60,933	61,002	65,127	699
	1959	2,674,727	2,199,348	17,000	9,500	51,850	148,652	68,822	54,815	17,000	701
Oteen (combined) (TB)	1955	7,494,187	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	1,496
	1956	7,748,438	6,232,940	38,979	33,660	222,347	516,432	180,352	159,463	80,530	1,456
	1957	7,434,188	6,006,688	32,226	33,906	210,219	463,242	159,852	144,756	84,115	1,583
	1958	7,484,351	6,085,220	31,782	33,876	194,486	440,913	168,234	153,923	118,977	1,510
	1959	7,847,210	6,394,486	32,462	33,405	206,669	446,878	186,754	161,742	74,754	1,426
Salisbury (NP)	1955	2,277,276	1,767,292	5,508	10,895	39,514	152,567	28,958	19,141	41,520	2,321
	1956	3,129,651	2,526,863	10,999	12,986	47,809	206,853	41,495	40,486	56,457	1,951
	1957	3,615,797	2,997,888	10,045	13,642	51,644	244,236	43,797	47,162	84,511	1,139
	1958	4,300,738	3,610,480	9,326	13,794	55,261	280,576	52,632	51,167	37,756	1,658
	1959	4,855,184	4,098,503	8,013	13,978	59,714	315,958	61,041	56,596	35,068	2,326
North Dakota:											
Fargo (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,211,419	976,979	12,664	5,355	44,047	47,960	26,129	20,769	11,831	680
	1956	1,379,057	1,095,611	14,525	4,736	44,349	60,845	41,706	26,872	37,464	652
	1957	1,455,382	1,146,834	11,799	2,236	50,029	72,355	41,368	29,614	49,623	789
	1958	1,610,989	1,301,660	12,264	1,858	44,339	77,184	43,013	26,374	43,279	883
	1959	1,667,071	1,393,229	12,958	5,148	53,025	71,737	53,677	29,702	12,386	722
Minot (G.M. & S.)	1955	659,544	515,098	3,475	3,359	32,511	25,361	11,897	7,466	8,667	1,010
	1956	610,638	491,300	3,204	3,703	27,320	27,824	11,624	8,200	3,049	1,075
	1957	690,438	554,552	3,993	3,073	24,298	34,146	14,692	11,658	13,682	767
	1958	750,457	612,267	3,869	3,083	25,417	34,840	16,036	11,317	8,773	876
	1959	802,676	659,126	4,409	3,510	27,224	35,737	17,584	11,616	3,070	961
Ohio:											
Brecksville (TB)	1955	1,626,846	1,246,082	2,324	5,280	49,248	144,145	24,366	20,720	36,477	4,246
	1956	1,616,737	1,266,681	2,306	5,009	51,468	112,649	31,982	28,917	30,058	3,909
	1957	1,610,480	1,279,519	2,158	4,970	53,101	111,800	30,366	26,675	18,924	3,707
	1958	1,755,307	1,414,424	3,020	5,382	53,920	113,017	33,553	22,182	29,841	3,777
	1959	1,822,114	1,488,667	2,946	5,855	53,429	115,775	32,473	25,131	12,066	3,682
Chillicothe (NP)	1955	5,924,831	4,528,068	3,720	5,108	106,152	720,310	41,443	115,928	114,335	4,267
	1956	6,211,049	4,853,655	4,596	4,899	126,698	666,697	87,014	125,955	71,758	4,992
	1957	6,225,013	4,894,774	4,523	5,167	136,339	639,726	124,847	80,660	110,669	5,501
	1958	6,799,557	5,443,319	5,136	5,821	134,395	660,069	127,605	97,490	84,218	6,438
	1959	7,089,113	5,817,733	5,495	5,107	137,655	655,568	123,309	72,884	47,541	6,837
Cincinnati (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,381,138	2,540,580	3,127	15,144	106,636	247,530	80,783	33,609	27,941	(3)
	1956	4,142,190	3,236,113	5,666	17,603	112,516	260,765	81,366	89,867	73,069	(3)
	1957	4,456,463	3,350,301	6,525	17,708	128,214	281,975	99,563	96,095	143,683	(3)
	1958	4,918,100	3,854,477	6,302	19,031	132,037	306,541	115,264	121,580	67,356	(3)
	1959	5,127,604	4,045,916	7,000	22,081	132,725	310,200	124,000	119,480	38,445	(3)
Cleveland (G.M. & S.)	1955	5,573,626	4,460,815	29,118	16,904	176,876	341,381	149,785	132,168	132,748	744
	1956	5,841,095	4,744,486	36,295	22,189	173,377	334,919	121,359	167,249	104,966	792
	1957	5,736,732	4,716,127	32,632	21,750	177,398	334,830	123,165	161,988	72,603	810
	1958	6,227,770	5,160,695	30,754	22,041	183,578	323,288	125,123	154,881	94,282	1,025
	1959	6,472,042	5,403,331	32,642	21,838	200,175	330,702	127,386	158,368	48,293	1,082
Dayton (G.M. & S.)	1955	5,329,214	4,125,361	22,328	16,111	49,859	356,418	144,131	113,549	116,304	(3)
	1956	5,761,014	4,459,732	16,338	18,306	41,887	347,732	161,982	129,592	147,173	(3)
	1957	6,080,686	4,686,244	12,704	20,773	38,695	360,681	166,337	144,617	157,359	(3)
	1958	6,719,442	5,486,063	10,379	19,693	43,509	351,005	159,128	150,875	100,883	(3)
	1959	6,736,150	5,599,835	11,507	19,568	68,897	310,726	147,819	136,373	68,957	(3)
Oklahoma:											
Muskogee (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,138,357	1,723,573	27,518	7,577	26,577	108,698	73,991	49,572	31,501	455
	1956	2,246,897	1,831,123	27,091	7,638	25,834	113,183	72,553	48,123	35,165	450
	1957	2,303,143	1,847,367	24,889	8,100	27,297	118,303	67,921	51,755	70,764	449
	1958	2,497,181	2,057,403	20,677	8,644	31,868	116,405	70,902	50,256	49,646	537
	1959	2,592,722	2,168,032	24,465	8,586	33,556	122,017	72,142	53,054	18,209	578
Oklahoma City (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,761,819	2,188,053	18,843	13,499	49,400	155,371	86,889	61,823	87,394	735
	1956	3,150,362	2,518,321	25,428	12,491	51,368	184,237	99,137	76,957	72,096	606
	1957	3,199,876	2,626,812	24,776	12,024	51,650	184,403	104,157	73,558	26,499	557
	1958	3,508,882	2,890,107	18,373	13,123	54,106	183,366	111,052	82,420	42,276	688
	1959	3,764,445	3,139,515	23,151	13,695	55,410	185,769	133,550	79,137	20,270	688
Oregon:											
Portland (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,845,065	3,043,323	21,324	14,913	(2)	197,778	(2)	(2)	126,887	(3)
	1956	3,866,885	3,163,509	24,198	16,640	21,037	197,103	88,787	95,843	47,798	(3)
	1957	3,903,637	3,199,777	23,124	20,859	20,799	193,746	95,183	95,173	66,059	(3)
	1958	4,349,604	3,637,455	31,742	18,874	21,190	204,130	101,387	96,898	36,200	(3)
	1959	4,533,171	3,830,325	32,382	19,115	22,300	202,967	107,264	101,199	1,862	(3)
Roseburg (NP)	1955	1,879,003	1,443,565	912	6,546	65,000	213,140	8,937	17,500	33,577	4,463
	1956	2,068,546	1,596,724	1,469	5,995	66,614	214,194	23,719	18,002	33,986	5,807
	1957	2,180,964	1,680,311	569	7,186	70,997	211,866	32,545	21,590	50,611	8,910
	1958	2,392,446	1,866,498	511	6,996	70,200	216,908	40,431	22,864	53,622	(2)
	1959	2,454,564	2,001,163	1,067	7,011	70,930	204,034	40,413	21,236	10,047	(2)
Pennsylvania:											
Altoona (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,324,387	1,042,100	7,503	5,351	35,794	75,698	26,716	22,360	42,118	633
	1956	1,386,759	1,115,519	6,482	5,416	36,728	73,427	30,883	26,476	17,500	723
	1957	1,414,748	1,143,167	6,492	5,854	39,821	74,430	31,831	23,763	23,293	739
	1958	1,548,204	1,283,882	5,341	6,312	42,350	76,408	36,929	24,467	14,011	912
	1959	1,615,788	1,372,271	5,881	6,244	43,931	76,179	36,010	20,737	5,449	885
Butler (TB)	1955	2,609,366	2,076,084	4,146	8,564	59,348	234,979	47,686	30,945	15,904	4,747
	1956	2,625,918	2,147,420	3,938	10,155	75,695	218,897	50,629	54,108	30,971	4,188
	1957	2,647,082	2,165,245	3,000	10,097	75,999	224,742	61,104	51,162	30,048	4,476
	1958	2,919,589	2,445,160	3,697	10,211	80,069	234,483	62,268	50,600	18,163	4,919
	1959	3,054,734	2,563,940	3,414	10,300	80,911	225,295	62,441	54,505	27,841	4,847
Coatesville (NP)	1955	5,590,404	4,505,339	2,948	10,992	154,293	662,612	42,235	31,195	58,638	12,595
	1956	5,866,399	4,663,872	608	11,421	129,260	565,799	71,898	58,152	142,624	14,773
	1957	5,894,574	4,736,321	9,356	12,814	142,444	551,344	114,496	55,573	114,005	11,181
	1958	6,096,849	4,960,309	1,422	13,405	152,476	531,889	104,241	42,935	53,604	11,534
	1959	6,259,914	5,260,440	2,108	13,722	149,141	534,708	104,581	51,649	28,261	13,897
Erie (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,243,214	1,005,547	4,175	6,377	46,930	62,505	27,546	18,481	22,100	770
	1956	1,318,563	1,071,511	4,880	5,849	49,572	64,813	25,712	16,854	5,979	867
	1957	1,309,750	1,096,514	4,696	5,318	47,924	66,937	30,699	17,258	3,065	1,029
	1958	1,480,810	1,230,531	5,086	5,084	52,358	73,905	33,628	18,815	14,460	932
	1959	1,552,121	1,310,257	5,132	5,294	51,349	78,007	35,152	19,113	6,989	940

Footnotes at end of table.

Net cost of operation of VA hospitals, fiscal years 1955–59—Continued

Hospital	Fiscal year	Elements of cost: Total	Salaries of staff	Patient travel	Communications	Utilities	Raw foods	Drugs and medicines	Medical and dental supplies	Asset acquisitions	Cost per patient discharged
Pennsylvania—Continued											
Lebanon (NP)	1955	$3,929,096	$3,182,451	$6,785	$11,184	$102,264	$343,350	$63,650	$68,176	$35,594	$986
	1956	4,148,922	3,438,370	7,961	11,147	103,981	322,291	60,274	70,894	32,743	1,071
	1957	4,225,058	3,507,985	7,675	11,343	99,729	320,661	71,514	81,244	45,824	1,257
	1958	4,644,275	3,916,594	7,997	11,729	114,211	335,203	74,178	74,502	26,970	1,874
	1959	4,896,628	4,127,546	8,734	11,953	118,736	339,488	70,028	62,931	13,778	1,836
Philadelphia (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,254,385	2,546,043	1,089	13,078	70,338	188,589	112,102	97,227	61,061	679
	1956	3,484,608	2,785,385	2,425	14,068	62,233	185,254	122,062	96,176	69,185	695
	1957	3,494,848	2,811,803	2,359	14,526	77,679	190,051	104,721	98,323	29,400	700
	1958	3,833,638	3,145,154	3,086	16,833	78,795	194,114	114,398	102,947	10,460	736
	1959	4,065,551	3,340,013	3,210	16,034	84,252	199,899	123,129	109,621	11,640	778
Pittsburgh (NP)	1955	3,619,398	2,832,045	4,035	11,174	96,302	249,662	52,603	54,270	177,907	1,897
	1956	4,896,008	4,053,042	3,874	12,966	99,433	318,846	60,852	60,342	113,387	2,847
	1957	4,784,353	4,062,874	3,920	14,942	94,449	342,037	72,422	53,790	29,003	4,089
	1958	5,156,249	4,356,222	3,019	15,761	103,783	329,782	90,286	66,316	43,604	4,695
	1959	5,446,818	4,657,685	3,668	16,000	116,255	337,829	87,572	59,088	16,009	5,228
Pittsburgh (G.M. & S.)	1955	6,058,777	4,688,566	32,544	19,842	59,628	304,222	202,643	232,242	198,319	715
	1956	6,623,331	5,273,240	28,729	23,465	127,895	373,937	175,865	141,604	55,608	591
	1957	6,728,634	5,530,727	30,088	27,069	147,950	418,473	185,389	164,586	109,739	494
	1958	7,411,723	6,069,677	29,582	26,286	139,394	450,172	243,120	153,830	104,969	696
	1959	7,784,043	6,337,632	41,120	26,800	146,653	472,922	213,147	156,659	88,170	733
Wilkes-Barre (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,945,646	2,483,480	6,294	8,835	83,281	182,257	54,624	36,929	11,325	979
	1956	3,157,783	2,668,695	5,295	9,380	82,651	186,933	63,985	48,356	12,201	863
	1957	3,180,885	2,676,839	4,664	9,944	77,848	182,544	56,332	52,390	21,020	981
	1958	3,487,073	2,973,109	3,599	10,214	84,973	190,026	66,273	57,868	17,287	1,178
	1959	3,645,365	3,116,725	4,024	10,564	84,850	190,226	65,318	66,197	4,465	1,279
Puerto Rico: San Juan (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,882,424	1,579,343	3,734	----------	13,021	82,047	36,483	60,229	23,500	560
	1956	1,954,037	1,579,654	3,889	----------	10,273	77,108	41,985	73,039	26,997	544
	1957	2,014,437	1,604,681	6,163	----------	15,036	81,924	38,979	68,559	46,533	555
	1958	2,045,759	1,691,727	3,926	----------	17,063	83,339	43,343	67,706	14,582	484
	1959	2,163,382	1,837,277	4,302	----------	20,595	78,256	52,764	58,505	4,915	463
Rhode Island: Providence (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,558,529	2,063,562	7,541	10,275	27,374	128,125	63,231	53,680	14,171	696
	1956	2,534,085	2,051,968	6,347	8,762	26,730	132,784	63,572	62,483	55,575	684
	1957	2,538,169	2,064,747	6,874	9,171	27,451	132,464	67,280	55,881	41,758	711
	1958	2,755,191	2,268,072	4,168	9,616	28,249	132,576	80,041	55,124	26,424	705
	1959	2,867,500	2,423,499	4,676	9,614	28,667	132,102	75,610	56,347	6,887	716
South Carolina: Columbia (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,275,453	2,618,002	37,557	9,430	25,895	185,247	118,415	89,054	33,168	689
	1956	3,587,976	2,851,084	41,231	9,875	27,640	202,917	114,343	89,469	69,550	593
	1957	3,690,737	2,948,278	42,121	10,234	30,267	212,385	107,679	91,783	80,717	637
	1958	4,008,022	3,280,120	41,793	11,538	29,675	203,046	115,472	88,853	46,140	620
	1959	4,244,064	3,478,612	45,165	11,904	31,242	222,590	117,093	93,359	64,308	617
South Dakota:											
Fort Meade (NP)	1955	2,466,526	1,792,330	2,618	9,399	71,255	251,200	20,805	45,733	112,839	5,207
	1956	2,500,089	1,941,609	1,351	10,823	69,442	227,821	23,794	42,069	49,647	10,848
	1957	2,512,123	1,977,609	1,286	9,873	63,832	231,908	21,804	33,342	44,765	7,918
	1958	2,738,357	2,175,563	1,732	10,158	58,630	234,701	24,951	34,168	57,211	7,829
	1959	3,129,374	2,453,998	3,012	10,530	76,089	248,808	23,919	30,928	1,521	7,951
Hot Springs (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,412,141	1,084,211	12,032	8,932	33,804	108,002	39,231	19,261	29,629	906
	1956	1,540,989	1,213,881	12,246	9,431	35,138	103,643	32,491	22,746	24,484	869
	1957	1,589,099	1,224,028	8,999	8,732	36,029	95,898	42,570	20,722	64,747	886
	1958	1,710,462	1,328,153	7,721	8,788	41,755	107,352	43,834	23,024	76,065	1,077
	1959	1,798,725	1,432,327	9,208	8,000	54,115	106,480	39,446	18,619	18,499	1,219
Sioux Falls (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,527,288	1,163,625	12,335	5,660	36,314	78,273	44,491	17,405	48,525	594
	1956	1,594,500	1,244,213	15,269	5,544	36,369	77,898	42,782	17,093	40,948	605
	1957	1,688,230	1,330,457	15,824	5,905	32,627	88,886	48,374	31,148	47,975	698
	1958	1,875,263	1,507,980	13,034	6,132	36,097	91,369	51,488	27,120	51,481	799
	1959	1,945,274	1,606,443	13,715	6,612	38,946	100,102	46,997	27,327	17,392	806
Memphis (G.M. & S.)	1955	8,088,178	6,499,746	93,027	25,709	121,413	450,398	251,432	149,145	132,164	600
	1956	8,495,465	6,937,655	92,539	25,044	122,193	409,984	255,374	206,444	152,664	728
	1957	8,643,770	7,019,676	96,509	26,640	124,859	426,552	283,887	225,368	155,410	757
	1958	9,521,224	7,935,431	76,681	32,164	135,341	454,040	348,143	218,509	81,634	903
	1959	10,504,178	8,957,956	70,093	32,432	148,193	486,847	304,409	219,909	42,375	943
Mountain Home (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,735,126	2,134,101	21,931	3,838	44,062	193,890	128,446	72,250	47,026	664
	1956	2,912,710	2,287,388	21,275	3,007	55,856	178,557	106,113	59,230	45,915	696
	1957	3,101,701	2,495,464	22,814	3,265	29,695	195,455	114,438	78,648	49,257	687
	1958	3,462,205	2,889,200	24,512	4,048	36,367	202,058	88,774	78,605	57,039	847
	1959	3,603,803	2,999,368	23,723	3,820	41,053	240,944	92,836	77,673	15,191	894
Murfreesboro (MP)	1955	3,143,873	2,521,344	6,541	7,049	79,701	337,248	12,507	32,822	40,840	9,527
	1956	3,308,780	2,666,766	6,237	7,172	59,865	330,714	29,485	38,371	40,518	9,140
	1957	3,404,961	2,724,075	10,121	7,110	64,951	321,180	53,709	48,055	55,303	5,591
	1958	3,963,659	3,169,401	21,205	9,042	70,846	381,573	64,024	59,100	42,752	4,499
	1959	4,058,349	3,320,698	25,000	9,216	70,959	383,869	56,440	48,793	8,594	4,289
Nashville (G.M. & S)	1955	3,731,735	3,001,324	35,213	15,230	114,533	202,977	109,840	97,334	37,345	771
	1956	3,878,693	3,126,729	40,412	16,625	116,632	190,330	106,800	94,683	52,460	771
	1957	3,855,248	3,115,269	45,779	16,522	117,077	187,080	98,873	93,798	55,630	720
	1958	4,201,836	3,419,226	46,490	19,625	128,746	194,544	138,136	103,614	34,462	796
	1959	4,489,297	3,594,297	47,051	19,789	127,752	194,540	122,771	120,289	48,305	847
Texas:											
Amarillo (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,002,926	794,133	11,629	4,523	18,056	50,691	19,741	14,113	17,452	436
	1956	1,057,131	822,485	11,342	4,399	17,226	53,840	27,314	18,752	34,600	504
	1957	1,078,567	833,151	11,465	5,016	18,061	54,863	26,302	15,824	28,987	522
	1958	1,202,838	921,300	11,415	5,234	17,396	56,572	29,051	17,306	23,121	586
	1959	1,247,647	1,012,904	13,400	5,320	17,450	56,385	26,509	16,894	6,363	593
Big Springs (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,172,720	888,411	18,616	7,374	39,000	68,535	40,444	19,279	8,297	506
	1956	1,408,646	1,073,334	21,009	7,220	42,370	93,636	57,708	24,656	13,474	449
	1957	1,452,855	1,103,879	20,242	7,941	41,662	90,915	64,840	26,553	28,645	476
	1958	1,633,410	1,271,937	21,234	6,980	42,978	97,409	65,874	29,259	27,270	534
	1959	1,733,734	1,386,787	19,828	7,905	45,426	97,027	63,319	28,164	13,007	565
Bonham (G.M. & S.)	1955	374,430	324,155	594	799	8,625	18,228	5,687	2,334	936	684
	1956	461,275	399,072	624	2,632	7,976	18,047	10,490	5,841	1,477	693
	1957	444,386	375,272	463	2,306	8,036	18,116	11,175	6,338	5,923	568
	1958	476,716	398,540	656	2,798	8,083	18,012	17,156	6,696	6,625	706
	1959	514,526	435,581	1,174	3,107	8,560	19,312	14,738	6,029	4,017	744
Dallas (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,557,218	1,951,421	11,224	11,910	42,304	128,789	91,734	135,283	11,393	723
	1956	3,042,324	2,393,653	34,599	17,797	48,882	139,209	107,037	145,406	50,610	618
	1957	3,143,666	2,539,085	41,831	18,262	51,160	149,699	127,031	130,706	17,516	562
	1958	3,536,876	2,862,201	22,985	18,510	52,447	150,463	138,804	112,881	25,321	707
	1959	4,746,157	3,833,113	34,022	20,856	78,590	227,086	172,177	181,302	24,300	731
Houston (G.M. & S.)	1955	7,121,305	5,548,479	77,156	33,483	120,754	476,087	260,817	241,563	137,332	769
	1956	7,662,463	6,053,246	75,239	35,151	129,176	463,400	299,696	252,804	49,410	773
	1957	7,802,352	6,165,507	63,428	34,861	152,998	445,683	286,459	311,460	69,201	780
	1958	9,052,328	7,266,363	59,497	38,237	167,705	470,448	294,259	318,013	98,151	916
	1959	9,741,411	7,854,279	66,000	38,621	190,000	531,230	354,692	328,056	34,491	860

Net cost of operation of VA hospitals, fiscal years 1955–59—Continued

Hospital	Fiscal year	Elements of cost: Total	Salaries of staff	Patient travel	Communications	Utilities	Raw foods	Drugs and medicines	Medical and dental supplies	Asset acquisitions	Cost per patient discharged
Texas—Continued											
Kerrville (TB)	1955	$2,241,363	$1,793,491	$7,595	$6,437	$44,401	$181,651	(2)	(2)	$52,629	$1,606
	1956	2,315,090	1,880,588	10,680	6,673	46,440	173,070	$46,199	$35,994	36,541	1,753
	1957	2,276,403	1,882,715	12,477	6,770	48,174	176,257	51,990	41,620	12,562	1,602
	1958	2,543,013	2,125,642	10,326	6,793	51,821	172,451	61,536	40,482	16,191	1,673
	1959	2,646,948	2,226,479	10,529	6,780	49,008	173,086	61,326	39,998	7,276	1,644
Marlin (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,009,682	827,093	7,008	5,818	27,708	55,174	20,555	15,453	20,059	741
	1956	1,209,594	990,333	5,475	6,140	28,221	65,404	30,471	18,606	10,990	895
	1957	1,317,172	1,079,502	6,486	6,500	30,657	75,011	32,937	22,722	19,520	759
	1958	1,548,594	1,291,506	10,037	6,671	31,837	75,979	44,048	30,349	35,209	744
	1959	1,629,464	1,382,025	11,037	6,629	31,444	76,647	39,694	29,802	7,880	741
McKinney (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,734,512	2,972,457	45,725	14,558	92,460	211,811	135,892	94,708	22,832	747
	1956	3,557,069	2,704,917	36,903	15,561	93,955	176,206	123,113	118,419	53,183	761
	1957	3,224,742	2,545,771	36,919	15,882	106,221	161,112	120,290	86,037	27,970	774
	1958	3,456,417	2,739,457	27,368	15,846	117,158	161,196	128,362	77,854	36,578	985
	1959	2,449,138	1,976,885	14,459	14,696	115,563	98,249	79,457	52,926	6,752	902
Temple (G.M. & S.) [5]	1956	4,260,464	3,343,754	25,070	13,406	80,113	249,097	93,157	72,295	120,575	695
	1957	4,347,478	3,409,364	26,629	14,642	81,040	262,742	91,644	75,014	106,764	771
	1958	4,699,191	3,783,851	19,374	16,083	83,060	274,585	109,993	84,394	72,411	874
	1959	4,901,823	4,028,624	20,900	14,846	82,824	280,467	108,388	77,017	35,714	906
Waco (NP)	1955	5,784,572	4,680,482	24,896	14,062	73,654	615,613	81,302	17,747	21,811	3,674
	1956	6,153,061	4,942,681	28,508	15,389	75,897	611,969	104,410	64,266	56,146	3,816
	1957	6,245,340	4,981,042	31,192	17,167	77,879	601,919	111,910	107,036	75,924	2,789
	1958	6,876,406	5,570,307	34,416	18,314	83,828	583,700	124,577	85,186	142,498	3,208
	1959	7,106,710	5,948,670	30,435	16,724	81,977	570,184	129,364	84,520	11,500	2,214
Utah: Salt Lake City (G.M. & S.) [5]	1956	5,093,438	4,268,608	15,372	22,021	69,605	268,564	88,675	74,866	49,883	1,242
	1957	5,091,518	4,288,077	12,564	21,085	71,402	269,998	100,226	79,154	34,961	1,229
	1958	5,349,864	4,419,656	11,433	22,974	77,838	269,749	135,333	86,209	53,298	1,641
	1959	5,601,341	4,612,407	14,263	23,800	74,465	275,970	136,226	102,520	34,823	1,889
Vermont: White River Junction (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,542,518	1,119,099	15,467	4,760	32,681	72,545	87,129	(6)	7,898	644
	1956	1,613,819	1,187,375	14,314	5,200	37,832	67,178	37,926	47,037	16,420	560
	1957	1,577,140	1,122,032	15,144	5,404	38,561	68,950	43,506	57,950	32,682	536
	1958	1,728,889	1,281,102	13,602	8,039	34,005	72,795	34,865	53,782	13,186	870
	1959	1,818,491	1,386,542	13,534	8,245	32,432	72,720	36,773	53,513	4,728	814
Virginia:											
Keeoughtan (G.M. & S.)	1955	3,176,117	2,487,158	4,444	10,228	56,323	217,807	81,546	59,871	113,232	1,280
	1956	3,296,142	2,411,467	7,615	11,218	74,450	172,362	93,711	67,793	111,225	1,314
	1957	3,302,543	2,464,749	5,776	11,751	70,681	167,855	106,077	73,194	55,924	1,313
	1958	3,554,693	2,939,799	3,956	12,935	80,783	159,804	122,503	66,698	39,046	1,546
	1959	3,756,163	3,132,372	3,839	11,875	67,588	162,223	117,955	66,967	33,412	1,590
Richmond (G.M. & S.)	1955	6,979,059	5,619,080	58,882	18,695	155,758	373,119	237,153	133,324	189,581	890
	1956	7,257,369	5,897,651	48,159	20,637	166,276	364,250	254,064	134,329	128,566	982
	1957	7,229,783	5,863,433	44,516	20,852	186,578	364,792	245,415	141,989	61,941	871
	1958	7,813,140	6,366,391	44,330	21,731	183,748	379,062	279,499	148,666	79,819	991
	1959	8,165,591	6,744,899	48,180	22,769	190,674	378,752	271,637	168,115	39,580	1,009
Roanoke (NP)	1955	6,060,201	4,906,209	12,787	16,361	101,414	630,360	51,553	64,117	76,965	3,023
	1956	6,385,368	5,211,010	10,661	15,637	113,022	585,542	126,036	78,294	64,530	3,560
	1957	6,515,340	5,163,603	15,200	16,187	126,489	581,115	140,917	86,942	178,994	3,494
	1958	7,066,801	5,726,779	11,892	15,650	140,149	609,414	146,707	75,818	126,725	3,468
	1959	7,258,289	5,985,301	12,245	15,155	127,939	636,878	128,496	79,556	73,968	3,906
Washington:											
American Lake (NP)	1955	3,108,763	2,335,727	1,836	12,475	93,975	271,820	28,586	24,781	112,575	8,007
	1956	3,213,551	2,507,582	2,073	10,237	61,451	266,131	39,112	38,414	46,197	7,558
	1957	3,403,171	2,642,907	1,180	9,778	77,697	250,899	32,283	53,131	81,098	8,255
	1958	3,683,771	2,924,123	2,246	9,818	79,294	260,860	48,907	46,817	57,710	9,639
	1959	3,741,609	3,101,267	2,784	10,011	82,785	254,556	48,880	44,464	30,475	9,576
Seattle (G.M. & S.)	1955	2,347,188	1,886,621	16,809	13,800	45,438	118,377	62,855	69,008	18,270	730
	1956	2,493,299	2,047,857	15,907	14,632	39,537	118,731	61,686	69,808	11,622	740
	1957	2,507,505	2,024,922	15,569	14,627	45,614	125,485	66,073	75,985	24,507	689
	1958	2,740,370	2,264,986	14,495	14,706	48,527	130,900	64,994	88,693	11,630	759
	1959	2,912,101	2,442,647	15,050	14,558	46,980	132,147	70,000	73,928	10,438	815
Spokane (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,056,208	835,070	6,042	7,330	38,469	53,659	34,189	22,565	5,111	756
	1956	1,357,000	1,074,954	7,068	7,913	37,678	75,229	45,068	39,247	12,243	755
	1957	1,393,646	1,116,059	6,609	7,363	48,317	75,051	41,428	33,955	17,458	745
	1958	1,537,922	1,241,950	7,180	7,324	48,600	74,513	40,000	36,774	22,569	775
	1959	1,628,880	1,350,352	6,700	7,175	48,200	75,948	40,227	35,275	7,017	787
Vancouver (G.M. & S.)	1955 [5]	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	745
	1956	3,070,378	2,347,206	14,700	10,500	20,600	176,300	64,700	40,900	23,700	760
	1957	3,174,384	2,190,243	12,300	8,100	23,800	188,600	70,700	40,700	39,500	864
	1958	3,671,180	3,055,881	14,500	11,400	18,100	182,500	70,300	47,200	93,900	895
	1959	3,771,538	3,236,649	14,000	11,300	24,000	182,800	71,100	43,300	3,900	1,008
Walla Walla (TB) [5]	1956	2,286,749	1,833,409	12,599	9,433	11,649	157,977	44,263	36,299	39,232	1,952
	1957	2,283,252	1,818,000	11,500	9,493	11,471	153,686	46,442	33,857	44,689	1,881
	1958	2,522,050	2,043,390	11,234	10,535	11,253	159,807	51,841	38,225	24,095	2,323
	1959	2,654,793	2,181,547	12,302	9,760	12,161	160,728	51,049	41,380	18,346	2,465
West Virginia:											
Beckley (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,068,814	871,566	7,124	5,891	33,063	60,464	17,601	19,401	5,992	370
	1956	1,152,623	943,500	8,772	6,476	34,863	53,787	18,090	20,153	12,703	460
	1957	1,159,289	953,498	8,883	7,053	33,589	58,539	27,422	16,261	5,355	522
	1958	1,327,949	1,087,838	6,786	7,479	39,733	63,279	32,696	21,538	17,365	712
	1959	1,409,200	1,170,934	7,415	8,070	40,506	63,453	32,715	21,393	7,298	758
Clarksburg (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,158,771	958,883	5,740	7,858	33,833	51,353	35,607	18,304	7,909	612
	1956	1,287,770	1,065,505	7,531	8,047	32,134	53,572	39,419	20,299	5,610	611
	1957	1,276,195	1,074,053	6,880	8,137	35,917	50,499	37,613	20,383	5,527	669
	1958	1,408,902	1,177,243	6,800	8,868	39,725	62,527	31,926	24,316	9,421	741
	1959	1,493,625	1,258,533	7,187	9,037	39,717	59,132	37,085	20,990	22,896	698
Huntington (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,373,414	1,048,850	18,827	7,473	29,043	65,216	28,736	25,136	61,230	690
	1956	1,400,276	1,112,325	19,821	6,736	27,195	60,676	31,526	24,610	59,896	664
	1957	1,398,174	1,138,931	19,235	7,694	29,688	64,438	40,273	30,965	20,050	701
	1958	1,507,285	1,243,419	19,214	9,173	32,102	66,189	49,871	30,801	16,072	922
	1959	1,572,757	1,309,723	18,513	7,377	34,276	66,285	53,257	31,299	2,545	757
Martinsburg (G.M. & S.)	1955	4,426,862	3,460,968	16,411	10,442	87,488	330,318	87,302	66,867	111,080	903
	1956	4,773,410	3,773,799	18,736	13,404	93,699	334,320	87,138	61,400	91,890	871
	1957	4,789,284	3,848,305	20,156	15,504	106,176	357,829	98,024	84,471	48,926	1,037
	1958	5,234,612	4,298,566	19,665	16,107	112,447	361,482	112,417	91,950	17,734	1,235
	1959	5,353,059	4,409,222	20,787	16,874	118,285	351,616	102,708	78,545	53,801	1,215

Footnotes at end of table.

Net cost of operation of VA hospitals, fiscal years 1955–59—Continued

Hospital	Fiscal year	Elements of cost: Total	Salaries of staff	Patient travel	Communications	Utilities	Raw foods	Drugs and medicines	Medical and dental supplies	Asset acquisitions	Cost per patient discharged
Wisconsin:											
Madison (TB)	1955	$2,634,609	$2,026,324	$7,234	$11,092	$57,874	$193,148	$62,219	$48,886	$70,986	$4,081
	1956	2,650,349	2,109,526	9,322	10,756	44,356	154,903	59,523	44,088	49,107	4,101
	1957	2,666,419	2,102,206	9,214	9,946	46,372	171,590	64,943	53,908	38,471	2,112
	1958	3,029,396	2,387,802	8,247	10,050	46,734	181,526	70,394	60,302	43,758	2,015
	1959	3,215,827	2,663,906	9,541	11,051	45,718	179,397	65,703	53,514	13,960	2,099
Tomah (NP)	1955	3,112,999	2,388,128	2,585	7,163	27,727	390,477	27,228	12,641	30,768	2,542
	1956	3,272,475	2,569,755	4,420	7,027	28,619	357,154	30,831	16,636	38,953	2,760
	1957	3,481,354	2,706,875	3,422	7,514	29,753	359,449	40,784	18,726	93,393	3,223
	1958	3,771,036	3,055,781	4,151	7,712	30,932	367,957	47,461	19,274	28,304	5,026
	1959	3,966,240	3,236,559	3,712	7,802	33,850	366,211	50,247	22,146	8,032	5,989
Wood (G.M. & S.)	1955	7,888,610	5,461,937	40,637	19,273	146,117	493,987	162,809	124,159	68,316	915
	1956	7,574,170	5,998,416	41,497	25,336	156,713	471,971	174,063	180,822	104,508	1,029
	1957	7,605,584	5,980,675	40,089	26,894	181,739	468,220	173,308	186,105	121,581	1,071
	1958	8,223,646	6,627,797	32,917	31,646	204,686	459,726	246,995	193,335	62,816	1,202
	1959	8,649,330	6,960,430	40,246	28,476	214,049	440,116	238,530	212,222	85,229	1,189
Wyoming:											
Cheyenne (G.M. & S.)	1955	1,013,992	773,132	21,068	5,583	20,557	55,315	14,434	11,784	5,062	237
	1956	1,085,726	847,874	20,705	5,198	22,487	50,097	21,277	19,760	39,822	255
	1957	1,071,674	845,142	19,036	4,217	21,581	50,480	10,904	12,653	26,275	249
	1958	1,168,858	939,712	19,370	4,019	17,720	51,201	15,944	12,067	15,815	276
	1959	1,233,791	1,010,624	20,054	4,549	21,786	50,663	17,563	16,250	15,944	296
Sheridan (NP)	1955	2,275,913	1,815,682	2,599	8,356	32,056	228,028	11,984	11,789	56,867	8,073
	1956	2,417,690	1,942,990	2,561	8,509	33,644	211,011	16,257	23,713	38,318	10,090
	1957	2,436,959	1,968,782	2,649	8,569	32,972	211,619	23,883	22,702	45,746	10,614
	1958	2,643,319	2,190,611	2,251	8,223	32,519	218,616	24,904	19,806	30,409	13,972
	1959	2,760,226	2,341,489	2,336	7,828	28,828	219,255	22,448	16,236	20,686	10,565

[1] Combined with medical and dental supplies.
[2] Not available.
[3] Not reported.
[4] Hospital opened Apr. 11, 1955.
[5] 1955 figures not available.
[6] Combined with drugs.

Source: Teague committee report.

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

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. As I understand the figure the gentleman submitted in this amendment, it is approximately $15 million more than the amount in the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. About $14 million.

Mr. YATES. The figure I thought the Clerk read was $792,779,000. If my mathematics is right, the result is over $15 million.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The exact figure is $14,579,000.

Mr. YATES. What was the figure that was in the gentleman's amendment? Was it $792,779,000?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. $792,079,000.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There is an item in this amendment that increases it over the budget slightly. Our committee in addition obtained a report from each VA hospital and had a hearing on deferred maintenance. We have a $2.8 billion hospital plant across the country which we are just letting fall to pieces without providing the essential upkeep. Another member of the committee will speak to that in a few minutes. All except a couple of million dollars of this pertains to the hospital care program. the Subcommittee on Hospitals found the need for additional funds for maintenance to be as indicated in the table which follows:

Summary of deferred maintenance and repair in VA hospitals

	Million
VA consolidated list of deferred maintenance and repair compiled for fiscal year 1959 budget	$15
List reduced by VA Central Office by reclassification and elimination of items to	11.5
Included in fiscal year 1959 budget for deferred maintenance and repair items	$3.1
Carryover of deferred maintenance items to fiscal year 1960	8.4
Included in fiscal year 1960 budget for deferred maintenance and repair items	3.1
Deferred maintenance and repair items to be carried over to fiscal year 1961 from fiscal year 1959	5.3
Deferred maintenance and repair items accumulated each year over and above appropriations for current and deferred maintenance and repair	3–4
Predicted deferred maintenance and repair items at end of fiscal year 1960, if appropriation for fiscal year 1960 for deferred maintenance and repair fund is not increased	8–9

The effect of the proposed reduction in the inpatient care is indicated by the table which I shall read:

Average employment including consultants	122,612
01 personal service costs	$597,596,000
Civil Service contribution	34,638,000
Federal insurance contribution account	180,000
Employee insurance	1,800,000
Total personal service and related costs	634,214,000
Average salary per budget	5,173
Inpatient care estimate in budget, total	786,779,000
Personal services and related costs	634,214,000
All others	152,565,000
House committee bill as reported	777,500,000
Reduction, net	$9,279,000
Increase to $6,0000,000 for deferred maintenance and repair, per report	2,912,000
Reductions to be applied to other costs	12,191,000
Total personal services in budget	634,214,000
Less reduction proposed	12,191,000
Total	622,023,000
Latest average salary per field report	5,258
Based on current experience will permit employment including consultants of	118,300
April 30 preliminary report of on duty employment	118,546
Reduction necessary under House committee bill, average employment of	246
Increase in patient load:	
1960 bill specifies	140,846
1959 fiscal year plan	140,493
Increased average patient load	253

Two hundred and sixty-five employees needed for additional patient load.

Two hundred and forty-six employees needed to maintain present on duty employment.

Five hundred and eleven employees at $5,258 average salary will require $2,687,000 in order to maintain present level of operations.

Additional staffing is needed to give adequate medical care—1960 patient loan in VA hospitals=111,296.

Employee-patient ratios of 1.048 necessary for proper hospital care applied to 1960 patient load (actual ratio is 1.035) will require 116,638 employees; 1960 member load of 16,750 at necessar employee member ratio

of .237 (actual ratio in 1959 is .233) will require 3,970 employees.

Total employees needed to care for patients	120,608
Cost for 120,608 at $5,258 average salary	$634,157,000
Amount provided by House bill	622,023,000
Increase needed to maintain proper care	12,134,000

(Mr. PORTER (at the request of Mr. ROUSH) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by my colleague, the respected chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Texas, OLIN TEAGUE. In my opinion this amount added to the budget and specifically earmarked for deferred maintenance at VA installations would be well used. For example in the city of Roseburg, in the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon, there is pressing need for a therapeutic exercise clinic building and connecting corridors from buildings 1 and 2.

Therapy to be effective is best performed under conditions where crowding is kept at a minimum. Patients deserve improvements which will keep them more comfortable.

The patients at the Roseburg Veterans' Administrative hospital, some 400 of them, are required to travel quite a distance from building 2 to the main dining room three times each day for their meals. It rains a great deal in my district. Too often these men must stand in the rain for many minutes as they go to the cafeteria for their meals. They catch colds. They are discomfited. There is no excuse for this sort of treatment. It can be corrected with a modest expenditure.

When I have discussed these hospital needs with the Veterans' Administration, I am told that the VA is aware of them but unable to budget for them. I believe this amendment would correct a deficient area. I am sure it would be helpful and would improve the care facilities for veterans throughout our country.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on these two paragraphs close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of this subcommittee should accept this amendment because a little while ago he said the amendment that was previously adopted did not pertain to veterans' care or medical care. I want to tell him now that this is something directly affecting the welfare of veterans of this country. As I said previously in my remarks here on the floor, Mr. Chairman, it just seems to me a foolhardy thing to do to take an installation in which the taxpayers of America have invested over $2.5 billions and not make these necessary repairs, which under the program that we have been using, especially for the last few years, continues to go backward in the upkeep of these hospitals. I think that if you had a building of your own and it needed a roof that you would put the roof on the building. That is exactly what we are trying to do here. I hope the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, all of us believe in economy, but when we seek to advance the cause of false economy by putting the dagger in the back of the veteran, I think we are departing from every American tradition. Since I have been in the Congress, I have always voted for the veteran and as long as I am here I will vote for the veteran. To me this is merely a matter of doing the decent thing for the veteran. I shall vote for amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Committee, Mr. TEAGUE, and supported by the beloved ranking minority member of that committee, Mrs. ROGERS.

There are no Members of the House whom I hold in higher regard and warmer esteem than the great chairman and his colleagues on this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. I know they have worked hard and conscientiously on this bill, and while I cannot agree with them in the items affecting veterans, I do want to commend them on their work generally. I am especially pleased with the understanding they have shown of the vital importance of the National Science Foundation and the recognition of the tremendously valuable achievements of the Foundation, they have given by boosting its appropriation $10 million above that of 1959.

If the committee now would reconsider and accept the amendments of the gentleman from Texas, its score would be near perfect.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MITCHELL].

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me commend each member of this distinguished committee and its able and gracious and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] for the able job that they have done on the entire bill, and particularly so far as the Veterans' Administration is concerned. I note in the committee report on page 12 that they have recognized the fact, and they put it in the report, and say that it has come to the committee's attention that there is need for more funds to eliminate the backlog of maintenance and repair items in the hospitals.

In doing that, they increased this item over the amount requested. What we are asking by this amendment is to set up an orderly 3-year plan to bring our Veterans' Administration maintenance program up to a current level. In effect, the amendment concerning maintenance will add only $2.4 million to the committee bill.

When you vote for this amendment, you will be setting up an orderly process of maintenance and operation in our Veterans' Administration hospital program. In addition, you will be saving the Government money in the long run because repairing a facility when it is needed is economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, the author of this amendment, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] is, in my opinion, one of the outstanding authorities on veterans' affairs in the Nation. He possesses a distinguished service record and is chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs as we all know.

It almost seems superfluous for me to add to the remarks that he has made. However, I can from personal observation attest to the condition of one of the hospitals which will be benefited by repair which will be made as a result of his amendment, and that is the neuropsychiatric hospital at Palo Alto. It is a World War I barrack, a firetrap, crowded to the rafters with neuropsychiatric veteran patients. I would like to say that this hospital is, in my opinion, a disgrace to the Government of the United States and it should be repaired. The outstanding and dedicated administration of Dr. Prusmack at this hospital is deserving of better facilities in which to work. I hope this amendment will be favorably considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I realize the temper of the House on these matters, but I think just a little factual information is not going to do us too much harm. I will repeat that we are all for the veterans and we are all in the same boat. This day-to-day maintenance is a matter that ought to be atteneded to. Let us deal here with maintenance and then we will talk about hospital care later. Of course, maintenance should be done and it is false economy not to be done. As a matter of fact, any hospital manager who lets his hospital get in a sloppy condition so far as day-to-day maintenance is concerned ought to be removed and replaced. There is no justification for it. The budget carried an item for $3,100,000 for day-to-day maintenance. Do not confuse that with a big operation in maintenance such as where you are going to tear down a wing of the hospital or you are going to put in a new boiler or a big cooking utensil in the kitchen costing maybe $15,000.

This is day-to-day ordinary maintenance and repair. We increased from $3,100,000 to $6 million. The Veterans Affairs' Committee wrote a letter and asked us to do it, and we did it. So that certainly ought to take care of that. But now let us look at the amendment, let us see what the amendment does.

The first amendment here on page 27 deals with an appropriation of $777,500,000, three-quarters of a billion dollars. We have cut it $9 million, about 1 percent. That is an increase of $9 over what they have for this year.

You have 121,000 employees in this organization. Any day of the week you are going to find a vacancy of 1,000 or

1,200 employees just because you cannot fill all the positions. Who am I to say that they cannot absorb that $9 million? Who are you?

There has not been a single new hospital built in a year, a year and a half, or 2 years, there has not been a single new bed added in a new hospital. They still have 141,000 beds. There is no salary increase here; that has already been taken care of, and yet all we cut was $9 million, and the amendment restores the $9 million plus 5 million more.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I shall be glad to yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. When it comes to these cuts and a reduction in personnel is forced it always happens to be the little three, four, five, and six categories that are cut; it never happens to be the higher ones.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think there is any reduction of personnel here. If I thought this was going to close one bed or cut off one service I would not do it. We gave $9 million over this year and cut out about 1 percent of the $786 million request. Now, this is not as if you had brought in four or five hundred new employees. That would be something else.

Mr. BAILEY. But this involves 570 employees, does it not, approximately?

Mr. THOMAS There are something like 1,350 unfilled jobs over there now, and that is normal, out of 121,000 employees, do you mean to tell me they cannot absorb this?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I hope the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will tell the House about the 4,000 phantom beds to show how difficult it is to appropriate with any degree of particularity.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, 4,165 phantom beds—beds that do not exist.

And then we come to a cut of $800,000 out of an item of $83 million. Not one employee was cut. And do you know what that cut of $800,000 was? It was for increased medical fees. The doctors out of that $83 million were getting $9.8 million for medical fees and they went up $800,000. We denied the increase. We did not cut a single employee or benefits to a single patient.

Five million dollars is in here for veterans' travel. We did not take a penny out of the item for veterans' travel.

Can we not make these little minor reductions of 1 percent? Can we not think of the taxpayer a little bit there?

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my distinguished friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to congratulate the gentleman on having such an agreeable job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired; all time on these amendments has expired.

The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS), there were—ayes 73, noes 40.

So the amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence and allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans' Administration, and for the payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended, $3,300,000,000, to remain available until expended.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is about all a man's political life is worth to vote against the veterans or anything that may be proposed in their behalf. It is also extremely difficult to vote against the committee and the chairman of the committee when they have such a disagreeable job, a job where they are permitted to limit the amount of other people's money to be voted away.

What I am now about to say, however, has nothing to do with the amendments heretofore offered on behalf of veterans. My purpose is to call attention to some remarks made on the floor not long ago when attention was called to the classes in hunting and fishing which it was said were being held in at least one Michigan university.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—INSTRUCTION THAT IS NECESSARY OR JUST INTERESTING OR PERHAPS DESIRABLE

Attention was called by me—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 30, 1959, page 6528—to a report that, in Michigan, two State universities had courses on hunting and fishing.

Thereafter, on May 4, Robert B. Weaver of the law firm of Weaver & Weaver, Leipsic, Ohio, wrote me as follows:

MR. HOFFMAN: If your remarks were accurately reported it would seem that you owe an apology to the University of Michigan, its students and alumni. Our local papers carried an account of a speech that you made in which you stated that both the University of Michigan and Michigan State University offered courses in fishing and hunting. I cannot speak for the curriculum offered at East Lansing; however, I can assure you that there is no course of study nor even a solitary credit course offered at Michigan which would be correctly cataloged as "hunting and fishing". We members of the "Michigan family" take pride in our academic standing and jealously cherish the fact that we have not placed education on the country club level. Again I say the big "if"—if you were reported correctly you have made a serious and reckless accusation with no basis in fact. The University of Michigan is presently fighting to maintain its high position among the colleges and universities of the United States even in face of the threatened bankruptcy of the State of Michigan. Your malicious statements will, of course, hurt them in that fight.

I would be interested in knowing to what college, if any, we owe our thanks for your learned stature? There certainly must be some taint of prejudice in your remarks for there is no other satisfactory explanation as to why you would make them.

Since I am not one of your constituents my displeasure can be manifested only in writing; however, write I will. Check the next monthly edition of the Michigan Alumnus when I will exercise my franchise in an entirely different but most effective way.

My attention was called to the report by a news article—and usually there is a background of truth in them. That article read:

[From the St. Joseph (Mich.) Herald-Press, Mar. 10, 1959]

HUNTING AND FISHING ON CURRICULUM

(By Tom Shawver)

EAST LANSING.—"Go to college and learn to hunt and fish."

There's no such slogan in brochures describing the advantages of life at Michigan State University. Both hunting and fly and bait casting courses are available nevertheless to men and women students at MSU—and for credit toward a degree.

Lest the academicians and tongue-cluckers get the wrong idea it should be made clear that both courses are part of the physical education program. They're good for only one credit and are completed in about 12 weeks.

There's no such thing as a B.A. degree in fly casting or hunting with a rifle.

Michigan State is the only higher education institute in the State offering both courses and one of the few in the Nation.

Dr. Roy Niemeyer, an assistant professor, teaches shooting and hunter training and Gene Kenney gives instruction in fly and bait castings. Both are widely experienced in their specialties.

Both courses caught on fast. Kenney's class is available only in the spring. Niemeyer gave his first course last fall to 30 students, including one girl. Two classes will be available this spring and three next fall.

Actually, there's some fairly good reasoning behind college training in skills normally picked up from longtime experiences and friends and relatives rather than from professors.

As Niemeyer puts it:

"Hunting is a good 'carryover' sport. Most boys who play football or basketball quit as soon as they leave college. But hunting is recreation that can last a lifetime. Physical education is a required course, so why not hunting and fly casting?"

Most of his students, he said are planning careers that will take them outdoors much of the time—game and fish biologists, and foresters, for example.

"The day is coming when a youngster will have to take a hunter training course in order to qualify for a hunting license," Niemeyer said. "My students, a good many of them, are probably going to be called on to teach those kids. This is a good place to learn what they need to know if they don't already have good experience."

Only cost to the student is $5 for ammunition and clay pigeon charges.

"This is a course that's going to catch on fast, not only at Michigan State but probably in many other parts of the country," Niemeyer said. "As more and more people

turn to hunting for recreation, it's going to become more important to know how to hunt properly. Two many people just don't know how."

The article named but Michigan State University, and apparently I assumed that the University of Michigan carried similar courses. If I was in error and the university does not offer all the courses that the State School at Lansing does, perhaps it should be commended.

From the Otsego Union, published at Otsego, Allegan County, Mich., on April 23, 1959, to me now comes the following statement:

From Chicago writer, Jack Mabley, writing for the Miami, Fla., Herald comes this little gem entitled, "Why Michigan Is Broke."

I think I can offer some light on why Michigan is broke.

There arrived in this office last week a paperbound book from Michigan State University, called the quarterly bulletin.

It apparently is distributed free. It is printed on an expensive glossy paper.

It contains articles on agriculture. One article is entitled "Some Economic Aspects of Pie Consumption."

The slick paper contains an astoundingly detailed analysis of the age, economic status, family size, and vocations of people who eat apple, blueberry, cherry, pineapple, berry, pumpkin, mince, cream and custard and other pies.

Thousands of man-hours must have gone into this study, which one presumes is intended as a service to people who grow the makings for the interiors of pies.

Whether this is an essential or necessary or even advisable service from a government that is on the verge of bankruptcy might be debated.

Another article is titled, "The Effect of Age on the Social Organizations of Chickens."

And that isn't a typographical error you just read.

The study relates instances of pecks, fights, and threats by chickens in a controllable group.

A peck was defined as a pack on the head or neck of another bird. A fight was two birds flying together and pecking at the same time.

The nastiest age of chickens was found to be about 17 months, when they constantly threatened other chickens.

I suppose all this has some value to the agricultural communities.

But if the State is looking for some way to economize, it doesn't seem it looked very far.

These studies were made in the very shadow of the Michigan State capitol.

Presumably, Mr. Robert B. Weaver, the writer of the letter quoted above, who suggests he will give me a going over in the Michigan Alumnus, may be able to profit from this illustration of spending in Michigan.

It is assumed Robert is a graduate of at least the Law School at the University of Michigan and it may be his courses there will enable him to justify both the activities referred to by the Otsego Union. Perhaps the Chicago writer, Jack Mabley, does not know what he is writing about.

In any event, I am quite well aware of the protests which come from constituents in the 4th Congressional District of Michigan and which have as their basis Michigan's present financial condition—due, many of the writers suggest, to unnecessary even though desirable courses in local schools and State universities.

Lack of funds would seem to suggest more discrimination in the selection of what is taught at publicly supported institutions of learning.

If time permits, perhaps I will get around to answering Brother Weaver.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend the committee for section 301 of the bill. I hope that when hearings are held again next year, and in the interim, Committee members will watch closely to see that that provision of the bill is not violated.

Also I want to commend the committee for the inquiries made during the hearings this year into the use of consultants in Government. I hope the committee next year will continue to quiz department and agency heads on the prevalent policy of going outside and hiring people to come in and tell those in the Government at further expense to the taxpayers, how they should run their departments. I hope the committee will continue its work along that line, too.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to express my personal appreciation to the committee of their foresight which they demonstrated by providing $2.5 million for construction of prototype shelters for demonstration purposes in the field of civil defense. I think that represents a very forward-moving step of the committee and of this Congress, and I am very pleased to see it in the bill.

I was concerned about some language that appears in the committee report which states that the committee has received assurances that a wide-scale shelter construction program is not contemplated. It was my hope that the gentleman would elaborate on that just a little, with regard to what was meant by that statement.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my friend from Oklahoma that this item represents the budget estimate. The very able Administrator of Civil Defense said he was coming back next year and ask for another $2.5 million and wind up the program. He said that these were experimental types. We took him at his word and said, "If that is what you are going to do, we will make a trade with you," and this is the result of it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Of course, the gentleman is aware, I imagine more than anyone else, that our Office of Civil Defense has put out publications all over the United States saying that shelter construction is of the very highest priority in our civil defense program. It was my hope that the committee did not mean in any way by this language in the report to discourage the construction of shelters by civil defense agencies across the country, when these shelters have supplied a model for construction. Can the gentleman give me some assurance on that?

Mr. THOMAS. I can only assure the gentleman that they stated that they wanted only $5 million for this purpose, and if they want more than that, I assure the gentleman that we shall take a really good, long, sharp look at it. It was their program. This is all they said they wanted, and we gave them what they asked for.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Many of us have been looking at the civil defense shelter program across the world and have observed that civil defense requirements are built into all public buildings in Germany. Every new building in the Soviet Union is required to include civil defense protection. In the Scandinavian countries and in most of the European countries civil defense requirements are built into the programs of the government in their new construction. We are hopeful that we will have something along that line in the United States in the near future. I think the shelter construction provided in this bill is a good step in that direction, and I commend the committee for making that money available.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I am gratified that this bill includes funds for planning and technical services for a replacement for the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Harrison, Mont.

Members of the Montana congressional delegation, who have been working for years with representatives of veterans organizations on modernization of this inadequate hospital, were pleased to receive the following letter early this year:

JANUARY 19, 1959.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. METCALF: In view of your keen interest in the construction of a replacement for the VA hospital at Fort Harrison, Mont., I am glad to tell you that the President's proposed 1960 budget includes funds for planning and technical services for this project.

The exact bed capacity of the new hospital is awaiting the outcome of a VA survey of bed needs in the Northwest, but it probably will be no less than the present capacity of 200 beds.

Contingent upon Congress passing the fiscal year 1960 budget, including the Fort Harrison project, and its being signed into law by the President, it would take probably a year to develop preliminary plans and working drawings for a hospital of this size.

Present plans call for the construction of a new hospital building. The present hospital building would be converted to an administration building to accommodate all hospital and regional office administrative activities at the Fort Harrison center.

Sincerely,

SUMNER G. WHITTIER,
Administrator.

Last year, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, visited Fort Harrison. He found facilities there to be "poor" and "obviously overcrowded." He told a news conference:

I don't know of any other place in the country that has temporary buildings for its administration quarters and part of the hospital that is not included in the rehabilitation program.

He also said:

There are too many beds in each ward.

From living for years within a few miles of this 27-year-old hospital, I know that it is inadequate to meet present-day needs. Our files are full of additional evidence provided by officials of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Montana Veterans Welfare Commission.

The Veterans' Administration says this facility has 262 beds. Together with a smaller hospital at Miles City, Mont. has a total of 358 beds, or a ratio of 1 bed for every 285 veterans. This compares with the national ratio of 186 veterans per operating bed.

But many of the beds at Fort Harrison are located in 17-year-old Army cantonment type wooden buildings. These are of frame construction, at best difficult to heat in Montana's winters, impossible to keep cool in the summer, and expensive to maintain. Because of the fire hazard, they are spread out over a considerable area, making operations relatively inefficient.

At times during the winter, it is impossible to heat these temporary buildings. This cuts the hospital back to the permanent structure, which has a rated bed capacity of 132 beds. Capacity of the permanent buildings has been increased to 165 by putting extra beds in single rooms, hallways, stair wells, porches, solariums and recreational space. At these times, the overflowing permanent structure at Fort Harrison plus the 100 beds at Miles City—500 miles away—gives Montana's almost 90,000 veterans an average of one bed for every 377 veterans—or about half the national average. Even with beds in every foot of available space, it is often impossible for anyone except an emergency case to be admitted, and many veterans have been turned away.

I hope the Veterans' Administtration will carry planning and design forward rapidly and that the next budget request will include an item to begin construction of this needed replacement.

Mr. THOMAS. 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.

(Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a telegram.)

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the members of the House that the increases in the bill for the Veterans' Administration do not increase the amount budget requests. They are really restoration of budget items. I am in favor of reduction in appropriations where I think it is reasonable to do so. I am not in favor of reducing items that might affect sick and disabled veterans. I wish to quote from a message I received today from Mr. David B. Williams, National Commander, Disabled American Veterans, being similar to messages received by other Members of the House:

Three important areas of the Veterans' Administration 1960 budget have just been slashed by the Appropriations Committee: $9¼ million slash in inpatient care; a $3⅓ million cut in general operating expenses; and a slash of over $800,000 for outpatient care. These three funds have to do primarily with care of the sick and the disabled. These cuts will substantially reduce treatment for paraplegics, blind, the mentally afflicted, and other disabled. The DAV believes that heavily reducing these vital funds below amounts already approved even by the Bureau of the Budget is poor economy. This will result in fewer doctors and nurses, service connected veterans will have to wait for treatment and examination in outpatient clinics. The DAV earnestly requests restoration of these funds.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. IKARD, 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. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, 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. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto 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 gros.

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.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS. 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 just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST SIGNIFICANT DISCOVERY OF SILVER IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1359) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the first significant discovery of silver in the United States, June 1859.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the first significant discovery of silver in the year 1859 the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Nevada Silver Centennial Committee one thousand silver medals one and five-sixteenth inches in diameter, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost.

(b) Upon authorization from the Nevada Silver Centennial Committee, the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in silver of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and passed, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee be permitted to sit during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, 1959, I introduced a resolution—House Joint Resolution 361—to establish a National Institute for International Health and Medical Research. As an integral part of the National Institutes of Health, the principal purpose of the new Institute would be to provide for international cooperation in health research, research training and research planning.

Mr. Speaker, in 1956 the Subcommittee on Health and Science, under the chairmanship of the late great Chairman J. Percy Priest, held several days of hearings on the subject of international health programs and the role

which the United States Public Health Service plays in these programs As a result of these hearings, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on May 23, 1957, filed a report on the organization and financing of, and the participation of the United States in, international health programs—House Report No. 474, 85th Congress, 1st session, Union Calendar No. 157.

The report attempted to present a complete résumé of what the United States is doing in the field of international health as a whole. Part I of the report deals with the organization and financing of international health programs; part II outlines international health problems that are of special significance to the United States, and describes what is being done by various agencies of the Government, in cooperation with other nations, to serve these problems; and part III gives detailed information concerning the organization of American and international health agencies.

The report stressed the importance of new insights which can frequently be obtained by studying the cause of particular diseases in different settings. Therefore, the report concluded, it is important that in addition to research carried on by American scientists at home, such research also be conducted abroad. The then Surgeon General, Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, testified that, for example, in the field of cancer there are substantial differences in the incidence of certain forms of cancer in different countries, and that by persuading researchers in these other countries to take on their country's side of the project, "we might have some windows of knowledge opened because of these differences."

Similar studies conducted abroad, Dr. Scheele testified, in the case of certain heart diseases might suggest the circumstances responsible for the fact that some populations do not seem to have coronary heart disease and do not seem to have as much hypertension as we have.

Use of foreign opportunities for research investigations not only helps us to find answers to unsolved disease problems but enables us to check the continuing validity of solutions of old problems. For example, cases of typhoid are so rare in this country that it was difficult to test the continued effectiveness of typhoid fever vaccine used for many years in this country. Through the cooperation of another country where typhoid is prevalent, more is now known about the efficacy of various typhoid vaccines.

Similar results were reached through tests abroad of an antirabies serum. It would have been impossible to conduct satisfactory tests in this country because cases of human rabies are too rare to make possible valid tests.

Mr. Speaker, the report further points out that international health activities have important collateral effects which go way beyond the immediate medical and health benefits. International health activities help the economies of foreign nations and create new markets for American business concerns. Although these collateral effects are by no means the principal goals of our international health programs, the building up of international trade greatly aids in strengthening peaceful international relations, and thus it may be said that these programs made a valuable contribution in promoting peace.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons I am gratified that through the introduction of House Joint Resolution 361 I am in a position to make a small contribution toward still more effective international health activities.

Under this resolution the following actions would be taken:

First. There would be established a National Institute of International Health Research as a part of the National Institutes of Health in the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Second. There would be created a National Advisory Council for International Health Research whose membership would be drawn from leaders in the fields of medical and health research and public affairs generally. This Counsel would serve under the chairmanship of the Surgeon General to provide advice and consulation in respect to programs and activities carried out under the resolution and to reviews and make recommendations in respect to the approval of applications for financial grants.

Third. The Surgeon General would be authorized:

(a) To conduct, or support through grants, loans, and contracts research, research planning and research training activities relating to the causes, diagnosis, treatment, control and prevention of disease and disability or relating to rehabilitation of the physically or mentally handicapped in the United States and foreign countries.

(b) Cooperate with and assist in the planning and conduct of research, research planning and research training projects carried out through the World Health Organization and other international organizations.

(c) Establish and maintain research fellowships to train U.S. research workers abroad or to provide for the training of talented research fellows from foreign countries in the United States or in other countries.

(d) Encourage and support international communication in the medical and biological sciences, through support of conferences, the international interchange of scientific personnel, the translation, financing and issuance of scientific materials and publications, and the means to secure the more effective dissemination of scientific information with respect to health research.

(e) Provide for the improvement, and alternation of facilities, including the erection of temporary facilities when necessary to carry out research and research training projects under the resolution.

Fourth. An annual appropriation of $50 million to remain available for a 2-year period would be authorized to carry out the provisions of the resolution.

The resolution also provides for certain other administrative matters considered necessary to permit the effective initiation and operation of programs and projects under its terms.

Mr. Speaker, other Members of the House of Representatives have introduced resolutions similar to House Joint Resolution 361, and I want to congratulate them on their awareness of the need for improved and expanded international health programs. It is my purpose, as chairman of the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to hold early hearings on these resolutions in the hope that the House of Representatives will overwhelmingly endorse this legislation. Perhaps the immediate undertaking proposed in its legislation is relatively modest, but the potential of this legislation in ts worldwide effect, in my judgment, is tremendous.

HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER

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

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is no more happy occasion for me than to congratulate a great public servant and a patriotic American—J. Edgar Hoover on his 35th anniversary as Director of the FBI. He has the best wishes of all citizens for many more years of service to his country.

Looking back over this span of years we can see that the history of the FBI is actually the history of America. There were the going twenties, the roaring thirties, the fighting forties, and the tension-laden fifties. In all of these the FBI played an important role. In the twenties Mr. Hoover started to mold the FBI into the image of a modern, efficient, hard-hitting, crime-fighting organization. Away with obsolescence, inefficiency, and political favoritism. In their place must be effectiveness, mobility, intelligent appraisal, and dedicated service. He led the way personally—with long hours of hard work. His employees followed. The groundwork was laid well.

Next came the roaring thirties—with the Lindbergh kidnaping, the Barker-Karpis gang, John Dillinger, and "Baby Face" Nelson. The FBI was ready and literally roared into action. The verdict of history stamps an emphatic approval on the fine work of the FBI, in cooperation with local law enforcement, in destroying the gangster elements.

In 1939 World War II broke out in Europe. In 1941 Japanese bombs dropped on Pearl Harbor. A peaceful Nation found itself in hostilities against three of the most vicious totalitarian nations in existence. Mr. Hoover mobilized the men and women of the FBI. Famous cases, such as the eight Nazi saboteurs, were solved; Japanese and German spies located; excellent undercover work accomplished in South America. Thousands of investigations were conducted. The internal security of the Nation was protected.

All the time the FBI was fighting the Communist Party, USA—a battle which became even more intense in the 1950's.

H. R. 7040

AN ACT

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7040

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 12, 1959

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry
5 independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, cor-
6 porations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending
7 June 30, 1960, namely:

1 TITLE I

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3 OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE

4 MOBILIZATION

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and De-
7 fense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section
8 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimburse-
9 ment of the General Services Administration for security
10 guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials
11 and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense
12 functions; not to exceed $8,500 for the purchase of news-
13 papers, periodicals and teletype news services; not to exceed
14 $1,000,000 for expenses of travel; and not to exceed $6,000
15 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended
16 under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he
17 deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final
18 and conclusive: $23,285,000, of which $185,000 shall be
19 available for the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Com-
20 mittee: *Provided,* That contracts for not to exceed eight
21 persons under this appropriation for temporary or inter-
22 mittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
23 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annually.

1 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

2 For financial contributions to the States for civil defense
3 purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,
4 as amended, to be equally matched with State funds,
5 $10,000,000.

6 EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

7 For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing,
8 distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense
9 materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of
10 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,
11 $6,950,000.

12 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

13 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
14 studies and research to develop measures and plans for evacu-
15 ation, shelter, and the protection of life and property, as au-
16 thorized by section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act
17 of 1950, as amended, including services as authorized by
18 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
19 $3,500,000, to remain available until expended.

20 No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be avail-
21 able for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of
22 warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed
23 specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense
24 Mobilization.

1 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

2 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board,
5 including contract stenographic reporting services; employ-
6 ment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; hire,
7 operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of pas-
8 senger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section
9 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates
10 for individuals not to exceed $50 per diem; $6,925,000.

11 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

12 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensa-
13 tion fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board
14 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72
15 Stat. 763–765), as is payable by the Board, $57,000,000,
16 to remain available until expended.

17 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $22,000
20 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
21 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed $10,000 for medical
22 examinations performed for veterans by private physicians

1 on a fee basis; not to exceed $100 for the purchase of
2 newspapers and periodicals (excluding scientific, technical,
3 trade or traffic periodicals, for official use); payment in ad-
4 vance for library membership in societies whose publications
5 are available to members only or to members at a price lower
6 than to the general public; not to exceed $77,000 for per-
7 forming the duties imposed upon the Commission by the
8 Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); reimbursement of
9 the General Services Administration for security guard serv-
10 ices for protection of confidential files; not to exceed $472,-
11 000 for expenses of travel; and not to exceed $5,000 for
12 actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709,
13 Revised Statutes, as amended; $18,800,000: *Provided,* That
14 no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career
15 Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758
16 of March 4, 1958, as amended.

17 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
18 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
19 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and
20 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established
21 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

1 INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR
2 EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
3 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
4 Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended,
5 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary
6 General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of
7 other international organizations, certain information con-
8 cerning United States citizens employed, or being con-
9 sidered for employment by such organizations, including
10 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
11 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $400,000: *Provided,* That this
12 appropriation shall be available for advances or reimburse-
13 ments to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil
14 Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation
15 for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive
16 order: *Provided further,* That members of the International
17 Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual
18 transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence
19 authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended,
20 while traveling on official business away from their homes or
21 regular places of business, including periods while en route
22 to and from and at the place where their services are to be

1 performed: *Provided further,* That nothing in sections 281
2 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of
3 the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply
4 to any person because of appointment for part-time or inter-
5 mittent service as a member of the International Organiza-
6 tions Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Com-
7 mission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated
8 January 9, 1953, as amended.

9 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

10 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May
11 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of
12 August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771–775),
13 $2,450,000.

14 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES'
15 LIFE INSURANCE FUND

16 Not to exceed $240,000 of the funds in the "Employees'
17 Life Insurance Fund" shall be available for reimbursement
18 to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses
19 incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in
20 the administration of the Federal Employees' Group Life
21 Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091–2103):
22 *Provided,* That this limitation shall include expenses in-

1 curred under section 10 of the Act, notwithstanding the pro-
2 visions of section 1 of Public Law 85–377 (5 U.S.C.
3 2094(c)).

4 FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

5 EXPENSES

6 For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency,
7 not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses
8 for research and development and for establishment of air
9 navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the
10 Federal Airport Act; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle
11 at not to exceed $3,500; not to exceed $12,950,000 for
12 expenses of travel; and purchase and repair of skis and snow-
13 shoes; $283,200,000: *Provided,* That there may be credited
14 to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties,
15 municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources,
16 for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of
17 air navigation facilities.

18 ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

19 For an additional amount for the acquisition, establish-
20 ment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire
21 of air navigation facilities, including the initial acquisition
22 of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and
23 furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers

1 and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed
2 at remote localities not on foreign soil where such accom-
3 modations are not available (at a total cost of construction
4 of not to exceed $40,000 per housing unit in Alaska) ; and
5 the initial flight checking of air navigation facilities and the
6 transportation by air to and from and within Alaska and
7 the Territories of the United States of materials and equip-
8 ment secured under this appropriation; $131,200,000, to
9 remain available until expended: *Provided,* That there may
10 be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States,
11 counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private
12 sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air
13 navigation facilities.

14 GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF
15 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

16 For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority
17 granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to
18 enter into contracts, $47,500,000, to remain available until
19 expended.

20 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

21 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
22 research, development, and service testing, including con-

1 struction of experimental facilities and acquisition of neces-
2 sary sites by lease or grant; and purchase of not to exceed
3 two passenger motor vehicles; $47,100,000, to remain avail-
4 able until expended.

5 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL
6 AIRPORT

7 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-
8 nance, improvement and protection of the Washington Na-
9 tional Airport, including purchase of one passenger motor
10 vehicle for replacement only; purchase, cleaning, and repair
11 of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $2,400,000.

12 GENERAL PROVISIONS

13 During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations
14 to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the
15 activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949, as
16 amended (5 U.S.C. 596a), to the extent and in the manner
17 prescribed by said Act; maintenance and operation of air-
18 craft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; and uni-
19 forms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of
20 September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

21 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the
24 Commission as authorized by law, including newspapers (not
25 to exceed $200), land and structures (not to exceed $81,800),

1 special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and
2 repairs to buildings (not to exceed $13,900), services as
3 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
4 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and purchase of not to exceed three pas-
5 senger motor vehicles for replacement only, $10,400,000.

6 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,
9 as authorized by law, including not to exceed $375,000 for
10 expenses of travel; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not
11 to exceed $500 for newspapers; $7,062,000, of which not to
12 exceed $10,000 shall be available for special counsel and
13 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
14 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not exceeding $50 per
15 diem for individuals: *Provided,* That not to exceed $354,200
16 shall be available for investigations relating to Federal river
17 development projects.

18 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commis-
21 sion, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized
22 by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), not to exceed $700 for news-
23 papers, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
24 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed $285,000

1 for expenses of travel, $6,745,000: *Provided,* That no part
2 of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any
3 investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of
4 the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to
5 the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such
6 investigation.

7 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office,
10 including newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding $500);
11 rental or lease of office space in foreign countries without
12 regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised
13 Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529); and services as
14 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
15 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $41,800,000.

16 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

17 OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDING SERVICE

18 For necessary expenses of real property management and
19 related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in
20 the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises;
21 moving Government agencies (including space adjustments)
22 in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer
23 of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and
24 disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests
25 therein; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of

1 August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); $148,150,000: *Pro-*
2 *vided,* That this appropriation shall be available, without
3 regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as
4 amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to buildings, or
5 parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appropriation for
6 "Emergency operating expenses".

7 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT, FEDERALLY OWNED
8 BUILDINGS

9 For expenses necessary for the repair, alteration, preser-
10 vation, renovation, improvement, extension, equipment, and
11 demolition of federally owned buildings and buildings occu-
12 pied pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act
13 of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), not otherwise provided for, in-
14 cluding grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and
15 piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto;
16 acquisition of land as authorized by title III of the Act
17 of June 16, 1949 (40 U.S.C. 297); and care and safeguard-
18 ing of sites acquired for Federal buildings; $60,000,000, to
19 remain available until expended.

20 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

21 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any
22 other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to
23 the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40
24 U.S.C. 356), $1,675,000: *Provided,* That authority hereto-
25 fore granted under this head for the Administrator of General

1 Services to enter into a 10-year contract for the project at
2 Sacramento, California, for which the annual payment for
3 amortization of principal and interest thereon shall not ex-
4 ceed $1,250,600, is hereby extended to December 31, 1959.

5 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

6 For an additional amount for expenses necessary in con-
7 nection with construction of public buildings projects not
8 otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the
9 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, $25,000,000,
10 to remain available until expended, and this amount shall be
11 expended for projects at such additional locations as may
12 be selected by the Administrator of General Services and in
13 amounts he deems necessary.

14 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

15 For necessary expenses of personal property manage-
16 ment and related activities as authorized by law and not
17 otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $300 for
18 the purchase of newspapers and periodicals, $3,770,000:
19 *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,230,000 of any funds re-
20 ceived during the current or preceding fiscal year for deposit
21 under section 204 (a) of the Federal Property and Admin-
22 istrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and not otherwise
23 disposed of by law, shall be deposited to the credit of this
24 appropriation and shall be available for necessary expenses in
25 carrying out the functions of the General Services Adminis-

1 tration under the said Act, with respect to the utilization
2 and disposal of excess and surplus personal property.

3 EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

4 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for
5 operation of the stores depot system and other procure-
6 ment services, including contractual services incident to re-
7 ceiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items; and not
8 to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals;
9 $21,150,000.

10 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND
11 RECORDS SERVICE

12 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal rec-
13 ords management and related activities as provided by law,
14 including contractual services incident to movement or dis-
15 posal of records, $9,176,800.

16 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC
17 UTILITIES SERVICE

18 For necessary expenses of transportation and public
19 utilities management and related activities, as provided by
20 law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the
21 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to
22 exceed $75 per diem for individuals, $2,000,000.

23 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

24 Funds available for carrying out the provisions of the
25 Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C.

1 98–98b), during the current fiscal year, shall be available
2 for transportation and handling, within the United States
3 (including charges at United States ports), storage, security,
4 and maintenance of strategic and critical materials acquired
5 for or transferred to the supplemental stockpile established
6 pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade De-
7 velopment and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)),
8 and for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial
9 Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462), relating to
10 machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for
11 which the General Services Administration is responsible,
12 including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
13 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed $3,150,-
14 000 for operating expenses, but total obligations of funds
15 available for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and
16 Critical Materials Stock Piling Act during the current fiscal
17 year shall not exceed $33,000,000: *Provided,* That during
18 the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the
19 value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in
20 accordance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical
21 Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be
22 transferred to stockpiles established in accordance with said
23 Act: *Provided further,* That no part of funds available shall
24 be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage
25 facilities: *Provided further,* That unobligated balances

1 of funds in excess of $33,000,000 as of July 1, 1959, to-
2 gether with any receipts from sales or otherwise, during the
3 fiscal year 1960, are hereby rescinded and shall be promptly
4 deposited into the Treasury.

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

6 For expenses of executive direction for activities under
7 the control of the General Services Administration, including
8 not to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodi-
9 cals, $225,000.

10 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER
11 PRESIDENTS

12 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August
13 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), $200,000: *Provided,* That the
14 Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Sec-
15 retary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to
16 carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

17 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

18 Funds available to General Services Administration for
19 administrative operations, in support of program activities,
20 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a
21 single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided,* That costs
22 and obligations for such administrative operations for the
23 respective program activities shall be accounted for in ac-
24 cordance with systems approved by the General Accounting

1 Office: *Provided further,* That the total amount deposited
2 into said account for the fiscal year 1960 from funds made
3 available to General Services Administration in this Act shall
4 not exceed $12,500,000, of which not to exceed $100 may
5 be used for purchase of newspapers and periodicals: *Pro-*
6 *vided further,* That amounts deposited into said account for
7 administrative operations for each program shall not exceed
8 the amounts included in the respective program appropria-
9 tions for such purposes.

10 GENERAL PROVISIONS

11 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the
12 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)
13 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,
14 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from
15 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129);
16 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to
17 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the
18 General Services Administration, issued by public authorities,
19 States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to
20 such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems neces-
21 sary and in the public interest may, upon the request and
22 at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the
23 appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations
24 or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the
25 General Services Administration, in connection with prop-

1 erty transferred to the General Services Administration pur-
2 suant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and
3 such appropriations or funds may, with the approval of the
4 Bureau of the Budget, be so transferred.

5 Not to exceed $2,000,000 granted in the Independent
6 Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the appropriation
7 for "Construction, Federal Office Building Numbered Six,
8 Washington, District of Columbia", may be transferred to
9 "Construction, Public Buildings projects": *Provided,* That
10 the latter appropriation shall be available for acquisition of
11 a building in Portland, Oregon: *Provided further,* That the
12 limits of cost applicable to projects authorized under said
13 appropriation may be exceeded to the extent that savings
14 are effected on other projects.

15 Funds available to the General Services Administration
16 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

17 No part of any money appropriated by this or any other
18 Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Govern-
19 ment shall be used during the current fiscal year for the
20 purchase within the continental limits of the United States
21 of any typewriting machines except in accordance with
22 regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal
23 Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as
24 amended.

25 Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made

1 available to the General Services Administration for the cur-
2 rent fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other
3 such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be
4 thereby increased more than 2 per centum: *Provided,* That
5 such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and
6 shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of $2,000,000.

7 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

8 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Admin-
11 istrator, including rent in the District of Columbia; services
12 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
13 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and purchase of two passenger motor
14 vehicles (including one in the District of Columbia, to re-
15 main under the control of the Agency, at a purchase price
16 of not to exceed $3,500) of which one shall be for replace-
17 ment only; $8,702,000: *Provided,* That necessary expenses
18 of inspections and of providing representatives at the site of
19 projects being planned or undertaken by local public agencies
20 pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended,
21 projects financed through loans to educational institutions
22 authorized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as
23 amended, and projects and facilities financed by loans to pub-
24 lic agencies pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments
25 of 1955, as amended, shall be compensated by such agencies

1 or institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the
2 aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services, and
3 expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministra-
4 tive; and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the
5 Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may
6 accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such
7 institutions, or the Administrator, and shall credit such
8 amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such
9 charges have been made, but such nonadministrative ex-
10 penses shall not exceed $2,900,000.

11 URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

12 For grants in accordance with the provisions of section
13 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, $975,000.

14 CAPITAL GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN
15 RENEWAL

16 For an additional amount for payment of capital grants
17 as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as
18 amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), $90,000,000.

19 RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS (PAYMENT TO
20 REVOLVING FUND)

21 For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant
22 to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40
23 U.S.C. 462), $6,000,000.

1 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

2 ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

3 For the payment of annual contributions to public hous-
4 ing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United
5 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),
6 $120,000,000.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

8 For administrative expenses of the Public Housing
9 Administration, $12,660,000, to be expended under the
10 authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this
11 Act.

12 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce
15 Commission, including not to exceed $5,000 for the employ-
16 ment of special counsel; services as authorized by section 15
17 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not
18 to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; newspapers (not to
19 exceed $300); and purchase of not to exceed thirty passen-
20 ger motor vehicles of which nineteen shall be for replacement
21 only; $19,400,000, of which not less then $1,526,100 shall be
22 available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety
23 activities and not less than $1,051,400 shall be available for
24 expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activi-

1 ties: *Provided,* That Joint Board members and cooperating
2 State commissioners may use Government transportation
3 requests when traveling in connection with their duties as
4 such.

5 NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

6 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

7 For the operation and maintenance of properties under
8 title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act,
9 $40,000: *Provided,* That all receipts derived from sales,
10 leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of
11 the United States monthly: *Provided further,* That so long
12 as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing
13 purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act
14 of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not
15 be effective.

16 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
19 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42
20 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellow-
21 ships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
22 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50
23 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
24 not to exceed $350 for the purchase of newspapers and
25 periodicals; and reimbursement of the General Services Ad-

1 ministration for security guard services; $143,273,000, to
2 remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the fore-
3 going amount not less than $30,250,000 shall be available
4 for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a pro-
5 gram of supplementary training for secondary school science
6 and mathematics teachers.

7 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-
10 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as
11 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
12 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for
13 individuals, $2,700,000.

14 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $1,125
17 for the purchase of newspapers; uniforms or allowances
18 therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and serv-
19 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
20 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $7,800,000.

21 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary for the operation and main-
24 tenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by

1 title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act
2 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized
3 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a);
4 purchase of ten passenger motor vehicles for replacement
5 only; not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers
6 and periodicals; not to exceed $50,000 for the National Se-
7 lective Service Appeal Board; and $19,000 for the National
8 Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists,
9 and Allied Specialists; $29,000,000: *Provided*, That during
10 the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this ap-
11 propriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section
12 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he
13 deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national
14 defense.

15 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

16 General Operating Expenses

17 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-
18 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses
19 incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uni-
20 forms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to
21 exceed $3,500 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to
22 exceed $67,000 for preparation, shipment, installation, and
23 display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures,
24 and other visual education information and descriptive

1 material, including purchase or rental of equipment;
2 $163,373,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
3 shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged
4 in public relations work: *Provided further,* That no part of
5 this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions
6 for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions
7 an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each
8 eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

9 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS
10 OPERATING EXPENSES

11 For expenses necessary for administration of the medi-
12 cal, hospital, domiciliary, special service, construction and
13 supply, research, and employee education and training
14 activities; expenses necessary for carrying out programs of
15 medical research, as authorized by law; and not to exceed
16 $2,700 for newspapers and periodicals; $27,349,000, of
17 which $15,344,000 shall be available for medical research:
18 *Provided,* That $1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriations
19 shall remain available until expended for prosthetic testing
20 and development.

21 INPATIENT CARE

22 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-
23 tion of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and for the care
24 and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administra-
25 tion in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans

1 Administration as authorized by law, including the furnish-
2 ing of recreational articles and facilities; maintenance and
3 operation of farms; repairing, altering, improving or provid-
4 ing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the
5 jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise
6 provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary
7 employees and purchase of materials; purchase of fifty-two
8 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or
9 allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September
10 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State
11 or Territorial homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38,
12 United States Code, for the support of veterans eligible for
13 admission to Veterans Administration facilities for hospital
14 or domiciliary care; $792,079,000, plus reimbursements:
15 *Provided,* That $8,400,000 of such sum shall be for
16 deferred maintenance: *Provided further,* That allot-
17 ments and transfers may be made from this appropria-
18 tion to the Department of Health, Education, and Wel-
19 fare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and
20 Air Force Departments, for disbursement by them under
21 the various headings of their applicable appropriations,
22 of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment
23 of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration: *Provided*
24 *further,* That the foregoing appropriation is predicated on
25 furnishing inpatient care and treatment to an average of

1 140,846 beneficiaries during the fiscal year 1960 including
2 members in State or Territorial homes, and if a lesser num-
3 ber is experienced such appropriation shall be expended
4 only in proportion to the average number of beneficiaries
5 furnished such care and treatment.

6 OUTPATIENT CARE

7 For expenses necessary for furnishing outpatient care to
8 beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, as authorized
9 by law; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles for re-
10 placement only; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as
11 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $83,866,000.

12 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF SUPPLY DEPOTS

13 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
14 of supply depots, including purchase of one passenger motor
15 vehicle for replacement only, and uniforms or allowances
16 therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), $2,218,000.

17 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

18 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,
19 and allowances (including burial awards authorized by sec-
20 tion 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence
21 allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under
22 any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based
23 thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and
24 annuities, the administration of which is now or may here-
25 after be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the

1 payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections
2 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended,
3 $3,300,000,000, to remain available until expended.

4 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

5 For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans
6 as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment
7 Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and
8 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equip-
9 ment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United
10 States Code, $585,000,000, to remain available until
11 expended.

12 VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

13 For military and naval insurance, for national service
14 life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-
15 disabled veterans insurance, $53,000,000, to remain avail-
16 able until expended: *Provided,* That certain premiums pro-
17 vided by law to be credited to the "Military and naval in-
18 surance" or "National service life insurance" appropriations
19 shall be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further,*
20 That this appropriation shall be subject to the same statu-
21 tory provisions and shall be available for the same purpose
22 as formerly applied to the appropriations for "Military and
23 naval insurance", "National service life insurance", and
24 "Servicemen's indemnities".

1 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

2 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants
3 in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United
4 States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treat-
5 ment of veterans, $2,000,000.

6 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY
7 FACILITIES

8 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and
9 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extend-
10 ing any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans
11 Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections
12 5001 and 5002, title 38, United States Code, $30,159,000,
13 to remain available until expended.

14 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

15 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for
16 the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions",
17 "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and in-
18 demnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned
19 appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appro-
20 priations so augmented, and not to exceed $500,000 of the
21 appropriation "Veterans insurance and indemnities" for the
22 current year may be transferred to "Service-disabled veterans
23 insurance fund".

24 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration
25 for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be

1 available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
2 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

3 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration
4 for the current fiscal year for "Inpatient care" and "Out-
5 patient care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other
6 expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized
7 by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for bene-
8 ficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under
9 such appropriations.

10 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Vet-
11 erans Administration (except the appropriation for "Con-
12 struction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be
13 available for the purchase of any site for or toward the
14 construction of any new hospital or home.

15 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-
16 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons ex-
17 cept beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such
18 benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made
19 to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the
20 Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

21 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

22 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expend-
23 able for travel expenses of employees and no specific limita-
24 tion has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel
25 expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in

1 the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Pro-*
2 *vided,* That this section shall not apply to travel performed
3 by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards
4 of the Selective Service System.

5 SEC. 103. Where appropriations in this title are expend-
6 able for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and no
7 specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures
8 therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed the
9 amount of $50: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not
10 apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic
11 periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of
12 the authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are
13 herein provided, nor to the purchase of newspapers and
14 periodicals necessary for the care and welfare of patients and
15 members in Veterans Administration hospitals and domi-
16 ciliary facilities.

17 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation contained in this
18 title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling
19 a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held
20 by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of
21 the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period
22 of active military or naval service and has within ninety
23 days after his release from such service or from hospitaliza-
24 tion continuing after discharge for a period of not more than
25 one year made application for restoration to his former posi-

1 tion and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission
2 as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position
3 and has not been restored thereto.

4 SEC. 105. No part of any appropriation made avail-
5 able by the provisions of this title shall be used for the
6 purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establish-
7 ing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided,*
8 That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have
9 been approved by the Congress and appropriations made
10 therefor.

11 SEC. 106. No part of any appropriation contained
12 in this title shall be used to pay the compensation of
13 any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the
14 number that would be provided by a ratio of one such em-
15 ployee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-
16 time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency
17 concerned: *Provided,* That for purposes of this section em-
18 ployees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if
19 they spend half time or more in personnel administration
20 consisting of direction and administration of the personnel
21 program; employment, placement, and separation; job
22 evaluation and classification; employee relations and serv-
23 ices; wage administration; and processing, recording, and
24 reporting.

1 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

2 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
3 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the
4 limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each
5 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
6 make such contracts and commitments without regard to
7 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the
8 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may
9 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the
10 Budget for the fiscal year 1960 for each such corporation
11 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

12 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

13 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXAMINATION
14 EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

15 Not to exceed a total of $1,800,000 shall be avail-
16 able for administrative expenses of the Federal Home
17 Loan Bank Board, and shall be derived from funds avail-
18 able to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including
19 those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving
20 fund and receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Adminis-
21 tration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home
22 Loan Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal
23 years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment
24 for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks,
25 the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan

1 Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Govern-
2 ment (including payment for office space) : *Provided,* That
3 all necessary expenses in connection with the conservator-
4 ship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan
5 Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of pro-
6 ceedings under section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan
7 Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act and
8 all necessary expenses (including services performed on a
9 contract or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
10 ices) in connection with the handling, including the pur-
11 chase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal
12 home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of,
13 or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the
14 Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-
15 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof:
16 *Provided further,* That members and alternates of the Federal
17 Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reim-
18 bursement from the Board as approved by the Board for
19 transportation expenses incurred in attendnace at meetings of
20 or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid
21 not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided*
22 *further,* That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this
23 Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore speci-
24 fied, the administrative expenses and other obligations of

1 the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance
2 with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of
3 July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421–1449):
4 *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses for
5 the examination of Federal and State chartered institutions
6 (other than special examinations determined by the Board
7 to be necessary) shall not exceed $7,700,000.

8 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
9 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

10 Not to exceed $775,000 shall be available for admin-
11 istrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and
12 shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly
13 capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liqui-
14 dation of insured institutions or preparation for or con-
15 duct of proceedings under section 407 of the National
16 Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived
17 from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action
18 for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of
19 losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and ex-
20 penses, and payments for administrative expenses of the
21 Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board
22 to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Cor-
23 poration may utilize and may make payment for services and

1 facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Re-
2 serve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and
3 other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwith-
4 standing any other provisions of this Act, except for the limi-
5 tation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative
6 expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be
7 incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the
8 Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724–1730).

9 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

10 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,
11 ABACA FIBER PROGRAM

12 Not to exceed $47,000 of funds available to the General
13 Services Administration for the abaca fiber program shall
14 be available for administrative expenses incident to the abaca
15 fiber program, to be computed on an accrual basis, and to
16 be exclusive of the interest paid, depreciation, capitalized
17 expenditures, expenses in connection with the acquisition,
18 protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposi-
19 tion of real or personal property relating to the abaca fiber
20 program, and expenses of services performed on a contract
21 or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal
22 services.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
2 FACILITIES CORPORATION

3 Not to exceed $20,000 shall be available during the
4 fiscal year 1960 for all administrative expenses of the Cor-
5 poration (including use of the services and facilities of Fed-
6 eral Reserve banks), to be computed on an accrual basis,
7 and to be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, capitalized
8 expenditures, expenses in connection with the acquisition,
9 protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or dispo-
10 sition of real or personal property belonging to the Corpora-
11 tion or in which it has an interest, expenses of services per-
12 formed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the
13 performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses
14 reimbursable from other Government agencies.

15 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECON-
16 STRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION
17 FUND

18 Not to exceed $40,000 (to be computed on an accrual
19 basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of
20 Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General
21 Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1
22 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the
23 current fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the
24 liquidation of said functions: *Provided*, That as used herein

1 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to
2 include all salaries and wages, services performed on a con-
3 tract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including
4 the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative
5 offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of services
6 performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the
7 termination of contracts or in the performance of legal serv-
8 ices: *Provided further,* That the distribution of administra-
9 tive expenses to the accounts shall be made in accordance
10 with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

11 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

12 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
13 THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

14 Not to exceed $1,723,000 shall be available for all
15 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis,
16 of carrying out the functions of the Administrator under
17 the program of housing loans to educational institutions (title
18 IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C.
19 1749–1749d), but this amount shall be exclusive of payment
20 for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or
21 any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any
22 insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the
23 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23,
24 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been desig-

1 nated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of
2 public money of the United States.

3 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
4 THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

5 Not to exceed $500,000 of funds in the revolving fund
6 established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments
7 of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative
8 expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment
9 for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or
10 any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any
11 insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the
12 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23,
13 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been desig-
14 nated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of
15 public money of the United States.

16 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
17 THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDAT-
18 ING PROGRAMS)

19 During the current fiscal year not to exceed $653,000
20 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount
21 shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of de-
22 faulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government
23 and legal services on a contract or fee basis and of payment
24 for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any

1 member thereof, any servicer approved by the Federal Na-
2 tional Mortgage Association, the Federal home-loan banks,
3 and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act of
4 August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Federal Deposit
5 Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which has been
6 designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository
7 of public money of the United States.

8 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
9 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

10 Not to exceed $6,050,000 shall be available for
11 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
12 basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses
13 (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on
14 a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and
15 servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized ex-
16 penditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (includ-
17 ing services performed on a force account, contract, or fee
18 basis, but not including other personal services) in connec-
19 tion with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance,
20 improvement, or disposition of real or personal property
21 belonging to said Association or in which it has an interest,
22 cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons
23 employed outside of the continental United States, expenses
24 of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection

1 with the performance of legal services, and all administrative
2 expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and
3 said Association may utilize and may make payment for
4 services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other
5 agencies of the Government: *Provided,* That the distribu-
6 tion of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Asso-
7 ciation shall be made in accordance with generally recognized
8 accounting principles and practices.

9 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINIS-
10 TRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRA-
11 TION

12 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-
13 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed $8,100,000 of the
14 various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall
15 be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act,
16 as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allow-
17 ances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1,
18 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided,* That, ex-
19 cept as herein otherwise provided, all expenses and obliga-
20 tions of said Administration shall be incurred, allowed, and
21 paid in accordance with the provisions of said Act: *Provided*
22 *further,* That funds shall be available for contract actuarial
23 services (not to exceed $1,500); and purchase of periodicals

1 and newspapers (not to exceed $750): *Provided further,*
2 That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of
3 Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not
4 exceed $48,000,000.

5 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
6 TIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

7 Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such ex-
8 penses by title I of this Act shall be available for the
9 administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administra-
10 tion in carrying out the provisions of the United States
11 Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401–1433);
12 purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by
13 the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131);
14 and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle
15 for replacement only: *Provided,* That necessary expenses of
16 providing representatives of the Administration at the sites
17 of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction
18 of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies
19 with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by
20 such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the
21 aggregate in relation to the development costs of such proj-
22 ects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and
23 expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall

1 be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received
2 from such payments may be used only for the payment of
3 necessary expenses of providing representatives of the
4 Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Pro-*
5 *vided further,* That all expenses of the Public Housing
6 Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in car-
7 rying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed
8 $1,500,000.

9 CORPORATIONS—GENERAL PROVISION

10 SEC. 202. No part of the funds of, or available for ex-
11 penditure by, any corporation or agency included in this title
12 shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee en-
13 gaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would
14 be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred
15 and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and in-
16 termittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided,*
17 That for purposes of this section employees shall be consid-
18 ered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or
19 more in personnel administration consisting of direction and
20 administration of the personnel program; employment, place-

1 ment, and separation; job evaluation and classification;
2 employee relations and services; committees of expert exam-
3 iners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage adminis-
4 tration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

5 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in
7 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
8 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used
9 for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support
10 or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

11 This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices
12 Appropriation Act, 1960".

Passed the House of Representatives May 11, 1959.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7040

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

MAY 12, 1959

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 23, 1959
For actions of June 22, 1959
86th-1st, No. 103

CONTENTS

Accounting.....12
Alaska.....25
Appropriations.....3,5
Budget.....12
Butter.....17
CCC grain.....16
Corn tassel.....22
Country life.....11
Depressed areas.....27
Egg prices.....21
Electrification.....13
Farm program.....26
Federal land banks.....15
Federal-State relations.17
Food and drug.....17
Foreign aid.....4,19
Foreign trade.....18
Forestry.....10
Health.....5
Housing.....2
Interest rates.....23
Intergovernmental relations.....14
Legislative program.....15
Mutual security.....4,19
Nomination.....9
Personnel.....5,31
Price supports.....1,17
Prices.....8,21
Property.....29
Public debt.....7,23,32
REA audit.....13
Research.....20
Rice.....30
Rural development.....12
Rural libraries.....6
State laws.....17
Tariffs.....28
TVA.....9
Wheat.....1,24
Wildlife.....16

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to wheat bill as passed by House. Senate agreed to conference report on housing bill. Senate committee reported mutual security authorization bill. Senate committee reported general government matters, independent offices, and State-Justice appropriation bills.

SENATE

1. WHEAT. By a 44-40 vote, receded from the previous disagreement of the Senate to the amendments of House to S. 1968, the wheat bill, and agreed to the bill as passed by the House (pp. 10366-7, 10431, 10436-43). Agreed to a motion by Sen. Ellender to table a proposed amendment by Sen. Case, S. Dak., which would have reduced the level of price supports provided in the bill from 90 to 85 percent of parity (pp. 10440-42). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Sen. Ellender inserted an explanation of the bill as passed by the House as follows:

"The House amendment to S. 1968 is a complete substitute for the Senate provisions. It would make the following changes in existing law:

"With respect to the 1960 and 1961 wheat crops, it would --

"(1) Provide price support at 90 percent of parity,

"(2) Reduce each farm acreage allotment by 25 percent.

"(3) Require, as a condition of wheat price support, that the farm acreage of price supported crops be reduced below the 1957 and 1958 average by an acreage equal to the 25 percent reduction in the wheat acreage allotment.

"(4) Provide for a payment in kind (equal to one-third of the average annual wheat yield) for the acreage representing the 25 percent reduction, if such acreage is not harvested or grazed.

"(5) Provide that the acreage represented by the 25 percent reduction shall be ineligible for the conservation reserve.

"(6) Limit price support to the commercial area and, if marketing quotas are not disapproved, to cooperators.

"(7) Provide price support at 50 percent of parity to noncooperators, as well as cooperators, if marketing quotas are disapproved.

"(8) Provide that if marketing quotas are disapproved, the minimum Commodity Credit Corporation sales price for wheat for unrestricted use shall be 105 percent of 75 percent of parity, plus reasonable carrying charges.

"(9) Impose penalties on the actual yield of the excess acres (or double the normal yield if the actual yield is not shown); except that if the actual yield does not exceed the normal yield of the farm acreage allotment, the marketing excess would be reduced to zero.

"(10) Increase the marketing penalty to 65 percent of parity.

"(11) Reduce the 15-acre exemption to the small of (A) 12 acres, or (B) the highest acreage planted in 1957, 1958, or 1959.

"(12) Remove the 30-acre limitation on the feed wheat exemption.

"The House amendment contains a $35,000 limitation on price support for wheat per producer per year, which we understand is intended to be permanent. In addition the House amendment would permanently --

"(A) Provide that in any case in which the wheat marketing excess for a farm is reduced to zero by reason of underproduction, the farm, county, and State shall not receive an acreage history penalty by reason of the overplanting.

"(B) Base eligibility for voting in marketing quota referendums on compliance with allotments in the year in which the referendum is held (rather than on being subject to the quota being voted on).

"(C) Repeal the 200 bushel wheat marketing quota exemption.

"(D) Repeal a requirement that an additional allotment list be kept by the county agent or local committee chairman."

2. HOUSING. Agreed, 56 to 31, to the conference report on S. 57, the housing bill for 1959 (pp. 10383-8, 10389-436). See Digest 102 for a summary of items of interest to this Department.

3. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported the following bills with amendments: p. 10355

H. R. 7040, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1960 (S. Rept. 423).

H. R. 7176, the general government matters appropriation bill for 1960 (S. Rept. 422).

H. R. 7343, the State-Justice appropriation bill for 1960 (S. Rept. 424).

4. MUTUAL SECURITY. The Foreign Relations Committee reported with amendment S. 1451, to extend the mutual security program (S. Rept. 412). p. 10354

5. PERSONNEL; HEALTH. A subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report to the full committee S. 2162, to provide a health benefits program for Government employees. p. D511

Calendar No. 417

86TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 423

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

JUNE 22, 1959.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 7040]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bill as passed House	$6, 457, 657, 800
Amount of increase by Senate	101, 690, 800
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	6, 559, 348, 600
Amount of appropriations, 1959	6, 875, 620, 240
Amount of regular estimates, 1960	6, 584, 188, 000
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the estimates for 1960	24, 839, 400
Under the appropriations for 1959	316, 271, 640

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill provides a total amount of $6,559,348,600, which is $24,839,400 under the estimates for 1960 and $316,271,640 under the

appropriations for 1959, and an increase of $101,690,800 over the House bill.

The House bill provided $44,644,000 over the budget estimates for the following:

GSA: Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	$25,000,000
VA:	
Medical administration (for medical research)	4,344,000
Inpatient care	5,300,000
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	10,000,000

The Senate committee has agreed with these increases and has added further increases over the budget estimates, as follows:

VA:	
Medical administration (for medical research)	$4,000,000
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities (for research facilities)	3,000,000

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The committee recommends the restoration of $15 million to provide the full budget estimate of $25 million for Federal contributions. Of this restoration, $3 million is to provide the full amount requested for continuing the program of matching State funds for the procurement of civil-defense equipment, education, training and other technical assistance, and $12 million is to implement Public Law 85–606 by matching funds of State and local governments for personnel and administrative costs.

As to this new program, enacted on August 8, 1958, the committee is advised that each State has a civil defense agency in being, that each State has submitted a plan which has been approved as in accord with the national plan, and that each State has a civil service system or a joint merit system under standards similar to those now participated in by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Labor. The committee understands that if such merit standards are not complied with, the law would prohibit the matching of funds in that event.

The committee is assured that these funds are required in order to build a workable nonmilitary defense program for the Nation, and trusts that the quality of the program will warrant such expenditure.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The committee agrees with the action of the House in providing $2,500,000 for construction of prototype shelters for demonstration purposes. In addition, the committee recommends increasing the amount available for other research activities to $2 million, to provide a total of $4,500,000, which is $2,770,000 below the budget estimate.

Civil Aeronautics Board

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The committee agrees with the House in providing $6,925,000 for salaries and expenses, which is $575,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee is concerned with the constant increase in personnel for the CAB. It raises questions as to whether the Board is making the most efficient use of its personnel. Public concern with the work of the Board focuses primarily on accident investigation and the development of service through attention to the routes of the carriers. The adequacy of rates and the level of rates are also of proper public concern, as is enforcement of the Board's economic regulations.

The committee believes the Board should assume the responsibilities for determining the probable cause of small aircraft accidents with due regard for the distinction between fatal and nonfatal accidents of consequence on the one hand, and inconsequential minor accidents on the other.

The Board's budget presentation indicates a desire to delve into many peripheral activities not closely related to the main purpose of the Board's work which would, if Congress were to permit, lead to the further dilution of Board energies from its more important duties.

Last year the committee attempted to meet the requirement of the Board for additional supergrades by authorizing 10 additional: 1 in grade GS–18, 2 in grade GS–17, and 7 in grade GS–16. Also, in passing the Federal Aviation Act with additional supergrades the Congress recognized the vital importance of obtaining and retaining the highest qualified personnel. In view of this apparently adequate legislation, the committee believes that the Civil Service Commission should promptly give very serious consideration to the needs of the Civil Aeronautics Board for such personnel in order to carry out their functions and to promote greater efficiency in their organization.

The committee recommends an increase to $1,600 in the limitation on the purchase of newspapers and periodicals.

The committed also recommends an exemption from section 102 of the general provisions, for travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

The committee recommends the restoration of $3 million, to provide a total amount of $60 million for payments to air carriers, which is $2,618,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee shares the concern which has been expressed over the increased amount which is estimated to be required for subsidies to local service and helicopter service airlines. The committee believes that the amount of such subsidy can be reduced by a cooperative effort between the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Post Office Department to increase the volume of nonpriority mail being transported by such carriers. These carriers have unused capacity which would permit them to handle substantially greater volumes of such mail. Their use for this purpose would substantially reduce the subsidy requirements for this group of carriers without significant increase in the cost to the Post Office Department of transporting the mail involved. In many instances it would also provide a substantial

improvement in postal service. The committee has requested the CAB to immediately institute discussions with the Post Office Department to effect the action suggested

Civil Service Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The committee recommends restoration in the amount of $570,000, of which $430,000 is for the recruiting and examining program, $20,000 is for printing funds, and $120,000 is for equipment funds. In addition, the committee recommends $70,000, as previously requested in the supplemental estimate, for furnishing and moving their New York regional headquarters. The committee deferred this latter item pending the execution of the lease for the property involved, which the committee is advised has now been consummated. The total amount recommended is $19,440,000, which is $725,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends increasing to $400 the limitation on the purchase of newspapers and periodicals.

EMPLOYEES' LIFE INSURANCE FUND

The committee recommends restoration of $18,000 to provide a total amount of $258,000 for administrative expenses reimbursed from the fund.

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The Kaplan committee, in 1954, recommended the adoption of the normal-cost-plus-interest basis for making annual appropriations to the fund. As required by law, the Civil Service Commission submitted an estimate for 1960 of such amount, $773,734,000, which was denied by the Bureau of the Budget. Such amount is not met by contributions of the agencies, and other than these agency appropriations no payment has been made to the fund since 1957. The unfunded liability in the fund has now slipped to $20.6 billion.

Last year the committee requested recommendations from the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the General Accounting Office for keeping the fund current, to be based on the evaluation of the fund by the Board of Actuaries as of September 30, 1958. It was hoped that such recommendations would be available before this report on the 1960 budget, but the committee is now advised that the evaluation has been laborious and detailed and has required much time. The committee awaits with interest the result of the collaborations requested. Meantime, there are indications that the factual evaluation will show a much larger unfunded liability than has been estimated.

Federal Aviation Agency

EXPENSES

The committee recommends restoration of $37 million to provide a total amount of $320,200,000 for expenses, which is $6,200,000 below the budget estimate. The restoration is for allocation to air traffic operation and safety, as opposed to administration or research.

The committee also recommends an increased limitation for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals, raising to $4,500 the limitation for the purchase of a passenger motor vehicle, and deleting the limitation for expenses of travel.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

Restoration of $8,500,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $139,700,000 for the establishment of air navigation facilities, which is $5,300,000 below the budget estimate. The restoration is recommended specifically for the purchase of three aircraft, the housing units in Alaska, and the garages and improved docking facilities in Alaska and at Swan Island, with the remainder to be applied toward the reduction in procurement funds.

The committee also recommends inserting the authorization for the purchase of three aircraft, and deleting the limitation on the cost of construction per housing unit in Alaska.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The committee recommends restoration of $3,250,000, to provide a total amount of $50,350,000 for research and development, which is $13,250,000 below the budget estimate. The restoration is recommended for the SAGE direction center and for a partial restoration of $2 million for research and development projects.

The necessary funds for a runway for research on planes over 80,000 pounds will be thoughtfully considered by the committee when the agency can justify a more immediate need for such purposes, either on a supplemental request or in the next annual budget. Also, the committee wants to be certain that no other existing runways can be used for the research purpose desired.

The committee also recommends inserting the authorization for the purchase of three aircraft for use in the research program.

Federal Communications Commission

Restoration of $300,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $10,700,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission, which is $300,000 below the budget estimate.

Federal Power Commission

The committee recommends restoration of $312,000, to provide a total amount of $7,374,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission, which is $51,000 below the budget estimate. No increase in travel funds is recommended. The committee believes that more emphasis sould be placed on handling the increased workload in gas rate cases.

Federal Trade Commission

Restoration of $190,000 is recommended for salaries and expenses, to provide a total amount of $6,935,000, which is $40,000 below the budget estimate.

General Services Administration

PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

The committee recommends restoration of $5 million, to provide a total amount of $153,150,000 for operating expenses, which is $1,950,000 below the budget estimate. The committee agrees with the House in urging the Administrator to exercise vigorous effort to reduce the annual rental bill, and also expects that as new Government-owned buildings are constructed the quantity of rental space will show a proportionate decrease.

The committee recognizes the need for additional temporary storage space for the Library of Congress, but feels that the cost estimate is too high and that a more reasonable estimate should be submitted for consideration at a later time.

SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

The committee is advised that the National Grange may be put to some additional cost in order to change the facing of their new building to conform to the surrounding buildings. Since this matter seems to have been a later development in connection with the contract and agreement they made with General Services Administration in vacating from the site for the new Federal Office Building, the committee directs that within the funds available under this item the National Grange be reimbursed for such costs as may equitably be determined to be attributable to such move.

The committee is concerned that many of the regulatory agencies are presently housed in inadequate Government-owned space or poorly located leased space costing ever-increasing rentals. The committee believes that greater efficiency could be obtained, at a cost that could be sizably reduced, if a group of such agencies could be housed together in one or more Government-owned buildings. The committee requests the Administrator to make a study of such possibilities and to report his findings and recommendations at a later time.

FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

Restoration of $200,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of $3,970,000 for operating expenses.

EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

The committee recommends restoration of $400,000, to provide a total amount of $21,550,000 for expenses of supply distribution, which is $450,000 below the budget estimate.

In this connection, the committee notes the ever-increasing appropriations to this item, and suggests to the Administrator that perhaps more of such costs could be absorbed by the agencies for which the service is rendered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

The committee agrees with the House that the stockpile program should be reviewed annually by the Congress. The committee believes it is important, however, to permit the sale without replacement of excess materials which are subject to deterioration when such action is in the national interest.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the rescission of $50 million of unobligated balances, instead of the House provision for rescinding all unobligated funds in excess of $33 million (amounting to about $107 million). An increase of $160,000 is recommended for operating expenses, to provide a total amount of $3,310,000.

The committee also recommends clarification of the authority to sell certain rotatable materials without replacement by inserting the following:

> *Provided*, That any funds received as proceeds from sale or other disposition of materials on account of the rotation of stocks under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act shall be deposited to the credit, and be available for expenditure for the purposes, of this appropriation except that, to the extent materials sold under section (d) of said Act to prevent deterioration are excess to stockpile needs, the proceeds of sale may be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and thereupon the replacement requirements of said section 3(d) shall not be applicable.

The Administrator of General Services advised the committee as to the operation of the rotation program, as follows:

> The amendments proposed would permit the continued rotation of a material to maintain quality when the amount of the inventory does not exceed the objective or when disposal of excess materials, without replacement, would disrupt market conditions. At the same time, the language would further what is believed to be the desire of the House Appropriations Committee in permitting, in effect, the reduction of inventories of perishable commodities to the extent feasible under then current market conditions and within the quantities that would otherwise be rotated to prevent deterioration. No such disposal action will, however, be undertaken by GSA until other interested Government agencies have had the opportunity to consider the proposed action and to consult as to its effect on the world market for that material, and all such disposal actions will be carried out with due regard to the protection of producers, processors and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The committee believes such considerations should cover world and domestic markets for such materials.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Restoration of $500,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of $13 million for the limitation on deposits made to the fund. The committee also recommends in-

creasing the limitation from $100 to $900 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals.

The committee recommends, in connection with the transfer of $2 million of construction funds, that the appropriation "Construction, public buildings projects" be available for acquisition of buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Restoration of $700,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $9,402,000 for salaries and expenses, which is $623,000 below the budget estimate. The committee also recommends the insertion of authorization to purchase newspapers and periodicals up to $6,000.

PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Restoration of $50,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of $550,000 for the limitation on administrative expenses.

REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

The committee recommends restoration of $102,000, to provide the full budget estimate of $755,000 for the limitation on administrative expenses.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

The committee recommends restoration of $340,000, to provide the full budget estimate of $13 million for administrative expenses.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Restoration of $500,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $19,900,000 for salaries and expenses, which is $250,000 below the budget estimate. The committee recommends increasing from 30 to 40 the limitation on the purchase of passenger motor vehicles, increasing the earmarking for railroad safety activities by $7,100 to provide the full budget estimate, and increasing the earmarking for locomotive inspection activities by $6,300 to provide the full budget estimate.

The committee recommends the insertion of a provision to place the salary of the Secretary of the Commission at grade GS–18.

National Science Foundation

The committee recommends restoration of $17,027,000, to provide the full budget estimate for salaries and expenses of $160,300,000.

Included in the restoration are funds in the amount of $3,300,000 for research facilities, including the Southern Hemisphere astrograph, university nuclear research equipment, and the National Institute for Atmospheric Research. The committee also includes restoration of $2 million for scientific studies concerning weather modification, as

well as the restoration of $1,480,000 to provide the full budget estimate of $5,100,000 for the dissemination of scientific information.

With funds previously provided, the optical astronomy observatory and the solar research telescope are being constructed for installation on Kitt Peak in Arizona. The observatory will house three telescopes, a 16-inch, a 36-inch, and an 80-inch; the solar telescope is a 60-inch. The pupose of the observatory is to provide facilities for astronomers located at other observatories and universities who do not have suitable instruments or favorable weather conditions for good observing. They will come to this national observatory, carefully selected for ideal seeing conditions, for observing periods as required by their particular research programs. Accommodations for these transient astronomers as well as a small permanent scientific staff will be located in the 70-acre area on the summit.

Last year's bill provided $1 million for transfer to the Bureau of Public Roads for construction of a secondary road to the observatory on Kitt Peak. From these funds, the Bureau of Public Roads has prepared a topographic map by photogrammetric methods, which will be used in making the final route selection and the actual road design. The 13 miles of access road from the highway must be built through extremely rugged terrain, and these large-scale maps have shown construction difficulties due to exceptionally severe geological conditions requiring a very large volume of expensive rock excavation, which difficulties were not previously known. It is now found that a wider roadbed is required and larger size drainage structures must be used. These necessities have added greatly to the cost.

The Bureau of Public Roads now estimates for construction of a 30-mile-per-hour road, including grading and paving, with a parking area on the peak, adequate drainage structures, and other costs, a total amount of $2,890,000.

The committee believes that such a road is essential to the operation of the observatory on Kitt Peak, and therefore recommends that additional funds for the road be provided within the funds available to the Foundation, with a provision for transferring $1,890,000 for that purpose to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce.

Renegotiation Board

Restoration of $300,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of $3 million for salaries and expenses.

Securities and Exchange Commission

The committee recommends restoration of $475,000, to provide the full budget estimate of $8,275,000 for salaries and expenses.

Selective Service System

Restoration of $556,800 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $29,556,800 for salaries and expenses, which is $1,093,200 below the budget estimate.

The committee also recommends restoration of $22,000, to provide the full budget estimate of $72,000 for the limitation for the National Selective Service Appeal Board.

Veterans' Administration

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

The committee agrees with the House in providing the full amount of the budget estimate of $163,373,000.

The committee is advised that a proposed reorganization will seriously affect the Reno, Nev., and Sioux Falls, S. Dak., offices of the guaranty loan program. It is hoped that the situation will not be changed, to the end that the veterans in any State are not denied the local contacts necessary in the program.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

The committee agrees with the House in restoring the medical research amount to the 1959 level of $15,344,000, by adding $4,344,000 over the budget estimate for that purpose. Testimony presented to the committee indicated substantial progress from the funds previously made available, as well as urgent requests for increasing the amount from eminent specialists. The committee is convinced that additional funds can be well and profitably used, and accordingly recommends further increasing the amount by $4 million, to provide a total amount for medical research of $19,344,000, within the total appropriation of $31,349,000.

The committee also recommends inserting a limitation in the bill in order to allow $1,200,000 for expenses of travel of employees.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

The committee agrees with the House in adding $10 million over the budget estimate, to provide a total amount of $30,159,000, particularly for hospital alterations and acceleration of modernization. In line with the recommendation for increasing the medical research program by $4 million, the committee recommends adding $3 million to construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities, to be used for research facilities and research laboratories to go along with the clinical investigations. The total amount recommended for the item is $33,159,000.

The committee is convinced that there is urgent need for the new veterans' hospital to be located at Martinez, Calif. It is understood that the plans are proceeding, and it is hoped that they will be finished under the highest priority, in order that construction can be started as soon as funds are available.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitations on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Authorizations, 1959 [1]	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended in House bill for 1960	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
					Authorizations, 1959	Estimates, 1960	House bill
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	$1,699,000	$1,900,000	$1,800,000	$1,800,000	+$101,000	−$100,000	
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	750,600	800,000	775,000	775,000	+24,400	−25,000	
General Services Administration:							
Abaca fiber program	51,950	52,500	47,000	47,000	−4,950	−5,500	
Federal Facilities Corporation	26,620	24,000	20,000	20,000	−6,620	−4,000	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation fund	53,960	44,000	40,000	40,000	−13,960	−4,000	
Housing and Home Finance Agency:							
College housing loans	1,718,200	1,780,000	1,723,000	1,723,000	+4,800	−57,000	
Public facility loans	434,200	550,000	500,000	550,000	+115,800		+$50,000
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)	650,900	755,000	653,000	755,000	+104,100		+102,000
Federal National Mortgage Association	4,885,000	6,100,000	6,050,000	6,050,000	+1,165,000	−50,000	
Federal Housing Administration	7,841,500	8,200,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	+258,500	−100,000	
Public Housing Administration	12,574,000	13,000,000	12,660,000	13,000,000	+426,000		+340,000
Total, administrative expenses	30,685,930	33,205,500	32,368,000	32,860,000	+2,174,070	−345,500	+492,000

[1] Includes funds contained in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1959 (Public Law 86-30).

PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE ANNUAL APPROPRIATION

Object	Appropriations, 1959	Budget estimates, 1960	Increase (+) or decrease (−), estimates compared with appropriations
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act	$59,000	$53,000	−$6,000
General Services Administration: Expenses, disposal of surplus real and related personal property	900,000	1,000,000	+100,000
Total, permanent and indefinite appropriations	959,000	1,053,000	+94,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1959, AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1960

Item	Appropriations, 1959 [1]	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended in House bill for 1960	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1959	Estimates, 1960	House bill
TITLE I							
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT							
OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION							
Salaries and expenses	$23,285,000	$28,800,000	$23,285,000	$23,285,000	----------	−$5,515,000	----------
Federal contributions	0	25,000,000	10,000,000	25,000,000	+$25,000,000	----------	+$15,000,000
Emergency supplies and equipment	20,000,000	13,900,000	6,950,000	6,950,000	−13,050,000	−6,950,000	----------
Research and development	2,000,000	7,270,000	3,500,000	4,500,000	+2,500,000	−2,770,000	+1,000,000
Total, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	45,285,000	74,970,000	43,735,000	59,735,000	+14,450,000	−15,235,000	+16,000,000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES							
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD							
Salaries and expenses	6,540,200	7,500,000	6,925,000	6,925,000	+384,800	−575,000	----------
Payments to air carriers	54,844,500	62,618,000	57,000,000	60,000,000	+5,155,500	−2,618,000	+3,000,000
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board	61,384,700	70,118,000	63,925,000	66,925,000	+5,540,300	−3,193,000	+3,000,000
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	19,787,200	20,165,000	18,800,000	19,440,000	−347,200	−725,000	+640,000
Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations	450,000	412,000	400,000	400,000	−50,000	−12,000	----------
Annuities under special acts	2,570,000	2,450,000	2,450,000	2,450,000	−120,000	----------	----------
Administrative expenses, exmployees' life insurance fund	*(123,800)*	*(70,000)*	*(240,000)*	*(258,000)*	*(−134,200)*	*(+188,000)*	*(+18,000)*
Total, Civil Service Commission	22,807,200	23,027,000	21,650,000	22,290,000	−517,200	−737,000	+640,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 18.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1959, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1960—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1959 [1]	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended in House bill for 1960	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1959	Estimates, 1960	House bill
TITLE I—Continued							
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued							
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY							
Expenses	$258,016,100	$326,400,000	$283,200,000	$320,200,000	+$62,183,900	−$6,200,000	+$37,000,000
Establishment of air navigation facilities	158,500,000	145,000,000	131,200,000	139,700,000	−18,800,000	−5,300,000	+8,500,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization)	48,000,000	50,000,000	47,500,000	47,500,000	−500,000	−2,500,000	
Research and development	297,000	63,600,000	47,100,000	50,350,000	+50,053,000	−13,250,000	+3,250,000
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport	2,490,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	−90,000		
Construction and development, additional Washington Airport	50,000,000	0			−50,000,000		
Operation and maintenance of public airports, Territory of Alaska	1,075,650	0			−1,075,650		
Airways Modernization Board	31,500,000	0			−31,500,000		
Total, Federal Aviation Agency	549,878,750	587,400,000	511,400,000	560,150,000	+10,271,250	−27,250,000	+48,750,000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	9,781,100	11,000,000	10,400,000	10,700,000	+918,900	−300,000	+300,000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	6,932,500	7,425,000	7,062,000	7,374,000	+441,500	−51,000	+312,000
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	6,488,000	6,975,000	6,745,000	6,935,000	+447,000	−40,000	+190,000
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE							
Salaries and expenses	39,020,500	41,869,000	41,800,000	41,800,000	+2,779,500	−69,000	

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION							
Operating expenses, Public Building Service	145,818,960	155,100,000	148,150,000	153,150,000	+7,331,040	−1,950,000	+5,000,000
Repair and improvement, federally owned buildings	75,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	−15,000,000		
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts	310,900	1,675,000	1,675,000	1,675,000	+1,364,100		
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects	39,915,000	0	25,000,000	25,000,000	−14,915,000	+25,000,000	
Construction, public buildings projects	152,810,000	0			−152,810,000		
Construction, Federal Office Building No. 6, Wasbington, D.C.	14,000,000	0			−14,000,000		
Construction, U.S. Court of Claims and Federal Office Building, Wasbington, D.C.	1,200,000	0			−1,200,000		
Construction, U.S. Mission Building, New York, N.Y.	3,750,000	0			−3,750,000		
Construction, public buildings	323,000	0			−323,000		
Hospital facilities in tbe District of Columbia	1,020,000	0			−1,020,000		
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	[2] 3,715,690	[3] 3,970,000	[3] 3,770,000	[3] 3,970,000	+254,310		+200,000
Expenses, supply distribution	20,507,000	22,000,000	21,150,000	21,550,000	+1,043,000	−450,000	+400,000
General supply fund	21,250,000	0			−21,250,000		
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	8,082,500	9,300,000	9,176,800	9,176,800	+1,094,300	−123,200	
Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Services	1,995,800	2,029,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+4,200	−29,000	
Refunds under Renegotiation Act	1,400,000				−1,400,000		
Strategic and critical materials	3,000,000	0	(4)	(5)	−3,000,000		
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	372,240	225,000	225,000	225,000	−147,240		
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents		200,000	200,000	200,000	+200,000		
Administrative operations fund (limitation)	*(12,366,900)*	*(13,000,000)*	*(12,500,000)*	*(13,000,000)*	*(+633,100)*		*(+500,000)*
Total, General Services Administration	494,471,090	254,499,000	271,346,800	276,946,800	−217,524,290	+22,447,800	+5,600,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 18.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1959, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1960—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1959 [1]	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended in House bill for 1960	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1959	Estimates, 1960	House bill
TITLE I—Continued							
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued							
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY							
Office of the Administrator:							
Salaries and expenses	$8,684,000	$10,025,000	$8,702,000	$9,402,000	+$718,000	−$623,000	+$700,000
Urban planning grants	3,250,000	975,000	975,000	975,000	−2,275,000		
Capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal	50,000,000	100,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	+40,000,000	−10,000,000	
Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund)	7,000,000	7,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	−1,000,000	−1,000,000	
Total, Office of the Administrator	68,934,000	118,000,000	105,677,000	106,377,000	+37,443,000	−11,623,000	+700,000
Public Housing Administration:							
Annual contributions	107,500,000	124,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	+12,500,000	−4,000,000	
Administrative expenses	12,574,000	13,000,000	12,660,000	13,000,000	+426,000		+340,000
Total, Public Housing Administration	120,074,000	137,000,000	132,660,000	133,000,000	+12,926,000	−4,000,000	+340,000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency	189,008,000	255,000,000	238,337,000	239,377,000	+50,369,000	−15,623,000	+1,040,000
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	18,747,800	20,150,000	19,400,000	19,900,000	+1,152,200	−250,000	+500,000
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION							
Salaries and expenses	86,286,300	0			−86,286,300		
Research and development	50,000,000	0			−50,000,000		

Construction and equipment	48,000,000	0			−48,000,000		
Total, National Acronautics and Space Administration	184,286,300	0			−184,286,300		
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY							
Operation and maintenance of properties	38,000	45,000	40,000	40,000	+2,000	−5,000	
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION							
Salaries and expenses	134,000,000	160,300,000	143,273,000	160,300,000	+26,300,000		+17,027,000
International Geophysical Year	2,500,000	0			−2,500,000		
Total, National Science Foundation	136,500,000	160,300,000	143,273,000	160,300,000	+23,800,000		+17,027,000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD							
Salaries and expenses	3,025,500	3,000,000	2,700,000	3,000,000	−25,500		+300,000
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	7,705,000	8,275,000	7,800,000	8,275,000	+570,000		+475,000
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM							
Salaries and expenses	29,556,800	30,650,000	29,000,000	29,556,800		−1,093,200	+556,800
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION							
General operating expenses	164,680,000	163,373,000	163,373,000	163,373,000	−1,307,000		
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	26,726,300	23,005,000	27,349,000	31,349,000	+4,622,700	+8,344,000	+4,000,000
Inpatient care	769,318,000	786,779,000	792,079,000	792,079,000	+22,761,000	+5,300,000	
Outpatient care	82,333,000	83,866,000	83,866,000	83,866,000	+1,533,000		
Maintenance and operation of supply depots	2,201,700	2,303,000	2,218,000	2,218,000	+16,300	−85,000	
Compensation and pensions	3,252,500,000	3,307,000,000	3,300,000,000	3,300,000,000	+47,500,000	−7,000,000	
Readjustment benefits	700,000,000	588,000,000	585,000,000	585,000,000	−115,000,000	−3,000,000	
Veterans insurance and indemnities	51,100,000	53,000,000	53,000,000	53,000,000	+1,900,000		
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	1,250,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+750,000		
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities	19,295,000	20,159,000	30,159,000	33,159,000	+13,864,000	+13,000,000	+3,000,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 18.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1959, and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1960—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1959 [1]	Budget estimates, 1960	Recommended in House bill for 1960	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−) Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1959	Estimates, 1960	House bill
TITLE I—Continued							
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued							
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—continued							
Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief	$1,300,000	0			−$1,300,000		
Total, Veterans' Administration	5,070,704,000	$5,029,485,000	$5,039,044,000	$5,046,044,000	−24,660,000	+$16,559,000	+$7,000,000
Total, title I	6,875,620,240	6,584,188,000	6,457,657,800	6,559,348,600	−316,271,640	−24,839,400	+101,690,800

[1] Includes funds contained in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1959 (Public Law 86-30).
[2] And $1,999,010 from proceeds of surplus personal property disposal.
[3] And $2,230,000 from proceeds of surplus personal property disposal.
[4] Rescission of prior year funds estimated at $107,000,000.
[5] Rescission of $50,000,000 of prior year funds.

O

Calendar No. 417

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7040

[Report No. 423]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 12, 1959

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JUNE 22, 1959

Reported by Mr. MAGNUSON, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, namely:

1 TITLE I

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3 OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE

4 MOBILIZATION

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and De-
7 fense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section
8 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; reimburse-
9 ment of the General Services Administration for security
10 guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials
11 and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense
12 functions; not to exceed $8,500 for the purchase of news-
13 papers, periodicals and teletype news services; not to exceed
14 $1,000,000 for expenses of travel; and not to exceed $6,000
15 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended
16 under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he
17 deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final
18 and conclusive: $23,285,000, of which $185,000 shall be
19 available for the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Com-
20 mittee: *Provided,* That contracts for not to exceed eight
21 persons under this appropriation for temporary or inter-
22 mittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
23 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annually.

1 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

2 For financial contributions to the States for civil defense
3 purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,
4 as amended, to be equally matched with State funds,
5 ~~$10,000,000~~ *$25,000,000*.

6 EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

7 For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing,
8 distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense
9 materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of
10 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,
11 $6,950,000.

12 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

13 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
14 studies and research to develop measures and plans for evacu-
15 ation, shelter, and the protection of life and property, as au-
16 thorized by section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act
17 of 1950, as amended, including services as authorized by
18 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
19 ~~$3,500,000~~ *$4,500,000*, to remain available until expended.

20 No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be avail-
21 able for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of
22 warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed

1 specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense
2 Mobilization.

3 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

4 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board,
7 including contract stenographic reporting services; employ-
8 ment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; *not to*
9 *exceed $1,600 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals*
10 *(excluding scientific, technical, trade or traffic periodicals,*
11 *for official use);* hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of
12 aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as
13 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
14 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $50
15 per diem; $6,925,000.

16 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

17 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensa-
18 tion fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board
19 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72
20 Stat. 763–765), as is payable by the Board, ~~$57,000,000~~
21 *$60,000,000,* to remain available until expended.

22 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

23 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

24 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $22,000
25 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August

2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed $10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; not to exceed ~~$100~~ *$400* for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals (excluding scientific, technical, trade or traffic periodicals, for official use); payment in advance for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed $77,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; not to exceed $472,000 for expenses of travel; and not to exceed $5,000 for actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; ~~$18,800,000~~ *$19,440,000*: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended.

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

1 INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR
2 EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
3 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
4 Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended,
5 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary
6 General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of
7 other international organizations, certain information con-
8 cerning United States citizens employed, or being con-
9 sidered for employment by such organizations, including
10 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
11 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $400,000: *Provided,* That this
12 appropriation shall be available for advances or reimburse-
13 ments to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil
14 Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation
15 for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive
16 order: *Provided further,* That members of the International
17 Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual
18 transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence
19 authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended,
20 while traveling on official business away from their homes or
21 regular places of business, including periods while en route
22 to and from and at the place where their services are to be
23 performed: *Provided further,* That nothing in sections 281
24 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of

1 the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply
2 to any person because of appointment for part-time or inter-
3 mittent service as a member of the International Organiza-
4 tions Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Com-
5 mission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated
6 January 9, 1953, as amended.

7 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

8 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May
9 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of
10 August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771–775),
11 $2,450,000.

12 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES'
13 LIFE INSURANCE FUND

14 Not to exceed ~~$240,000~~ *$258,000* of the funds in the
15 "Employees' Life Insurance Fund" shall be available for re-
16 imbursement to the Civil Service Commission for adminis-
17 trative expenses incurred by the Commission during the cur-
18 rent fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Em-
19 ployees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended
20 (5 U.S.C. 2091–2103): *Provided,* That this limitation shall
21 include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act, not-
22 withstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 85–
23 377 (5 U.S.C. 2094(c)).

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; *not to exceed $10,000 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals (excluding scientific, technical, trade or traffic periodicals, for official use only);* purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at not to exceed ~~$3,500~~ *$4,500*; ~~not to exceed $12,950,000 for expenses of travel;~~ and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; ~~$283,200,000~~ *$320,200,000*: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

Establishment of Air Navigation Facilities

For an additional amount for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of air navigation facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at remote localities not on foreign soil where such accom-

modations are not available ~~(at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $40,000 per housing unit in Alaska)~~; *purchase of not to exceed three aircraft;* and the initial flight checking of air navigation facilities and the transportation by air to and from and within Alaska and the Territories of the United States of materials and equipment secured under this appropriation; ~~$131,200,000~~ *$139,700,000,* to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air navigation facilities.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to enter into contracts, $47,500,000, to remain available until expended.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for research, development, and service testing, including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; and purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles; *and purchase of not to exceed*

1 *three aircraft;* ~~$47,100,000~~ *$50,350,000,* to remain avail-
2 able until expended.

3 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL
4 AIRPORT

5 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-
6 nance, improvement and protection of the Washington Na-
7 tional Airport, including purchase of one passenger motor
8 vehicle for replacement only; purchase, cleaning, and repair
9 of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $2,400,000.

10 GENERAL PROVISIONS

11 During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations
12 to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the
13 activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949, as
14 amended (5 U.S.C. 596a), to the extent and in the manner
15 prescribed by said Act; maintenance and operation of air-
16 craft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; and uni-
17 forms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of
18 September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

19 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the
22 Commission as authorized by law, including newspapers (not
23 to exceed $200), land and structures (not to exceed $81,800),
24 special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and
25 repairs to buildings (not to exceed $13,900), services as

1 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
2 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and purchase of not to exceed three pas-
3 senger motor vehicles for replacement only, ~~$10,400,000~~
4 *$10,700,000.*

5 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,
8 as authorized by law, including not to exceed $375,000 for
9 expenses of travel; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not
10 to exceed $500 for newspapers; ~~$7,062,000~~ *$7,374,000,* of
11 which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for special
12 counsel and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
13 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not exceed-
14 ing $50 per diem for individuals: *Provided,* That not to
15 exceed $354,200 shall be available for investigations relating
16 to Federal river development projects.

17 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commis-
20 sion, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized
21 by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), not to exceed $700 for news-
22 papers, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
23 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed $285,000
24 for expenses of travel, ~~$6,745,000~~ *$6,935,000*: *Provided,*
25 That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be ex-

1 pended upon any investigation hereafter provided by con-
2 current resolution of the Congress until funds are appropri-
3 ated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to
4 finance the cost of such investigation.

5 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office,
8 including newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding $500);
9 rental or lease of office space in foreign countries without
10 regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised
11 Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529); and services as
12 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
13 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $41,800,000.

14 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

15 OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDING SERVICE

16 For necessary expenses of real property management and
17 related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in
18 the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises;
19 moving Government agencies (including space adjustments)
20 in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer
21 of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and
22 disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests
23 therein; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of
24 August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); ~~$148,150,000~~ *$153,-*
25 *150,000*: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be avail-

1 able, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30,
2 1932, as amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to build-
3 ings, or parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appropria-
4 tion for "Emergency operating expenses".

5 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT, FEDERALLY OWNED
6 BUILDINGS

7 For expenses necessary for the repair, alteration, preser-
8 vation, renovation, improvement, extension, equipment, and
9 demolition of federally owned buildings and buildings occu-
10 pied pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act
11 of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), not otherwise provided for, in-
12 cluding grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and
13 piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto;
14 acquisition of land as authorized by title III of the Act
15 of June 16, 1949 (40 U.S.C. 297); and care and safeguard-
16 ing of sites acquired for Federal buildings; $60,000,000, to
17 remain available until expended.

18 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

19 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any
20 other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to
21 the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40
22 U.S.C. 356), $1,675,000: *Provided,* That authority hereto-
23 fore granted under this head for the Administrator of General
24 Services to enter into a 10-year contract for the project at
25 Sacramento, California, for which the annual payment for

1 amortization of principal and interest thereon shall not ex-
2 ceed $1,250,600, is hereby extended to December 31, 1959.

3 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

4 For an additional amount for expenses necessary in con-
5 nection with construction of public buildings projects not
6 otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the
7 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, $25,000,000,
8 to remain available until expended, and this amount shall be
9 expended for projects at such additional locations as may
10 be selected by the Administrator of General Services and in
11 amounts he deems necessary.

12 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

13 For necessary expenses of personal property manage-
14 ment and related activities as authorized by law and not
15 otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $300 for
16 the purchase of newspapers and periodicals, ~~$3,770,000~~
17 *$3,970,000*: *Provided,* That not to exceed $2,230,000 of
18 any funds received during the current or preceding fiscal
19 year for deposit under section 204 (a) of the Federal Prop-
20 erty and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended,
21 and not otherwise disposed of by law, shall be deposited to
22 the credit of this appropriation and shall be available for
23 necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the Gen-

1 eral Services Administration under the said Act, with respect
2 to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus personal
3 property.

4 EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

5 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for
6 operation of the stores depot system and other procure-
7 ment services, including contractual services incident to re-
8 ceiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items; and not
9 to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals;
10 ~~$21,150,000~~ *$21,550,000.*

11 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND
12 RECORDS SERVICE

13 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal rec-
14 ords management and related activities as provided by law,
15 including contractual services incident to movement or dis-
16 posal of records, $9,176,800.

17 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC
18 UTILITIES SERVICE

19 For necessary expenses of transportation and public
20 utilities management and related activities, as provided by
21 law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the
22 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to
23 exceed $75 per diem for individuals, $2,000,000.

1 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

2 Funds available for carrying out the provisions of the
3 Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C.
4 98–98b), during the current fiscal year, shall be available
5 for transportation and handling, within the United States
6 (including charges at United States ports), storage, security,
7 and maintenance of strategic and critical materials acquired
8 for or transferred to the supplemental stockpile established
9 pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade De-
10 velopment and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)),
11 and for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial
12 Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462), relating to
13 machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for
14 which the General Services Administration is responsible,
15 including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
16 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed ~~$3,150,~~
17 ~~000~~ *$3,310,000* for operating expenses, ~~but total obligations~~
18 ~~of funds available for carrying out the provisions of the~~
19 ~~Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act during the~~
20 ~~current fiscal year shall not exceed $33,000,000~~: *Provided,*
21 That *any funds received as proceeds from sale or other dis-*
22 *position of materials on account of the rotation of stocks under*
23 *the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act shall*

1 *be deposited to the credit, and be available for expenditure*
2 *for the purposes, of this appropriation except that, to the*
3 *extent materials sold under section (d) of said Act to prevent*
4 *deterioration are excess to stockpile needs, the proceeds of*
5 *sale may be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous re-*
6 *ceipts and thereupon the replacement requirements of said*
7 *section 3(d) shall not be applicable: Provided further, That*
8 during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation
9 on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which,
10 in accordance with section 6 (a) of the Strategic and Critical
11 facilities~~: *Provided further,* That unobligated balances~~
12 ~~of funds in excess of $33,000,000 as of July 1, 1959, to-~~
13 ~~gether with any receipts from sales or otherwise, during the~~
14 ~~fiscal year 1960, are hereby rescinded and shall be promptly~~
15 ~~deposited into the Treasury~~*: Provided further, That the sum*
16 *of $50,000,000 of funds heretofore appropriated under this*
17 *head is hereby rescinded, and such amount shall be covered*
18 *into the Treasury promptly upon enactment of this Act.*

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

20 For expenses of executive direction for activities under
21 the control of the General Services Administration, including
22 not to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodi-
23 cals, $225,000.

1 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER
2 PRESIDENTS

3 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August
4 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), $200,000: *Provided,* That the
5 Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Sec-
6 retary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to
7 carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

9 Funds available to General Services Administration for
10 administrative operations, in support of program activities,
11 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a
12 single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided,* That costs
13 and obligations for such administrative operations for the
14 respective program activities shall be accounted for in ac-
15 cordance with systems approved by the General Accounting
16 Office: *Provided further,* That the total amount deposited
17 into said account for the fiscal year 1960 from funds made
18 available to General Services Administration in this Act shall
19 not exceed ~~$12,500,000~~ *$13,000,000,* of which not to exceed
20 ~~$100~~ *$900* may be used for purchase of newspapers and
21 periodicals: *Provided further,* That amounts deposited into
22 said account for administrative operations for each program
23 shall not exceed the amounts included in the respective pro-
24 gram appropriations for such purposes.

1 GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the
3 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)
4 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,
5 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from
6 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129);
7 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to
8 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the
9 General Services Administration, issued by public authorities,
10 States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to
11 such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems neces-
12 sary and in the public interest may, upon the request and
13 at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the
14 appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations
15 or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the
16 General Services Administration, in connection with prop-
17 erty transferred to the General Services Administration pur-
18 suant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and
19 such appropriations or funds may, with the approval of the
20 Bureau of the Budget, be so transferred.

21 Not to exceed $2,000,000 granted in the Independent
22 Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the appropriation
23 for "Construction, Federal Office Building Numbered Six,
24 Washington, District of Columbia", may be transferred to

1 "Construction, Public Buildings projects": *Provided,* That
2 the latter appropriation shall be available for acquisition of
3 ~~a building in Portland, Oregon~~ *buildings and sites thereof by*
4 *purchase, condemnation or otherwise*: *Provided further,* That
5 the limits of costs applicable to projects authorized under said
6 appropriation may be exceeded to the extent that savings
7 are effected on other projects.

8 Funds available to the General Services Administration
9 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

10 No part of any money appropriated by this or any other
11 Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Govern-
12 ment shall be used during the current fiscal year for the
13 purchase within the continental limits of the United States
14 of any typewriting machines except in accordance with
15 regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal
16 Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as
17 amended.

18 Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made
19 available to the General Services Administration for the cur-
20 rent fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other
21 such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be
22 thereby increased more than 2 per centum: *Provided,* That
23 such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and
24 shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of $2,000,000.

1 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

2 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Admin-
5 istrator, including rent in the District of Columbia; services
6 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
7 (5 U.S.C. 55a); *purchase of newspapers and periodicals*
8 *(not to exceed $6,000);* and purchase of two passenger motor
9 vehicles (including one in the District of Columbia, to re-
10 main under the control of the Agency, at a purchase price of
11 not to exceed $3,500) of which one shall be for replacement
12 only; ~~$8,702,000~~ *$9,402,000*: *Provided,* That necessary ex-
13 penses of inspections and of providing representatives at the site
14 of projects being planned or undertaken by local public agencies
15 pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended,
16 projects financed through loans to educational institutions
17 authorized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as
18 amended, and projects and facilities financed by loans to pub-
19 lic agencies pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments
20 of 1955, as amended, shall be compensated by such agencies
21 or institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the
22 aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services, and
23 expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministra-
24 tive; and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the

1 Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may
2 accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such
3 institutions, or the Administrator, and shall credit such
4 amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such
5 charges have been made, but such nonadministrative ex-
6 penses shall not exceed $2,900,000.

7 URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

8 For grants in accordance with the provisions of section
9 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, $975,000.

10 CAPITAL GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN
11 RENEWAL

12 For an additional amount for payment of capital grants
13 as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as
14 amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), $90,000,000.

15 RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS (PAYMENT TO
16 REVOLVING FUND)

17 For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant
18 to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40
19 U.S.C. 462), $6,000,000.

20 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

21 ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

22 For the payment of annual contributions to public hous-
23 ing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United
24 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),
25 $120,000,000.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

2 For administrative expenses of the Public Housing
3 Administration, ~~$12,660,000~~ *$13,000,000,* to be expended
4 under the authorization for such expenses contained in title
5 II of this Act.

6 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce
9 Commission, including not to exceed $5,000 for the employ-
10 ment of special counsel; services as authorized by section 15
11 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not
12 to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; newspapers (not to
13 exceed $300); and purchase of not to exceed ~~thirty~~ *forty*
14 passenger motor vehicles of which nineteen shall be for re-
15 placement only; ~~$19,400,000~~ *$19,900,000,* of which not less
16 than ~~$1,526,100~~ *$1,533,200* shall be available for expenses
17 necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less
18 than ~~$1,051,400~~ *$1,057,700* shall be available for expenses
19 necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Pro-*
20 *vided,* That Joint Board members and cooperating State
21 commissioners may use Government transportation requests
22 when traveling in connection with their duties as such: *Pro-*
23 *vided further, That without regard to the Classification Act*
24 *of 1949, as amended, the salary of the Secretary of the*

1 *Commission shall be at the salary rate of grade GS–18 so*
2 *long as such position is occupied by the present incumbent.*

3 NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

4 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

5 For the operation and maintenance of properties under
6 title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act,
7 $40,000: *Provided,* That all receipts derived from sales,
8 leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of
9 the United States monthly: *Provided further,* That so long
10 as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing
11 purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act
12 of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not
13 be effective.

14 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
17 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42
18 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellow-
19 ships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
20 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50
21 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
22 not to exceed $350 for the purchase of newspapers and
23 periodicals; and reimbursement of the General Services Ad-
24 ministration for security guard services; ~~$143,273,000~~

1 *$160,300,000,* to remain available until expended, *of which*
2 *$1,890,000 shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public*
3 *Roads, Department of Commerce, for an additional amount*
4 *to complete the construction of a secondary road to the Op-*
5 *tical Astronomy Observatory on Kitt Peak in Arizona: Pro-*
6 *vided,* That of the foregoing amount not less than $30,250,-
7 000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances
8 in connection with a program of supplementary training
9 for secondary school science and mathematics teachers.

10 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-
13 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as
14 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
15 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for
16 individuals, ~~$2,700,000~~ *$3,000,000.*

17 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $1,125
20 for the purchase of newspapers; uniforms or allowances
21 therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and serv-
22 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
23 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); ~~$7,800,000~~ *$8,275,000.*

1 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary for the operation and main-
4 tenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by
5 title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act
6 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized
7 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a);
8 purchase of ten passenger motor vehicles for replacement
9 only; not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers
10 and periodicals; not to exceed ~~$50,000~~ *$72,000* for the Na-
11 tional Selective Service Appeal Board; and $19,000 for the
12 National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians,
13 Dentists, and Allied Specialists; ~~$29,000,000~~ *$29,556,800*:
14 *Provided,* That during the current fiscal year, the President
15 may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsec-
16 tion (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended,
17 whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest
18 of national defense.

19 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

20 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

21 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-
22 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses
23 incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uni-
24 forms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to
25 exceed $3,500 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to

exceed $67,000 for preparation, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures, and other visual education information and descriptive material, including purchase or rental of equipment; $163,373,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for administration of the medical, hospital, domiciliary, special service, construction and supply, research, and employee education and training activities; expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical research, as authorized by law; *not to exceed $1,200,000 for expenses of travel of employees paid from this appropriation, and those engaged in training programs;* and not to exceed $2,700 for newspapers and periodicals; ~~$27,349,000~~ *$31,349,000,* of which ~~$15,344,000~~ *$19,344,000* shall be available for medical research: *Provided,* That $1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriations shall remain available until expended for prosthetic testing and development.

1 INPATIENT CARE

2 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-
3 tion of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and for the care
4 and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administra-
5 tion in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans
6 Administration as authorized by law, including the furnish-
7 ing of recreational articles and facilities; maintenance and
8 operation of farms; repairing, altering, improving or provid-
9 ing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the
10 jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise
11 provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary
12 employees and purchase of materials; purchase of fifty-two
13 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or
14 allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September
15 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State
16 or Territorial homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38,
17 United States Code, for the support of veterans eligible for
18 admission to Veterans Administration facilities for hospital
19 or domiciliary care; $792,079,000, plus reimbursements:
20 *Provided,* That $8,400,000 of such sum shall be for
21 deferred maintenance: *Provided further,* That allot-
22 ments and transfers may be made from this appropria-
23 tion to the Department of Health, Education, and Wel-
24 fare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and
25 Air Force Departments, for disbursement by them under

1 the various headings of their applicable appropriations,
2 of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment
3 of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration: *Provided*
4 *further,* That the foregoing appropriation is predicated on
5 furnishing inpatient care and treatment to an average of
6 140,846 beneficiaries during the fiscal year 1960 including
7 members in State or Territorial homes, and if a lesser num-
8 ber is experienced such appropriation shall be expended
9 only in proportion to the average number of beneficiaries
10 furnished such care and treatment.

11 OUTPATIENT CARE

12 For expenses necessary for furnishing outpatient care to
13 beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, as authorized
14 by law; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles for re-
15 placement only; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as
16 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $83,866,000.

17 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF SUPPLY DEPOTS

18 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
19 of supply depots, including purchase of one passenger motor
20 vehicle for replacement only, and uniforms or allowances
21 therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), $2,218,000.

22 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

23 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,
24 and allowances (including burial awards authorized by sec-
25 tion 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence

1 allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under
2 any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based
3 thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and
4 annuities, the administration of which is now or may here-
5 after be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the
6 payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections
7 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended,
8 $3,300,000,000, to remain available until expended.

9 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

10 For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans
11 as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment
12 Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and
13 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equip-
14 ment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United
15 States Code, $585,000,000, to remain available until
16 expended.

17 VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

18 For military and naval insurance, for national service
19 life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-
20 disabled veterans insurance, $53,000,000, to remain avail-
21 able until expended: *Provided,* That certain premiums pro-
22 vided by law to be credited to the "Military and naval in-
23 surance" or "National service life insurance" appropriations
24 shall be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further,*
25 That this appropriation shall be subject to the same statu-

1 tory provisions and shall be available for the same purpose
2 as formerly applied to the appropriations for "Military and
3 naval insurance", "National service life insurance", and
4 "Servicemen's indemnities".

5 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

6 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants
7 in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United
8 States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treat-
9 ment of veterans, $2,000,000.

10 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY
11 FACILITIES

12 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and
13 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extend-
14 ing any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans
15 Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections
16 5001 and 5002, title 38, United States Code, ~~$30,159,000~~
17 *$33,159,000*, to remain available until expended.

18 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

19 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for
20 the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions",
21 "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and in-
22 demnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned
23 appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appro-
24 priations so augmented, and not to exceed $500,000 of the
25 appropriation "Veterans insurance and indemnities" for the

1 current year may be transferred to "Service-disabled veterans
2 insurance fund".

3 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration
4 for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be
5 available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
6 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

7 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration
8 for the current fiscal year for "Inpatient care" and "Out-
9 patient care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other
10 expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized
11 by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for bene-
12 ficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under
13 such appropriations.

14 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Vet-
15 erans Administration (except the appropriation for "Con-
16 struction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be
17 available for the purchase of any site for or toward the
18 construction of any new hospital or home.

19 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-
20 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons ex-
21 cept beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such
22 benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made
23 to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the
24 Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

1 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expend-
3 able for travel expenses of employees and no specific limita-
4 tion has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel
5 expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in
6 the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Pro-*
7 *vided,* That this section shall not apply to travel performed
8 by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards
9 of the Selective Service System, *or to travel performed in*
10 *connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by*
11 *the Civil Aeronautics Board.*

12 SEC. 103. Where appropriations in this title are expend-
13 able for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and no
14 specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures
15 therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed the
16 amount of $50: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not
17 apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic
18 periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of
19 the authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are
20 herein provided, nor to the purchase of newspapers and
21 periodicals necessary for the care and welfare of patients and
22 members in Veterans Administration hospitals and domi-
23 ciliary facilities.

24 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation contained in this

1 title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling
2 a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held
3 by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of
4 the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period
5 of active military or naval service and has within ninety
6 days after his release from such service or from hospitaliza-
7 tion continuing after discharge for a period of not more than
8 one year made application for restoration to his former posi-
9 tion and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission
10 as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position
11 and has not been restored thereto.

12 SEC. 105. No part of any appropriation made avail-
13 able by the provisions of this title shall be used for the
14 purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establish-
15 ing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided,*
16 That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have
17 been approved by the Congress and appropriations made
18 therefor.

19 SEC. 106. No part of any appropriation contained
20 in this title shall be used to pay the compensation of
21 any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the
22 number that would be provided by a ratio of one such em-
23 ployee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-
24 time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency
25 concerned: *Provided,* That for purposes of this section em-

1 ployees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if
2 they spend half time or more in personnel administration
3 consisting of direction and administration of the personnel
4 program; employment, placement, and separation; job
5 evaluation and classification; employee relations and serv-
6 ices; wage administration; and processing, recording, and
7 reporting.

8 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

9 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
10 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the
11 limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each
12 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
13 make such contracts and commitments without regard to
14 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the
15 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may
16 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the
17 Budget for the fiscal year 1960 for each such corporation
18 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

19 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

20 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXAMINATION
21 EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

22 Not to exceed a total of $1,800,000 shall be avail-
23 able for administrative expenses of the Federal Home
24 Loan Bank Board, and shall be derived from funds avail-
25 able to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including

1 those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving
2 fund and receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Adminis-
3 tration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home
4 Loan Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal
5 years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment
6 for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks,
7 the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan
8 Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Govern-
9 ment (including payment for office space) : *Provided,* That
10 all necessary expenses in connection with the conservator-
11 ship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan
12 Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of pro-
13 ceedings under section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan
14 Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act and
15 all necessary expenses (including services performed on a
16 contract or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
17 ices) in connection with the handling, including the pur-
18 chase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal
19 home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of,
20 or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the
21 Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-
22 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof:
23 *Provided further,* That members and alternates of the Federal
24 Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reim-
25 bursement from the Board as approved by the Board for

1 transportation expenses incurred in attendnace at meetings of
2 or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid
3 not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided*
4 *further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this
5 Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore speci-
6 fied, the administrative expenses and other obligations of
7 the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance
8 with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of
9 July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421–1449):
10 *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses for
11 the examination of Federal and State chartered institutions
12 (other than special examinations determined by the Board
13 to be necessary) shall not exceed $7,700,000.

14 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
15 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

16 Not to exceed $775,000 shall be available for admin-
17 istrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and
18 shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly
19 capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liqui-
20 dation of insured institutions or preparation for or con-
21 duct of proceedings under section 407 of the National
22 Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived
23 from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action
24 for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of
25 losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and ex-

1 penses, and payments for administrative expenses of the
2 Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board
3 to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Cor-
4 poration may utilize and may make payment for services and
5 facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Re-
6 serve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and
7 other agencies of the Government: *Provided,* That, notwith-
8 standing any other provisions of this Act, except for the limi-
9 tation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative
10 expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be
11 incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the
12 Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724–1730).

13 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

14 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,

15 ABACA FIBER PROGRAM

16 Not to exceed $47,000 of funds available to the General
17 Services Administration for the abaca fiber program shall
18 be available for administrative expenses incident to the abaca
19 fiber program, to be computed on an accrual basis, and to
20 be exclusive of the interest paid, depreciation, capitalized
21 expenditures, expenses in connection with the acquisition,
22 protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposi-
23 tion of real or personal property relating to the abaca fiber
24 program, and expenses of services performed on a contract

1 or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal
2 services.

3 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
4 FACILITIES CORPORATION

5 Not to exceed $20,000 shall be available during the
6 fiscal year 1960 for all administrative expenses of the Cor-
7 poration (including use of the services and facilities of Fed-
8 eral Reserve banks), to be computed on an accrual basis,
9 and to be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, capitalized
10 expenditures, expenses in connection with the acquisition,
11 protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or dispo-
12 sition of real or personal property belonging to the Corpora-
13 tion or in which it has an interest, expenses of services per-
14 formed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the
15 performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses
16 reimbursable from other Government agencies.

17 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECON-
18 STRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION
19 FUND

20 Not to exceed $40,000 (to be computed on an accrual
21 basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of
22 Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General
23 Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1
24 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the

1 current fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the
2 liquidation of said functions: *Provided,* That as used herein
3 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to
4 include all salaries and wages, services performed on a con-
5 tract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including
6 the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative
7 offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of services
8 performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the
9 termination of contracts or in the performance of legal serv-
10 ices: *Provided further,* That the distribution of administra-
11 tive expenses to the accounts shall be made in accordance
12 with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

13 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

14 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
15 THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

16 Not to exceed $1,723,000 shall be available for all
17 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis,
18 of carrying out the functions of the Administrator under
19 the program of housing loans to educational institutions (title
20 IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C.
21 1749–1749d), but this amount shall be exclusive of payment
22 for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or
23 any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any
24 insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the
25 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23,

1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the United States.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Not to exceed ~~$500,000~~ *$550,000* of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the United States.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

During the current fiscal year not to exceed ~~$653,000~~ *$755,000* shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government and legal services on a contract or fee basis and of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve

1 banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the
2 Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-
3 loan banks, and any insured banks within the meaning of the
4 Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Federal
5 Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which has
6 been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a de-
7 pository of public money of the United States.

8 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
9 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

10 Not to exceed $6,050,000 shall be available for
11 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
12 basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses
13 (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on
14 a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and
15 servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized ex-
16 penditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (includ-
17 ing services performed on a force account, contract, or fee
18 basis, but not including other personal services) in connec-
19 tion with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance,
20 improvement, or disposition of real or personal property
21 belonging to said Association or in which it has an interest,
22 cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons
23 employed outside of the continental United States, expenses
24 of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection

1 with the performance of legal services, and all administrative
2 expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and
3 said Association may utilize and may make payment for
4 services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other
5 agencies of the Government: *Provided,* That the distribu-
6 tion of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Asso-
7 ciation shall be made in accordance with generally recognized
8 accounting principles and practices.

9 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINIS-
10 TRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRA-
11 TION

12 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-
13 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed $8,100,000 of the
14 various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall
15 be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act,
16 as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allow-
17 ances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1,
18 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided,* That, ex-
19 cept as herein otherwise provided, all expenses and obliga-
20 tions of said Administration shall be incurred, allowed, and
21 paid in accordance with the provisions of said Act: *Provided*
22 *further,* That funds shall be available for contract actuarial
23 services (not to exceed $1,500); and purchase of periodicals
24 and newspapers (not to exceed $750): *Provided further,*

1 That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of
2 Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not
3 exceed $48,000,000.

4 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
5 TIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

6 Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such ex-
7 penses by title I of this Act shall be available for the
8 administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administra-
9 tion in carrying out the provisions of the United States
10 Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401–1433);
11 purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by
12 the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131);
13 and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle
14 for replacement only: *Provided,* That necessary expenses of
15 providing representatives of the Administration at the sites
16 of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction
17 of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies
18 with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by
19 such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the
20 aggregate in relation to the development costs of such proj-
21 ects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and
22 expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall
23 be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received
24 from such payments may be used only for the payment of
25 necessary expenses of providing representatives of the

1 Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Pro-*
2 *vided further,* That all expenses of the Public Housing
3 Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in car-
4 rying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed
5 $1,500,000.

6 CORPORATIONS—GENERAL PROVISION

7 SEC. 202. No part of the funds of, or available for ex-
8 penditure by, any corporation or agency included in this title
9 shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee en-
10 gaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would
11 be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred
12 and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and in-
13 termittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided,*
14 That for purposes of this section employees shall be consid-
15 ered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or
16 more in personnel administration consisting of direction and
17 administration of the personnel program; employment, place-
18 ment, and separation; job evaluation and classification;
19 employee relations and services; committees of expert exam-
20 iners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage adminis-
21 tration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

22 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

23 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in
24 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
25 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used

1 for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support
2 or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.
3 This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices
4 Appropriation Act, 1960".

Passed the House of Representatives May 11, 1959.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7040

[Report No. 423]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

MAY 12, 1959

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JUNE 22, 1959

Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 24, 1959
For actions of June 23, 1959
86th-1st, No. 104

CONTENTS

Access roads.....39
Accounting.....6
Acreage allotments.....19
Agricultural appropriations.....38
Appropriations 1,2,3,5,23,24,38
Area redevelopment...26,42
Beef sales.....18
Contracts.....12
Cooperatives.....35
Electrification.....4
Employment.....43
Fair trade.....32
Farm income.....10
Farm labor.....30
Fats and oils.....8
Federal-State relations.18
Foreign affairs.....15,44
Foreign aid.....16
Foreign service.....45
Forestry.....14,34,39
Health.....6
Housing.....17
Inflation.....22
Information.....37
Lands.....46
Legislative program..16,24
Meat inspection.....7
Milk.....27
Monopolies.....21
Mutual security.....16
Nomination.....9
Peanuts.....19
Personnel.....6,20,43
Public Law 480.....13
Regulatory agencies.....33
River basin.....25
Soil bank.....31
State laws.....18,29
Stockpile.....8
Surplus food.....13
Surplus property.....40
Transportation.....11
TVA.....4,9,16
Vehicle operation.....20
Water pollution.....36
Watersheds.....28
Wildlife.....40,41

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed: State-Justice appropriation bill. Independent offices appropriation bill. Senate committee reported Labor-HEW appropriation bill. House agreed to conference report on housing bill. Sen. Murray and other Senators and Rep. Metcalf introduced and Sen. Murray discussed bill to authorize additional appropriations for forest access roads development.

SENATE

1. STATE-JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Passed, 90 to 0, with amendments this bill, H. R. 7343 (pp. 10491-502, 10506-11). Conferees were appointed (p. 10511). House conferees have not yet been appointed.

2. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Passed, 89 to 1, as reported this bill, H. R. 7040 (pp. 10525-30). Conferees were appointed (p. 10530). House conferees have not yet been appointed.

3. LABOR-HEW APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 6769 (S. Rept. 425). p. 10480

4. ELECTRIFICATION. The Public Works Committee reported with amendments H. R. 3460, to amend the TVA Act of 1933 so as to provide for the issuance of revenue bonds by TVA to finance additions to its power system (S.Rept. 426). p. 10480

5. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. This bill, H. R. 7176, was made the unfinished business for consideration today, June 24. p. 10530

6. PERSONNEL; ACCOUNTING. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report without amendment (but did not actually report) H. R. 6134, to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 so as to eliminate the authority to charge to certain current appropriations or allotments the gross amount of the salary earnings of Federal employees for certain pay periods occurring in part in previous fiscal years. p. D517

The "Daily Digest" states that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee "postponed action for 1 week on S. 2162, Federal Employees' Health Benefits Act of 1959." p. D517

7. MEAT INSPECTION. Both Houses received from GAO a report on the review of activities of the Meat Inspection Division of this Department. pp. 10479, 10618

8. FATS AND OILS. Received from GSA a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 265 million pounds of coconut oil from the national stockpile. p. 10478

9. NOMINATION. Confirmed the nomination of Brooks Hays to be a member of the Board of Directors of TVA. pp. 10514, 10540

10. FARM INCOME. Sen. Langer inserted a GTA Daily Radio Roundup discussing farm income, and stating that "farming continues to be a sort of island of recession in a sea of prosperity." p. 10504

11. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Schoeppel inserted a statement by Ernest J. Williams before the Transportation Council discussing the comprehensive study being made of transportation policy at the request of the President, including activities on which reports are expected to be made from the study. pp. 10504-6

12. CONTRACTS. Passed, with amendments, H. R. 7086, to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 until December 31, 1961 (pp. 10511-2, 10514-6). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Butler to prohibit Government agencies from inserting provisions in certain contracts which would limit profits under the contract (p. 10515).

13. SURPLUS FOODS. Sen. Humphrey inserted two articles, "Our Wheat Surplus: 100 Billion Loaves," and "Farm Surplus Bill Extension Vital," discussing the surplus food situation and activities under Public Law 480 for distributing such food abroad. pp. 10512-3

14. FORESTRY. Sen. Morse inserted a report prepared for him by the Small Business Administration listing timber sales by the Forest Service from tracts which had been set aside for competitive bidding by small business. p. 10534

15. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Sen. Mansfield inserted a list of bills on which hearings will be held by the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs beginning July 6. p. 10489

16. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson announced that S. 1451, the mutual security authorization bill, and H. R. 3460, the TVA self-financing bill, will be considered in the next few days. pp. 10478, 10511

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7040

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 23, 1959

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry
5 independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, cor-
6 porations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending
7 June 30, 1960, namely:

★I

1 TITLE I

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

3 OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE

4 MOBILIZATION

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and De-
7 fense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section
8 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; reimburse-
9 ment of the General Services Administration for security
10 guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials
11 and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense
12 functions; not to exceed $8,500 for the purchase of news-
13 papers, periodicals and teletype news services; not to exceed
14 $1,000,000 for expenses of travel; and not to exceed $6,000
15 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended
16 under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he
17 deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final
18 and conclusive: $23,285,000, of which $185,000 shall be
19 available for the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Com-
20 mittee: *Provided,* That contracts for not to exceed eight
21 persons under this appropriation for temporary or inter-
22 mittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
23 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annually.

1 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

2 For financial contributions to the States for civil defense
3 purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,
4 as amended, to be equally matched with State funds,
5 (1)~~$10,000,000~~ *$25,000,000.*

6 EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

7 For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing,
8 distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense
9 materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of
10 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,
11 $6,950,000.

12 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

13 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
14 studies and research to develop measures and plans for evacu-
15 ation, shelter, and the protection of life and property, as au-
16 thorized by section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act
17 of 1950, as amended, including services as authorized by
18 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
19 (2)~~$3,500,000~~ *$4,500,000,* to remain available until ex-
20 pended.

21 No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be avail-
22 able for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of
23 warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed

1 specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense
2 Mobilization.

3 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

4 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board,
7 including contract stenographic reporting services; employ-
8 ment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; (3)*not*
9 *to exceed $1,600 for the purchase of newspapers and periodi-*
10 *cals (excluding scientific, technical, trade or traffic periodicals,*
11 *for official use);* hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of
12 aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as
13 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
14 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $50
15 per diem; $6,925,000.

16 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

17 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensa-
18 tion fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board
19 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72
20 Stat. 763–765), as is payable by the Board, (4)~~$57,000,000~~
21 *$60,000,000,* to remain available until expended.

1 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $22,000
4 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
5 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed $10,000 for medical
6 examinations performed for veterans by private physicians
7 on a fee basis; not to exceed (5)~~$100~~ *$400* for the purchase
8 of newspapers and periodicals (excluding scientific, technical,
9 trade or traffic periodicals, for official use); payment in ad-
10 vance for library membership in societies whose publications
11 are available to members only or to members at a price lower
12 than to the general public; not to exceed $77,000 for per-
13 forming the duties imposed upon the Commission by the
14 Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); reimbursement of
15 the General Services Administration for security guard serv-
16 ices for protection of confidential files; not to exceed $472,-
17 000 for expenses of travel; and not to exceed $5,000 for
18 actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709,
19 Revised Statutes, as amended; (6)~~$18,800,000~~ *$19,440,-*
20 *000*: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be

1 available for the Career Executive Board established by
2 Executive Order 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended.
3 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
4 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
5 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and
6 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established
7 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

8 INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR
9 EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

10 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
11 Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended,
12 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary
13 General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of
14 other international organizations, certain information con-
15 cerning United States citizens employed, or being con-
16 sidered for employment by such organizations, including
17 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
18 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $400,000: *Provided,* That this
19 appropriation shall be available for advances or reimburse-
20 ments to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil
21 Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation
22 for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive
23 order: *Provided further,* That members of the International
24 Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual
25 transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence

1 authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended,
2 while traveling on official business away from their homes or
3 regular places of business, including periods while en route
4 to and from and at the place where their services are to be
5 performed: *Provided further,* That nothing in sections 281
6 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of
7 the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply
8 to any person because of appointment for part-time or inter-
9 mittent service as a member of the International Organiza-
10 tions Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Com-
11 mission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated
12 January 9, 1953, as amended.

13 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

14 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May
15 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of
16 August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771–775),
17 $2,450,000.

18 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES'
19 LIFE INSURANCE FUND

20 Not to exceed **(7)**~~$240,000~~ *$258,000* of the funds in the
21 "Employees' Life Insurance Fund" shall be available for re-
22 imbursement to the Civil Service Commission for adminis-
23 trative expenses incurred by the Commission during the cur-
24 rent fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Em-
25 ployees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended

(5 U.S.C. 2091–2103) : *Provided,* That this limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 85–377 (5 U.S.C. 2094 (c)).

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; (8)*not to exceed $10,000 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals (excluding scientific, technical, trade or traffic periodicals, for official use only);* purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at not to exceed (9)~~$3,500~~ *$4,500*; (10)~~not to exceed $12,950,000 for expenses of travel;~~ and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; (11)~~$283,200,000~~ *$320,200,000*: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

Establishment of Air Navigation Facilities

For an additional amount for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire

of air navigation facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at remote localities not on foreign soil where such accommodations are not available (12)~~(at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $40,000 per housing unit in Alaska)~~; (13)*Purchase of not to exceed three aircraft;* and the initial flight checking of air navigation facilities and the transportation by air to and from and within Alaska and the Territories of the United States of materials and equipment secured under this appropriation; (14)~~$131,200,000~~ *$139,700,000,* to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air navigation facilities.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to enter into contracts, $47,500,000. to remain available until expended.

1 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

2 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
3 research, development, and service testing, including con-
4 struction of experimental facilities and acquisition of neces-
5 sary sites by lease or grant; and purchase of not to exceed
6 two passenger motor vehicles; (15)*and purchase of not to*
7 *exceed three aircraft;* (16)~~$47,100,000~~ *$50,350,000,* to
8 remain available until expended.

9 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL
10 AIRPORT

11 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-
12 nance, improvement and protection of the Washington Na-
13 tional Airport, including purchase of one passenger motor
14 vehicle for replacement only; purchase, cleaning, and repair
15 of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $2,400,000.

16 GENERAL PROVISIONS

17 During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations
18 to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the
19 activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949, as
20 amended (5 U.S.C. 596a), to the extent and in the manner
21 prescribed by said Act; maintenance and operation of air-
22 craft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; and uni-
23 forms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of
24 September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including newspapers (not to exceed $200), land and structures (not to exceed $81,800), special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed $13,900), services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, (17)~~$10,400,000~~ *$10,700,000.*

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including not to exceed $375,000 for expenses of travel; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $500 for newspapers; (18)~~$7,062,000~~ *$7,374,000,* of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for special counsel and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not exceeding $50 per diem for individuals: *Provided,* That not to exceed $354,200 shall be available for investigations relating to Federal river development projects.

1 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commis-
4 sion, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized
5 by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), not to exceed $700 for news-
6 papers, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
7 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed $285,000
8 for expenses of travel, (19)~~$6,745,000~~ *$6,935,000*: *Pro-*
9 *vided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be
10 expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by con-
11 current resolution of the Congress until funds are appropri-
12 ated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to
13 finance the cost of such investigation.

14 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office,
17 including newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding $500);
18 rental or lease of office space in foreign countries without
19 regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised
20 Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529); and services as
21 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
22 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $41,800,000.

23 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

24 OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDING SERVICE

25 For necessary expenses of real property management and
26 related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in

1 the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises;
2 moving Government agencies (including space adjustments)
3 in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer
4 of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and
5 disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests
6 therein; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of
7 August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); (20)~~$148,150,000~~
8 *$153,150,000*: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be
9 available, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June
10 30, 1932, as amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to
11 buildings, or parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appro-
12 priation for "Emergency operating expenses".

13 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT, FEDERALLY OWNED
14 BUILDINGS

15 For expenses necessary for the repair, alteration, preser-
16 vation, renovation, improvement, extension, equipment, and
17 demolition of federally owned buildings and buildings occu-
18 pied pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act
19 of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), not otherwise provided for, in-
20 cluding grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and
21 piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto;
22 acquisition of land as authorized by title III of the Act
23 of June 16, 1949 (40 U.S.C. 297); and care and safeguard-

1 ing of sites acquired for Federal buildings; $60,000,000, to
2 remain available until expended.

3 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

4 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any
5 other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to
6 the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40
7 U.S.C. 356), $1,675,000: *Provided,* That authority hereto-
8 fore granted under this head for the Administrator of General
9 Services to enter into a 10-year contract for the project at
10 Sacramento, California, for which the annual payment for
11 amortization of principal and interest thereon shall not ex-
12 ceed $1,250,600, is hereby extended to December 31, 1959.

13 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

14 For an additional amount for expenses necessary in con-
15 nection with construction of public buildings projects not
16 otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the
17 Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, $25,000,000,
18 to remain available until expended, and this amount shall be
19 expended for projects at such additional locations as may
20 be selected by the Administrator of General Services and in
21 amounts he deems necessary.

22 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

23 For necessary expenses of personal property manage-
24 ment and related activities as authorized by law and not

1 otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $300 for
2 the purchase of newspapers and periodicals, (21)~~$3,770,000~~
3 *$3,970,000*: *Provided,* That not to exceed $2,230,000 of
4 any funds received during the current or preceding fiscal
5 year for deposit under section 204 (a) of the Federal Prop-
6 erty and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended,
7 and not otherwise disposed of by law, shall be deposited to
8 the credit of this appropriation and shall be available for
9 necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the Gen-
10 eral Services Administration under the said Act, with respect
11 to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus personal
12 property.

13 EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

14 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for
15 operation of the stores depot system and other procure-
16 ment services, including contractual services incident to re-
17 ceiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items; and not
18 to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals;
19 (22)~~$21,150,000~~ *$21,550,000.*

20 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND
21 RECORDS SERVICE

22 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal rec-
23 ords management and related activities as provided by law,

1 including contractual services incident to movement or dis-
2 posal of records, $9,176,800.

3 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC
4 UTILITIES SERVICE

5 For necessary expenses of transportation and public
6 utilities management and related activities, as provided by
7 law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the
8 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to
9 exceed $75 per diem for individuals, $2,000,000.

10 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

11 Funds available for carrying out the provisions of the
12 Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C.
13 98–98b), during the current fiscal year, shall be available
14 for transportation and handling, within the United States
15 (including charges at United States ports), storage, security,
16 and maintenance of strategic and critical materials acquired
17 for or transferred to the supplemental stockpile established
18 pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade De-
19 velopment and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)),
20 and for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial
21 Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462), relating to
22 machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for
23 which the General Services Administration is responsible,
24 including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
25 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed (23) ~~$3,~~

~~150,000~~ *$3,310,000* for operating expenses(24)~~, but total obligations of funds available for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act during the current fiscal year shall not exceed $33,000,000~~: *Provided,* That (25)*any funds received as proceeds from sale or other disposition of materials on account of the rotation of stocks under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act shall be deposited to the credit, and be available for expenditure for the purposes, of this appropriation except that, to the extent materials sold under section 3(d) of said Act to prevent deterioration are excess to stockpile needs, the proceeds of sale may be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and thereupon the replacement requirements of said section 3(d) shall not be applicable: Provided further, That* during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6 (a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e (a)), may be transferred to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Provided further,* That no part of funds available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage facilities(26)~~: *Provided further,* That unobligated balances of funds in excess of $33,000,000 as of July 1, 1959, together with any receipts from sales or otherwise, during the~~

1 ~~fiscal year 1960, are hereby rescinded and shall be promptly~~
2 ~~deposited into the Treasury~~: *Provided further, That the sum*
3 *of $50,000,000 of funds heretofore appropriated under this*
4 *head is hereby rescinded, and such amount shall be covered*
5 *into the Treasury promptly upon enactment of this Act.*

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

7 For expenses of executive direction for activities under
8 the control of the General Services Administration, including
9 not to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodi-
10 cals, $225,000.

11 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER
12 PRESIDENTS

13 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August
14 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), $200,000: *Provided,* That the
15 Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Sec-
16 retary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to
17 carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

18 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

19 Funds available to General Services Administration for
20 administrative operations, in support of program activities,
21 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a
22 single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided,* That costs
23 and obligations for such administrative operations for the
24 respective program activities shall be accounted for in ac-
25 cordance with systems approved by the General Accounting

1 Office: *Provided further,* That the total amount deposited
2 into said account for the fiscal year 1960 from funds made
3 available to General Services Administration in this Act shall
4 not exceed (27)~~$12,500,000~~ *$13,000,000,* of which not to
5 exceed (28)~~$100~~ *$900* may be used for purchase of news-
6 papers and periodicals: *Provided further,* That amounts de-
7 posited into said account for administrative operations for each
8 program shall not exceed the amounts included in the respec-
9 tive program appropriations for such purposes.

10 GENERAL PROVISIONS

11 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the
12 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)
13 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,
14 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from
15 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129);
16 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to
17 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the
18 General Services Administration, issued by public authorities,
19 States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to
20 such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems neces-
21 sary and in the public interest may, upon the request and
22 at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the
23 appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations
24 or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the
25 General Services Administration, in connection with prop-

1 erty transferred to the General Services Administration pur-
2 suant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and
3 such appropriations or funds may, with the approval of the
4 Bureau of the Budget, be so transferred.

5 Not to exceed $2,000,000 granted in the Independent
6 Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the appropriation
7 for "Construction, Federal Office Building Numbered Six,
8 Washington, District of Columbia", may be transferred to
9 "Construction, Public Buildings projects": *Provided,* That
10 the latter appropriation shall be available for acquisition of
11 (29)~~a building in Portland, Oregon~~ *buildings and sites thereof*
12 *by purchase, condemnation or otherwise*: *Provided further,*
13 That the limits of costs applicable to projects authorized under
14 said appropriation may be exceeded to the extent that savings
15 are effected on other projects.

16 Funds available to the General Services Administration
17 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

18 No part of any money appropriated by this or any other
19 Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Govern-
20 ment shall be used during the current fiscal year for the
21 purchase within the continental limits of the United States
22 of any typewriting machines except in accordance with
23 regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal
24 Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as
25 amended.

1 Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made
2 available to the General Services Administration for the cur-
3 rent fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other
4 such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be
5 thereby increased more than 2 per centum: *Provided,* That
6 such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and
7 shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of $2,000,000.

8 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

9 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Admin-
12 istrator, including rent in the District of Columbia; services
13 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
14 (5 U.S.C. 55a); (30)*purchase of newspapers and periodi-*
15 *cals (not to exceed $6,000);* and purchase of two passenger
16 motor vehicles (including one in the District of Columbia,
17 to remain under the control of the Agency, at a purchase
18 price of not to exceed $3,500) of which one shall be for
19 replacement only; (31)~~$8,702,000~~ *$9,402,000*: *Provided,*
20 That necessary expenses of inspections and of providing
21 representatives at the site of projects being planned or
22 undertaken by local public agencies pursuant to title I
23 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects
24 financed through loans to educational institutions author-
25 ized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended,

1 and projects and facilities financed by loans to pub-
2 lic agencies pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments
3 of 1955, as amended, shall be compensated by such agencies
4 or institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the
5 aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services, and
6 expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministra-
7 tive; and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the
8 Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may
9 accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such
10 institutions, or the Administrator, and shall credit such
11 amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such
12 charges have been made, but such nonadministrative ex-
13 penses shall not exceed $2,900,000.

14 URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

15 For grants in accordance with the provisions of section
16 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, $975,000.

17 CAPITAL GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN
18 RENEWAL

19 For an additional amount for payment of capital grants
20 as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as
21 amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), $90,000,000.

22 RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS (PAYMENT TO
23 REVOLVING FUND)

24 For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant
25 to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40
26 U.S.C. 462), $6,000,000.

1 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

2 ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

3 For the payment of annual contributions to public hous-
4 ing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United
5 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),
6 $120,000,000.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

8 For administrative expenses of the Public Housing
9 Administration, (32)~~$12,660,000~~ *$13,000,000*, to be ex-
10 pended under the authorization for such expenses contained in
11 title II of this Act.

12 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce
15 Commission, including not to exceed $5,000 for the employ-
16 ment of special counsel; services as authorized by section 15
17 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not
18 to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; newspapers (not to
19 exceed $300); and purchase of not to exceed (33)~~thirty~~
20 *forty* passenger motor vehicles of which nineteen shall be for
21 replacement only; (34)~~$19,400,000~~ *$19,900,000*, of which
22 not less than (35)~~$1,526,100~~ *$1,533,200* shall be available
23 for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities
24 and not less than (36)~~$1,051,400~~ *$1,057,700* shall be avail-
25 able for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection

1 activities: *Provided,* That Joint Board members and coop-
2 erating State commissioners may use Government transporta-
3 tion requests when traveling in connection with their duties
4 as such(37): *Provided further, That without regard to the*
5 *Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the salary of the Sec-*
6 *retary of the Commission shall be at the salary rate of grade*
7 *GS-18 so long as such position is occupied by the present*
8 *incumbent.*

9 NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

10 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

11 For the operation and maintenance of properties under
12 title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act,
13 $40,000: *Provided,* That all receipts derived from sales,
14 leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of
15 the United States monthly: *Provided further,* That so long
16 as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing
17 purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act
18 of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not
19 be effective.

20 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

22 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
23 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42
24 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellow-
25 ships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of

1 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50
2 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
3 not to exceed $350 for the purchase of newspapers and
4 periodicals; and reimbursement of the General Services Ad-
5 ministration for security guard services; (38)~~$143,273,000~~
6 *$160,300,000*, to remain available until expended(39), *of*
7 *which $1,890,000 shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public*
8 *Roads, Department of Commerce, for an additional amount*
9 *to complete the construction of a secondary road to the Op-*
10 *tical Astronomy Observatory on Kitt Peak in Arizona: Pro-*
11 *vided,* That of the foregoing amount not less than $30,250,-
12 000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances
13 in connection with a program of supplementary training
14 for secondary school science and mathematics teachers.

15 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-
18 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as
19 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
20 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for
21 individuals, (40)~~$2,700,000~~ *$3,000,000.*

22 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

23 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

24 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $1,125
25 for the purchase of newspapers; uniforms or allowances

1 therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and serv-
2 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
3 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); (41)~~$7,800,000~~ *$8,275,000.*

4 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For expenses necessary for the operation and main-
7 tenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by
8 title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act
9 (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized
10 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a);
11 purchase of ten passenger motor vehicles for replacement
12 only; not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers
13 and periodicals; not to exceed (42)~~$50,000~~ *$72,000* for the
14 National Selective Service Appeal Board; and $19,000 for
15 the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physi-
16 cians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; (43)~~$29,000,000~~
17 *$29,556,800*: *Provided,* That during the current year, the
18 President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions
19 of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as
20 amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in
21 the interest of national defense.

22 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

23 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

24 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-
25 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses

1 incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uni-
2 forms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to
3 exceed $3,500 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to
4 exceed $67,000 for preparation, shipment, installation, and
5 display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures,
6 and other visual education information and descriptive
7 material, including purchase or rental of equipment;
8 $163,373,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation
9 shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged
10 in public relations work: *Provided further,* That no part of
11 this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions
12 for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions
13 an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each
14 eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

15 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS
16 OPERATING EXPENSES

17 For expenses necessary for administration of the medi-
18 cal, hospital, domiciliary, special service, construction and
19 supply, research, and employee education and training
20 activities; expenses necessary for carrying out programs of
21 medical research, as authorized by law; (44)*not to exceed*
22 *$1,200,000 for expenses of travel of employees paid from this*
23 *appropriation, and those engaged in training programs;* and
24 not to exceed $2,700 for newspapers and periodicals;
25 (45)~~$27,349,000~~ *$31,349,000,* of which (46)~~$15,344,000~~

1 *$19,344,000* shall be available for medical research: *Pro-*
2 *vided,* That $1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriations shall
3 remain available until expended for prosthetic testing and
4 development.

5 INPATIENT CARE

6 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-
7 tion of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and for the care
8 and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administra-
9 tion in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans
10 Administration as authorized by law, including the furnish-
11 ing of recreational articles and facilities; maintenance and
12 operation of farms; repairing, altering, improving or provid-
13 ing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the
14 jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise
15 provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary
16 employees and purchase of materials; purchase of fifty-two
17 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or
18 allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September
19 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State
20 or Territorial homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38,
21 United States Code, for the support of veterans eligible for
22 admission to Veterans Administration facilities for hospital
23 or domiciliary care; $792,079,000, plus reimbursements:
24 *Provided,* That $8,400,000 of such sum shall be for
25 deferred maintenance: *Provided further,* That allot-

1 ments and transfers may be made from this appropria-
2 tion to the Department of Health, Education, and Wel-
3 fare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and
4 Air Force Departments, for disbursement by them under
5 the various headings of their applicable appropriations,
6 of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment
7 of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration: *Provided*
8 *further*, That the foregoing appropriation is predicated on
9 furnishing inpatient care and treatment to an average of
10 140,846 beneficiaries during the fiscal year 1960 including
11 members in State or Territorial homes, and if a lesser num-
12 ber is experienced such appropriation shall be expended
13 only in proportion to the average number of beneficiaries
14 furnished such care and treatment.

15 OUTPATIENT CARE

16 For expenses necessary for furnishing outpatient care to
17 beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, as authorized
18 by law; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles for re-
19 placement only; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as
20 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $83,866,000.

21 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF SUPPLY DEPOTS

22 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
23 of supply depots, including purchase of one passenger motor
24 vehicle for replacement only, and uniforms or allowances
25 therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), $2,218,000.

1 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

2 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,
3 and allowances (including burial awards authorized by sec-
4 tion 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence
5 allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under
6 any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based
7 thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and
8 annuities, the administration of which is now or may here-
9 after be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the
10 payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections
11 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended,
12 $3,300,000,000, to remain available until expended.

13 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

14 For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans
15 as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment
16 Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and
17 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equip-
18 ment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United
19 States Code, $585,000,000, to remain available until
20 expended.

21 VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

22 For military and naval insurance, for national service
23 life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-
24 disabled veterans insurance, $53,000,000, to remain avail-
25 able until expended: *Provided,* That certain premiums pro-

1 vided by law to be credited to the "Military and naval in-
2 surance" or "National service life insurance" appropriations
3 shall be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further,*
4 That this appropriation shall be subject to the same statu-
5 tory provisions and shall be available for the same purpose
6 as formerly applied to the appropriations for "Military and
7 naval insurance", "National service life insurance", and
8 "Servicemen's indemnities".

9 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

10 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants
11 in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United
12 States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treat-
13 ment of veterans, $2,000,000.

14 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY
15 FACILITIES

16 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and
17 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extend-
18 ing any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans
19 Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections
20 5001 and 5002, title 38, United States Code, (47)~~$30,~~
21 ~~159,000~~ *$33,159,000,* to remain available until expended.

22 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

23 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for
24 the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions",
25 "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and in-

1 demnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned
2 appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appro-
3 priations so augmented, and not to exceed $500,000 of the
4 appropriation "Veterans insurance and indemnities" for the
5 current year may be transferred to "Service-disabled veterans
6 insurance fund".

7 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration
8 for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be
9 available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
10 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

11 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration
12 for the current fiscal year for "Inpatient care" and "Out-
13 patient care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other
14 expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized
15 by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for bene-
16 ficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under
17 such appropriations.

18 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Vet-
19 erans Administration (except the appropriation for "Con-
20 struction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be
21 available for the purchase of any site for or toward the
22 construction of any new hospital or home.

23 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-
24 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons ex-

1 cept beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such
2 benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made
3 to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the
4 Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

5 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expend-
7 able for travel expenses of employees and no specific limita-
8 tion has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel
9 expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in
10 the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Pro-*
11 *vided,* That this section shall not apply to travel performed
12 by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards
13 of the Selective Service System(48), *or to travel performed*
14 *in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by*
15 *the Civil Aeronautics Board.*

16 SEC. 103. Where appropriations in this title are expend-
17 able for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and no
18 specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures
19 therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed the
20 amount of $50: *Provided,* That this limitation shall not
21 apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic
22 periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of
23 the authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are
24 herein provided, nor to the purchase of newspapers and

1 periodicals necessary for the care and welfare of patients and
2 members in Veterans Administration hospitals and domi-
3 ciliary facilities.

4 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation contained in this
5 title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling
6 a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held
7 by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of
8 the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period
9 of active military or naval service and has within ninety
10 days after his release from such service or from hospitaliza-
11 tion continuing after discharge for a period of not more than
12 one year made application for restoration to his former posi-
13 tion and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission
14 as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position
15 and has not been restored thereto.

16 SEC. 105. No part of any appropriation made avail-
17 able by the provisions of this title shall be used for the
18 purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establish-
19 ing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided,*
20 That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have
21 been approved by the Congress and appropriations made
22 therefor.

23 SEC. 106. No part of any appropriation contained
24 in this title shall be used to pay the compensation of

1 any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the
2 number that would be provided by a ratio of one such em-
3 ployee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-
4 time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency
5 concerned: *Provided,* That for purposes of this section em-
6 ployees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if
7 they spend half time or more in personnel administration
8 consisting of direction and administration of the personnel
9 program; employment, placement, and separation; job
10 evaluation and classification; employee relations and serv-
11 ices; wage administration; and processing, recording, and
12 reporting.

13 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

14 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
15 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the
16 limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each
17 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
18 make such contracts and commitments without regard to
19 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the
20 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may
21 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the
22 Budget for the fiscal year 1960 for each such corporation
23 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

1 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

2 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXAMINATION

3 EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

4 Not to exceed a total of $1,800,000 shall be avail-
5 able for administrative expenses of the Federal Home
6 Loan Bank Board, and shall be derived from funds avail-
7 able to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including
8 those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving
9 fund and receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Admini-
10 tration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home
11 Loan Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal
12 years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment
13 for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks,
14 the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan
15 Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Govern-
16 ment (including payment for office space) : *Provided,* That
17 all necessary expenses in connection with the conservator-
18 ship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan
19 Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of pro-
20 ceedings under section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan
21 Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act and
22 all necessary expenses (including services performed on a
23 contract or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
24 ices) in connection with the handling, including the pur-
25 chase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal

1 home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of,
2 or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the
3 Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-
4 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof:
5 *Provided further*, That members and alternates of the Federal
6 Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reim-
7 bursement from the Board as approved by the Board for
8 transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of
9 or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid
10 not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided*
11 *further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this
12 Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore speci-
13 fied, the administrative expenses and other obligations of
14 the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance
15 with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of
16 July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421–1449):
17 *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses for
18 the examination of Federal and State chartered institutions
19 (other than special examinations determined by the Board
20 to be necessary) shall not exceed $7,700,000.

21 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
22 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

23 Not to exceed $775,000 shall be available for admin-
24 istrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and
25 shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly

1 capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liqui-
2 dation of insured institutions or preparation for or con-
3 duct of proceedings under section 407 of the National
4 Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived
5 from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action
6 for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of
7 losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and ex-
8 penses, and payments for administrative expenses of the
9 Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board
10 to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Cor-
11 poration may utilize and may make payment for services and
12 facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Re-
13 serve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and
14 other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwith-
15 standing any other provisions of this Act, except for the limi-
16 tation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative
17 expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be
18 incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the
19 Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724–1730).

20 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

21 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,

22 ABACA FIBER PROGRAM

23 Not to exceed $47,000 of funds available to the General
24 Services Administration for the abaca fiber program shall

1 be available for administrative expenses incident to the abaca
2 fiber program, to be computed on an accrual basis, and to
3 be exclusive of the interest paid, depreciation, capitalized
4 expenditures, expenses in connection with the acquisition,
5 protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposi-
6 tion of real or personal property relating to the abaca fiber
7 program, and expenses of services performed on a contract
8 or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal
9 services.

10 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
11 FACILITIES CORPORATION

12 Not to exceed $20,000 shall be available during the
13 fiscal year 1960 for all administrative expenses of the Cor-
14 poration (including use of the services and facilities of Fed-
15 eral Reserve banks), to be computed on an accrual basis,
16 and to be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, capitalized
17 expenditures, expenses in connection with the acquisition,
18 protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or dispo-
19 sition of real or personal property belonging to the Corpora-
20 tion or in which it has an interest, expenses of services per-
21 formed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the
22 performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses
23 reimbursable from other Government agencies.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECON-
2 STRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION
3 FUND

4 Not to exceed $40,000 (to be computed on an accrual
5 basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of
6 Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General
7 Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1
8 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the
9 current fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the
10 liquidation of said functions: *Provided,* That as used herein
11 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to
12 include all salaries and wages, services performed on a con-
13 tract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including
14 the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative
15 offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of services
16 performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the
17 termination of contracts or in the performance of legal serv-
18 ices: *Provided further,* That the distribution of administra-
19 tive expenses to the accounts shall be made in accordance
20 with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

21 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

22 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
23 THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

24 Not to exceed $1,723,000 shall be available for all
25 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis,

1 of carrying out the functions of the Administrator under
2 the program of housing loans to educational institutions (title
3 IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C.
4 1749–1749d), but this amount shall be exclusive of payment
5 for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or
6 any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any
7 insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the
8 Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23,
9 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been desig-
10 nated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of
11 public money of the United States.

12 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
13 THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

14 Not to exceed (49) ~~$500,000~~ *$550,000* of funds in the
15 revolving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing
16 Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for ad-
17 ministrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of
18 payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve
19 banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks,
20 and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating
21 the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August
22 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been
23 designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository
24 of public money of the United States.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
2 THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDAT-
3 ING PROGRAMS)

4 During the current fiscal year not to exceed (50)~~$653,~~
5 ~~000~~ *$755,000* shall be available for administrative expenses,
6 but this amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in
7 the case of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the
8 Government and legal services on a contract or fee basis and
9 of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve
10 banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the
11 Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-
12 loan banks, and any insured banks within the meaning of the
13 Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Federal
14 Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which has
15 been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a de-
16 pository of public money of the United States.

17 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
18 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

19 Not to exceed $6,050,000 shall be available for
20 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
21 basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses
22 (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on
23 a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and
24 servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized ex-
25 penditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (includ-

1 ing services performed on a force account, contract, or fee
2 basis, but not including other personal services) in connec-
3 tion with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance,
4 improvement, or disposition of real or personal property
5 belonging to said Association or in which it has an interest,
6 cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons
7 employed outside of the continental United States, expenses
8 of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection
9 with the performance of legal services, and all administrative
10 expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and
11 said Association may utilize and may make payment for
12 services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other
13 agencies of the Government: *Provided,* That the distribu-
14 tion of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Asso-
15 ciation shall be made in accordance with generally recognized
16 accounting principles and practices.

17 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINIS-
18 TRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRA-
19 TION

20 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-
21 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed $8,100,000 of the
22 various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall
23 be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act,
24 as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allow-
25 ances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1,

1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided*, That, except as herein otherwise provided, all expenses and obligations of said Administration shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said Act: *Provided further*, That funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed $1,500); and purchase of periodicals and newspapers (not to exceed $750): *Provided further*, That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed $48,000,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such expenses by title I of this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401–1433); purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by

1 such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the
2 aggregate in relation to the development costs of such proj-
3 ects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and
4 expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall
5 be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received
6 from such payments may be used only for the payment of
7 necessary expenses of providing representatives of the
8 Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Pro-*
9 *vided further,* That all expenses of the Public Housing
10 Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in car-
11 rying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed
12 $1,500,000.

13 CORPORATIONS—GENERAL PROVISION

14 SEC. 202. No part of the funds of, or available for ex-
15 penditure by, any corporation or agency included in this title
16 shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee en-
17 gaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would
18 be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred
19 and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and in-
20 termittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided,*
21 That for purposes of this section employees shall be consid-
22 ered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or
23 more in personnel administration consisting of direction and
24 administration of the personnel program; employment, place-
25 ment, and separation; job evaluation and classification;

1 employee relations and services; committees of expert exam-
2 iners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage adminis-
3 tration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

4 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

5 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in
6 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
7 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used
8 for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support
9 or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

10 This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices
11 Appropriation Act, 1960".

Passed the House of Representatives May 11, 1959.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments June 23, 1959.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

86TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 7040

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 23, 1959

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

is that everyone—including New York—receive a fair and even "break."

It is my firm belief that if this bill becomes law, the United States can effect substantial savings in the field of military procurement, without in any way interfering with—but, instead, indeed, enhancing—the efficiency and effectiveness of our defense effort.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

(Mr. CLARK proceeded to address the Senate on a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 52) submitted by him proposing a review of the Charter of the United Nations so as to advance the rule of law in the world community. His speech appears in the RECORD following the debate and action on the independent offices appropriation bill.)

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

During the delivery of Mr. CLARK's speech,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7040, Calendar No. 417, the independent offices appropriation bill.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have asked the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], to leave a very important meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, at which the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is being marked up, in order that he may present the bill.

How long does the Senator from Washington anticipate he will need to present the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It should not require more than half an hour.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield the floor so that the independent offices appropriation bill may be acted upon, with the understanding that I may resume the floor when action upon the bill is completed, and that my remarks may appear in one place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is extremely gracious and cooperative. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania may yield the floor so that the Senate may consider the independent offices appropriation bill, with the understanding that he shall not lose his right to the floor, and that when action on the bill is completed he will resume the floor.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1960, H.R. 7040, contains funds for 17 agencies and regulatory commissions, as well as expense limitations for 11 corporate organizations.

The bill as reported totals $6,559,348,600, which is an increase of $101,690,800 over the House bill, and $24,839,400 below the budget estimates.

The committee accepted increases by the House over the budget estimates for public buildings projects, medical research, care and hospitals for veterans, amounting to $44,644,000, and further increased medical research for veterans, including laboratory facilities, by $7 million.

The largest increase over the House is $37 million for the Federal Aviation Agency, to assure the operation of air navigation and safety facilities, besides $8,500,000 restored for establishment of air navigation facilities, and $3,250,000 restored for research and development.

Other large increases include $17,027,000 restored to the National Science Foundation programs, and $15 million to the civil defense programs, as well as $1 million for research and development.

The bill also includes language for the stockpiling program to clarify the rotating program under a reduced amount of funds available.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered, for the purpose of further amendment, as original text; provided, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by agreement to this request.

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

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not hear the request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The request was that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. The total appropriation is in excess of $6 billion; is it not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it planned to have a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes. The pending request is the routine, normal request. Any Senator may offer amendments.

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

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 5, to strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000."

On page 3, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$4,500,000."

On page 4, line 8, after the word "basis", to insert "not to exceed $1,600 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals (excluding scientific, technical, trade or traffic periodicals, for official use);".

On page 4, line 20, after the word "Board", to strike out "$57,000,000" and insert $60,000,000."

On page 5, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100" and insert "$400", and in line 15, after the word "amended", to strike out "$18,800,000" and insert "$19,440,000."

On page 7, line 14, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$240,000" and insert "$258,000."

On page 8, line 7, after the word "Act", to inset "not to exceed $10,000 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals (excluding scientific, technical, trade or traffic periodicals, for official use only);"; in line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$4,500"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "not to exceed $12,950,000 for expenses of travel;"; and in line 12, after the word "snowshoes", to strike out "$283,200,000" and insert "$320,200,000."

On page 9, line 1, after the word "available", to strike out "(at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $40,000 per housing unit in Alaska)"; in line 2, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "purchase of not to exceed three aircraft;", and in line 7, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$131,200,000" and insert "$139,700,000."

On page 9, line 24, after the word "vehicles", to insert "and purchase of not to exceed three aircraft;", and on page 10, line 1, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$47,100,000" and insert "$50,350,000."

On page 11, line 3, after the word "only", to strike out "$10,400,000" and insert "$10,700,000."

On page 11, line 10, after the word "newspapers", to strike out "$7,062,000" and insert "$7,374,000."

On page 11, line 24, after the word "travel", to strike out "$6,745,000" and insert "$6,935,000."

On page 12, line 24, after "(40 U.S.C. 521)", to strike out "$148,150,000" and insert "$153,150,000."

On page 14, line 16, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$3,770,000" and insert "$3,970,000."

On page 15, line 10, to strike out "$21,150,000" and insert "$21,550,000."

On page 16, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$3,150,000" and insert "$3,310,000"; in line 17, after the word "expenses", to strike out "but total obligations of funds available for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act during the current fiscal year shall not exceed "$33,000,000"; in line 21, after the word "That", to insert "any funds received as proceeds from sale or other disposition of materials on account of the rotation of stocks under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act shall be deposited to the credit, and be available for expenditure for the purposes, of this appropriation except that, to the extent materials sold under section (d) of said Act to prevent deterioration are excess to stockpile needs, the proceeds of sale may be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and thereupon the replacement requirements of said section 3(d) shall not be applicable: "; on page 17, line 11, after the word "facilities", to strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That unobligated balances of funds in excess of $33,000,000 as or July 1, 1959, together with any receipts from sales or otherwise, during the fiscal year 1960, are hereby rescinded and shall be promptly deposited

into the Treasury"; and in line 15, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That the sum of $50,000,000 of funds heretofore appropriated under this head is hereby rescinded, and such amount shall be covered into the Treasury promptly upon enactment of this Act.".

On page 18, line 19, after the word "exceed", where it appears the first time, to strike out "$12,500,000" and insert "$13,000,000", and at the beginning of line 20, to strike out "$100" and insert "$900."

On page 20, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "a building in Portland, Oregon" and insert "buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise."

On page 21, line 7, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to insert "purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed $6,000);", and in line 12, after the word "only", to strike out "$8,702,000" and insert "$9,402,000."

On page 23, line 3, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$12,660,000" and insert "$13,000,000."

On page 23, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "thirty" and insert "forty"; in line 15, after the word "only", to strike out "$19,400,000" and insert "$19,900,000"; in line 16, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,526,100" and insert "$1,533,200"; in line 18, after the word "than", to strike out "$1,051,400" and insert "$1,057,700"; and in line 22, after the word "such", to insert a colon and *"Provided further,* That without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the salary of the Secretary of the Commission shall be at the salary rate of grade GS–18 so long as such position is occupied by the present incumbent."

On page 24, line 24, after the word "services", to strike out "$143,273,000" and insert "$160,300,000", and on page 25, line 1, after the word "expended", to insert "of which $1,890,000 shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, for an additional amount to complete the construction of a secondary road to the Optical Astronomy Observatory on Kitt Peak in Arizona."

On page 25, line 16, after the word "individuals", to strike out "$2,700,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

On page 25, line 23, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "$7,800,000" and insert "$8,275,000."

On page 26, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$72,000", and in line 13, after the word "Specialists", to strike out "$29,000,000" and insert "$29,556,800."

On page 27, line 18, after the word "law", to insert "not to exceed $1,200,000 for expenses of travel of employees paid from this appropriation, and those engaged in training programs;"; in line 21, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$27,349,000" and insert "$31,349,000"; and in line 22, after the word "which", to strike out "$15,344,000" and insert "$19,344,000."

On page 31, line 16, after the word "Code", to strike out "$30,159,000" and insert "$33,159,000."

On page 33, line 9, after the word "System," to insert a comma and "or to travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board."

On page 41, line 6, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$550,000."

On page 41, line 20, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$653,000" and insert "$755,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, unless there are some questions by Members of the Senate, I refer Senators to the report, which details all the items and all the commissions and regulatory agencies involved. The only substantial increases over the House figures were those involving grants in aid for salaries of civil defense employees in local communities, and an extra amount for medical research in the Veterans' Bureau.

Although the bill involves appropriations of $6,485 million, the great bulk of that sum is represented by appropriations for the Veterans' Administration, which account for more than $5 billion, much of it representing fixed charges, under laws enacted by Congress.

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

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

The bill was read the third time.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President. I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee some questions about civil defense. I might say that this bill was called up without a quorum call. I was as far away from the Senate Chamber as a telephone in the reception room. Had I not returned now, I would not have know that the bill was being considered.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I am not complaining.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New York has within 10 feet of him an attaché of the Senate. There is also present the acting minority leader. At any time the Senator wishes to be notified, all he need do is to leave his name at either desk, and he will be notified when a bill is being taken up. I reported to both of those gentlemen, and they told me that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] who had asked that this bill be held up, was assured that it would be held as long as he wanted it held up, and that he had finished his study of it and was prepared to have action taken on it. If the Senator from New York will leave his name, asking that he be notified when a certain bill comes up, he will be notified. The Senator from Texas will attempt to see that he is located, but the Senator from Texas cannot do it if there is no such request.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to say to the Senator from Texas, whose relations with me have been excellent—and I know that he always strives to accommodate all of us—that we cannot anticipate every bill which will come up and arrange to have ourselves notified when it does come up. We would be called all the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If we had a quorum call each time, we would consume most of our time in quorum calls. I announced three times today that the independent offices appropriation bill would be called up today.

Mr. JAVITS. So far as my own rights are concerned I have no desire to have that done, although if I wished it, I am sure I would be accommodated. I should like to ask some questions of the Senator from Washington.

We in the State of New York are vitally interested in civil defense. I should like to ask the Senator with respect to the overall restoration in the civil defense appropriation which was made over the House cut, which I understand is about 40 percent. What was the overall restoration?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to my friend from New York that the Senate accepted the House version on civil defense, with one major exception; and that exception was the restoration of some $15 million, which will go for grants as payments to States whose plans for civil defense are approved by the Federal agency. In other words, in New York, for instance, a city, borough, or whatever it might be, may employ people, and they will be paid 50 percent by the city, for example, and 50 percent by the Federal Government, and that will be the relation between the Federal Civil Defense Agency and the local people.

That item was included by the Senate last year, but was not approved in conference because some of the States had not submitted their plans. Now all the States have submitted their plans. Each one has a system of civil defense. So this will not be a matter of local patronage.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. As I understand, therefore, nothing which the House has adopted has been taken out of the bill, but the Senate has made some additions of its own.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senate has made additions. Three million of the $15 million is for the purchase of equipment which will be necessary for the local agencies to use in conjunction with this program.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly. This merely represents matching funds for personnel and administrative costs.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to ask the Senator a question about the shelter program. As I see it, $2,500,000, which is the same amount as the House provided, is provided for prototype shelters. But I notice also that there has been an increase to $2 million for additional research and development. That appears on page 2 of the report. I ask the Senator if it is within the contemplation of the committee that any part of that sum might be used for research to improve shelter design.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The $2,500,000 is exactly for that purpose. I think perhaps a little better language might have been used than "construction of prototype shelters." This item will allow the Civil Defense Agency to aid communities, particularly with respect to public buildings, such as showing how a shelter might be included in the plans for the construction of a hospital or a school.

The item also provides for the erection of prototype shelters which might be shown around the country.

As a matter of fact, a program is provided by which the average citizen will be shown how to fix up his own basement as a shelter at a very small cost.

Mr. JAVITS. Prototype shelter construction is one phase of the program. Is there any inhibition upon the use of of the amount allocated for research and development for research with respect to shelters or to teach people how to take care of themselves in the event of an atomic attack?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; this is a part of the whole program.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, there is no inhibition?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; and there is no limitation. I agree with the Senator from New York. I think this is a program which is long overdue.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe in the civil defense program. I think we have been shortchanging civil defense. I think we are shortchanging it in this bill. I understand the problems connected with appropriations. I understand the views of the other body. We have to fight our battle on other grounds. This is another field of battle. But I will state as my decided opinion that we are shortchanging the civil defense program, so far as the people of the United States are concerned, in terms of their own elementary protection. We should adopt an infinitely more comprehensive plan with respect to civil defense. I feel very deeply about this subject.

I think we will rue the day we do not have such defense. This is true not only in terms of elementary protection; it is true in terms of our defense against the Russians and in terms of morale in this country. They will see, by our sincere determination, that we mean business.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator from New York. I am very hopeful that by means of the programs in every one of the 50 States, together with the local participation which will be available, it will be possible to devise a better program all over the United States in conjunction with the local authorities. The bill provides for a good training program, from which the local chiefs of police, water superintendents, and heads of fire departments can benefit. For instance, a water superintendent can learn just what needs to be done in case something happens to a water system. The local fire chiefs and police chiefs also will be aided by this program.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Washington.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Will not the Senator agree that one of the great problems we have to face in connection with civil defense is a lack of interest at the local level?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. The amounts which are included in the bill to provide for local grants will greatly increase their interest and will increase the cooperation and effectiveness of the whole program, will they not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Colorado and I were very much impressed with the testimony that no civil defense program can be effective unless there is local interest. That is why we have emphasized local participation.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is correct.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to say to the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that if there is any blame to be assessed for the failure to notify him that this bill was to be taken up let me belatedly assume that blame. I was the acting minority leader. It had been my understanding that there was no objection on our side to having the bill taken up, except that of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who had withdrawn his objection.

For the failure to suggest a quorum call at that time, I wish publicly to say that that was my responsibility. I apologize to the Senator from New York. So far as the Senator from Texas is concerned, he had nothing to do with that.

Mr. JAVITS. I have no complaint at all. All my rights have been fully preserved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for his generous courtesy.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of which the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is the chairman. For his comments there and for the action which the subcommittee took with respect to the appearance of witnesses from California, whom I introduced, all asking for the consideration of a long overdue veterans' hospital in the city of Martinez, Calif., I thank the Senator from Washington very much. I recognize as keenly as does anyone else the budgetary exigencies which exist in our Government today. But I must say it is reassuring for veterans' organizations nationally and for the senior Senator from California now to read, on page 10 of the report:

> The committee is convinced that there is urgent need for the new veterans' hospital to be located at Martinez, Calif. It is understood that the plans are proceeding, and it is hoped that they will be finished under the highest priority, in order that construction can be started as soon as funds are available.

I thank the Senator from Washington and the Senate Committee on Appropriations for their acknowledgment that a veterans' hospital in California is long overdue, and I voice my hope that with the assistance which the Senator from Washington and other members of the committee will unquestionably give to the matter in the future, it will be possible to speed this hospital toward construction.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee was very much impressed with the situation. I am familiar, as is the Senator from California, with the real problem which exists in Oakland, where there is an old building. It is difficult to provide maintenance, and research laboratories cannot be established. The new hospital in Palo Alto is one of the finest in the country for the care of mental cases, which is the purpose for which that hospital will be used. It will not provide facilities such as those which will be installed at Martinez. Therefore, the new hospital at Martinez should have the highest priority with the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. KUCHEL. Once again, I thank most sincerely the senior Senator from Washington.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to make some observations about the appropriation and also about the very wise, penetrating examination conducted by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] with respect to some of the independent agencies. I should also like to make a record on another issue affecting the independent agencies.

The chairman of the important Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations is also the chairman of one of the most powerful committees in the Senate, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Has the Senator from Washington interviewed or questioned some of the witnesses—some of the chairmen and commissioners of these important independent agencies—to be able to determine whether they consider themselves an arm of the legislative branch or the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some of the independent agencies do not act like they are arms of Congress. All of them are under our jurisdiction, having been created as arms of Congress. They are independent agencies, it is true, and not executive agencies.

All of them are under our jurisdiction, and are established as arms of the Congress, not as executive agencies, even though the Executive has to appoint the commissioners. But the law provides that these agencies shall report to the Congress after they do the detailed work which the Congress itself cannot do.

For instance, the Congess passed the Federal Aviation Act, and then designated the Civil Aeronautics Board to enforce it. A similar situation exists in the case of the Martime Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the various other agencies.

At times our committee has had much difficulty because some of the commissioners thought their agencies were executive agencies and were to report to the President. However, the fact is that

under the laws by which the agencies have been established, they are to report to the Congress. The commissioners are appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate; but their agencies are arms of the Congress.

Whenever a nominee to one of these agencies comes before the appropriate Senate committee, I think the committee has been very diligent in asking about the point the Senator from Colorado has raised, namely, whether such officials believe that under the law they are to report to the Congress. Sometimes we obtain good answers; at other times we do not.

Certainly in the past few years there has been a tendency for some of these agencies to regard themselves as executive agencies, whereas they have actually been established as agencies which are to report to the Congress.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield further to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. In testimony given before the Legislative Oversight Committee of the House of Representatives, such officials have stated, almost without exception, that they consider their agencies to be arms of the Congress. As a matter of fact, I do not even ask that they go that far, provided they will consider themselves as truly independent agencies and not arms of the executive department.

The Senator from Washington has referred to the Civil Aeronautics Board. An article published in a law review shows that when a committee of the other body was making an investigation, and called before it officials of the Civil Aeronautics Board and requested that they produce certain files, they refused, and based their refusal on the claim of executive privilege. I think we must deal with that problem. Certainly one of the powers of the Congress is the power of the purse, and if the senion Senator from Washington will indulge me I shall enlarge, in a moment, on this subject and also on the question of whether independent agencies have the right of executive privilege.

I observed that my senior colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] asked some very penetrating questions of the Federal Power Commission.

I believe that some of the appropriations the Congress makes for these regulatory agencies are too small. I am not opposed to these agencies. I want them to do their jobs. But in many cases they are not doing the jobs they should be doing. That fact was plainly shown in the hearings the Appropriations Committee held. For instance, in some cases the agencies have not acted in the public interest. They have permitted large numbers of cases, involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, to pile up to so great an extent that at the present time there is an extremely large backlog, according to the testimony of the officials of the agencies themselves.

Delayed justice is denied justice. The failure to process these cases denies relief to the public. The interim higher rates amount to an economic burden on the people.

The question now is whether we shall provide the regulatory agencies with sufficient funds, so they will not have an alibi.

Not long ago our Antimonopoly Subcommittee had before it officials of the Federal Trade Commission. The chairman of the Commission testified that it is not an arm of the Congress. We have been trying to obtain some antitrust action by that Commission. The chairman testified that the Commission did not have enough employees.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that there has been a growth which was not contemplated by the Founding Fathers when they wrote the Constitution; I refer to the growth of what appears to be a fourth branch of the Government. That branch, which is composed of the regulatory agencies, deals with billions and billions of dollars, and has a great effect on the economy of the Nation. But these agencies exist in sort of a no man's land, and do not belong to either the legislative branch or the executive branch.

I want the Record to be clear, because I am going to begin to call some of the officials of these agencies before our Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure. With the support of the able chairman of the powerful Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and with the support of the Congress generally, I think we shall be able to make some progress in regard to obtaining the cooperation of these agencies.

Does the Senator from Washington believe they really are arms of the Congress?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly. And I believe that some of the commissioners believe they are responsible to the Congress. But many of the commissioners do not seem to share that belief. Of course there is a great turnover in the officials of regulatory agencies.

I wish to commend the Senator from Colorado for his plans to get at this matter, as I know he will do as chairman of the subcommittee which deals with it. I believe he will do a great deal to solve the problems which have plagued us for a long time, in connection with regulatory agencies, both as regards their appropriations and as regards the legislation which applies to them.

It is true that large backlogs have developed. I must say that within the past 4 or 5 years some of them have done a very good job, particularly the Interstate Commerce Commission, in reducing the size of their backlogs.

The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I went into great detail with the Federal Power Commission, particularly with regard to the gas rate cases. The Commission has a large backlog of them. In our report we suggest that the Commission place more emphasis on handling those cases, some of which have been pending in the Commission for 6 or 7 years. It is very important that these rate cases be handled expeditiously.

The Federal Communications Commission also has a great backlog of cases. Much of its work has accumulated because of the increase in the number of applications in regard to FM radio and AM radio—for instance, because of the use of radio in industrial plants and by various branches of the transportation industry. But that Commission is catching up fairly well, too, with its backlog of work.

In the case of the Civil Aeronautics Board, we suggested—and I think the testimony on that point is quite explicit—that it direct its attention to reducing the size of the backlog, which in many cases was becoming larger.

Our committee has voted to increase many of the amounts voted by the House of Representatives for these agencies; in fact, in many cases our committee has voted to increase them almost to the amounts of the budget estimates.

We think some of these agencies can improve their organization.

The Federal Trade Commission has had additional work to do because of the enactment, last year, of the textile labeling bill.

In addition, the Congress passed the bill which deals with accidents to small planes; and the Civil Aeronautics Board has assumed authority in that connection, as we stated, and as the Board has agreed. Additional work for that agency has developed as a result.

But on the whole I think we have provided for about as many employees as these agencies can use wisely; and we voted for the increases in the hope that the backlogs would be reduced and the lag to which the Senator from Colorado has referred in doing the regulatory work would be shortened.

Of course the situation is a difficult one.

I wish to state that I do not think any money is saved by not allowing these agencies to employ the personnel they need in order to do the job. If they do not have staffs of sufficient size, in the long run the public suffers, much time is lost, much effort is lost, and much money is lost. In fact, when there are long delays, the national economy also loses.

Our work on this bill has been long and very involved. We have had to deal with a total of 29 agencies and groups. The officials of each of them wished to discuss their problems. That meant that we had to have at least 29 days of hearings.

Of course the Veterans' Administration is very large; and its total appropriations amount to in excess of $5 billion.

The General Services Administration is very large and complex. I must say that the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I were very much im-

pressed with the job Mr. Floete is doing there in a very complex and difficult situation.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think that is true. We went into that situation very thoroughly. The job he is doing, which is of a very complex nature, is certainly outstanding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would take 3 Philadelphia lawyers and 17 public accountants even to understand some of the bookkeeping being done. It is difficult for us to understand it. We try to keep our appropriations consistent with the purposes of the laws by which the agencies were established.

Mr. CARROLL. This is one of the reasons why I commended the able chairman of the subcommittee and my senior colleague from Colorado. I have been reading in the hearings their penetrating questions. It has been a difficult and massive job.

This is the purpose for which I put some of the questions, I may say for the RECORD. Does the Senator from Washington, who is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, and who is also chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, think the Congress has the power of investigation to find out what is going on in the agencies?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Congress not only has the power and authority but has the responsibility to do so, because these agencies were established as arms of the Congress.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator think it is presumptuous for representatives of the agencies to claim executive privilege when Congress wants to find out what is going on in the agencies?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The agencies were created to administer the laws of Congress. I do not think it is presumptuous at all for Congress to want to know about the agencies it created. I commend anyone who takes on the job, as the Senator from Colorado has done, to ascertain what is going on. These agencies wield tremendous power in the economy of the country—much more than do the executive agencies of Government.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a further question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Would the Senator say if the representatives of the agencies did not respond to inquiries of Congress, and claimed an executive privilege, the Appropriations Committee would examine them most closely when they appeared before the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Appropriations Committee will examine them closely on any of these matters.

Mr. CARROLL. That is the power of Congress. It is incident to the power of the purse.

If I may refer to page 216 of the hearings, I think it will be clearly illustrated what my colleague from Colorado was trying to ascertain with respect to the Federal Power Commission. My colleague was questioning Mr. Kuykendall the chairman of the FPC. Later he questioned Mr. Carl Kallina chief of the FPC Bureau of Gas Rates with respect to gas rate cases, which appears on page 216 of the hearings. I will read one sentence, and I ask unanimous consent that the whole paragraph may appear in the RECORD. It appears under the subheading "Independent Producer Rate Cases." A part of the sentence reads with Mr. Kallina speaking:

> At the end of fiscal 1959 we estimated we were going to have 1,264.

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

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

> INDEPENDENT PRODUCER RATE CASES
>
> Then on the independent producer rate cases, if you will turn to page D–12, on the bottom tabulation you will see there we have an estimated figure of the number of independent producer rate cases at the end of 1958. The actual was 1,064 at the end of fiscal year 1958 and at the end of fiscal 1959 we estimated we were going to have 1,264. Actually, on December 31, 1958 we had 1,518, so there again the same thing prevails. We are having more cases than we anticipated.
>
> Senator MAGNUSON. If this amount were restored, are you pretty sure that you can get the people?
>
> Mr. KUYKENDALL. Yes, we are confident we can.

That many cases are on the docket, cluttering the docket. It is estimated there will be 2,000 cases of all descriptions cluttering the docket. How can that be in the public interest?

In my State of Colorado in 5 years we have had four successive gas rate increases, and not one case adjudicated by the FPC. These four cases involved $90 million of the consumers' funds subject to refund.

The Supreme Court only yesterday unanimously moved again to compel the FPC to act to protect the public interest in adjudicating gas rate cases.

I sincerely hope the important Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Agencies will put the needle to the regulatory agencies to insure that they will operate for the public interest. For my own part, in my Judiciary Subcommittee, if the agencies attempt to use Executive privilege—and this is why I want to make a record today—I will go to the Appropriations Committee, and I may even come to the bar of the Senate itself, because I think the ruling of Attorney General Brownell on Executive privilege in 1954 was not so extensive as to allow such regulatory agencies to claim Executive privilege.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent because of illnesses in their families.

I further announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is detained on official committee business, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

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

YEAS—89

Aiken	Engle	Martin
Allott	Ervin	McCarthy
Anderson	Frear	McNamara
Bartlett	Fulbright	Monroney
Beall	Gore	Morse
Bennett	Green	Morton
Bible	Gruening	Moss
Bridges	Hartke	Mundt
Bush	Hayden	Muskie
Butler	Hennings	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Prouty
Cannon	Holland	Proxmire
Capehart	Hruska	Randolph
Carlson	Humphrey	Robertson
Carroll	Jackson	Russell
Case, N.J.	Javits	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Chavez	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Church	Jordan	Smith
Clark	Keating	Sparkman
Cooper	Kefauver	Stennis
Cotton	Kennedy	Symington
Curtis	Kerr	Talmadge
Dirksen	Kuchel	Thurmond
Dodd	Langer	Wiley
Douglas	Lausche	Williams, N.J.
Dworshak	Long	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Mansfield	

NAYS—1

Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—8

Goldwater	McGee	Schoeppel
Hart	Murray	Yarborough
McClellan	O'Mahoney	

So the bill (H.R. 7040) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement previously made, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to inform Senators that we anticipate no more yea-and-nay votes this evening. I think Senators may be free to leave the Chamber with that understanding.

Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 416, House bill 7176, the general Government matters appropriation bill, with the understanding that it will not be discussed until tomorrow.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7176) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

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

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

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed that the appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, House bill 6769, was reported by the committee this afternoon.

I have asked that the printed report of the subcommittee be brought to the Chamber so that any Senator who desires to do so may review it. I am informed that no change was made in the amounts contained in the subcommittee report. There was some change in language. I believe the distinguished ranking minority member is familiar with the language which was added.

I hope, before the Senate concludes its business today, that any Senator who desires to do so will ask for a copy of the subcommittee report. I am informed that copies will be available at the desk.

CONFERENCE TO REVIEW THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of myself, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JAVITS Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McGEE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PROXMIRE, and Mr. SYMINGTON, a concurrent resolution dealing with world peace through world law. The proposal calls for United Nations Charter review and revision to advance the rule of law in the world community.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 52) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 52

Whereas the basic purpose of the foreign policy of the United States is to achieve a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas there can be no such peace without the development of the rule of law in the limited field of war prevention; and

Whereas peace does not rest on law today but on the delicate balance of terror of armed force; and

Whereas the United Nations and other international organizations constitute an important influence for peace and need to be strengthened to achieve the rule of law in the world community; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly at its tenth session resolved that "a general conference to review the charter shall be held at an appropriate time"; and appointed a "Committee consisting of all the members of the United Nations to consider, in consultation with the Secretary-General, the question of fixing a time and place for the Conference, and its organization and procedures"; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly at its twelfth session resolved "to keep in being the Committee on Arrangements for a Conference for the Purpose of Reviewing the Charter, * * * and to request the Committee to report, with recommendations, to the General Assembly not later than at its fourteenth session"; and

Whereas the said Committee is scheduled to meet in the summer of 1959 in advance of the fourteenth session of the General Assembly to be convened in New York in September of 1959: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States position at the forthcoming meeting of the Committee on Arrangements for a Conference for the Purpose of Reviewing the Charter should be that the Committee recommends to the fourteenth session of the United Nations General Assembly that a charter review conference be held not later than December 31, 1962, and that member governments be requested to prepare recommendations and to exchange views with respect to United Nations Charter review and revision in order to facilitate the organization of the said conference and to further the chances of its success.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to initiate high-level studies in the executive branch of the Government to determine what changes should be made in the Charter of the United Nations, and the charters of other international organizations to which the United States is a party, to promote a just and lasting peace through the development of the rule of law in the limited field of war prevention. The President is further requested to report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, within twelve months after the date of approval to this resolution, the results of such studies.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on April 23 I submitted a substantially similar concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) on behalf of 14 other Senators and myself, and identical concurrent resolutions were submitted in the House of Representatives by a dozen Members of the other body.

Although the State Department, as expected, commented adversely on Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, and I will discuss the Department's views later, the general response to the resolution, both in this country and abroad, has been most favorable.

Just 2 weeks ago 46 members of the House of Commons, under the leadership of Arthur Henderson, sponsored a measure containing largely identical language to that set forth in Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 to urge the British Government to take a position in favor of the convening of a U.N. Charter Review Conference.

Since Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 was submitted, a number of constructive suggestions as to how the resolution could be strengthened have been made by Charles S. Rhyne, Esq., only recently president of the American Bar Association; Grenville Clark, Esq.; and Prof. Louis B. Bohn, of the Harvard Law School, who have coauthored a monumental work published last year, entitled "World Peace Through World Law"; and other interested persons and groups.

Accordingly, I am introducing at this time an amended concurrent resolution regarding U.N. Charter review on behalf of the same 14 Senators who cosponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and myself. The amended resolution is also being reintroduced today in the House by a large group of sponsors. As changed, I am confident that this measure will have the backing of the American Bar Association and its committee on world peace through law, which has taken such a commendable lead in bringing public attention to bear on the need for the development of the rule of law in international affairs.

PRELIMINARY PARAGRAPHS OF RESOLUTION

The resolution notes first that the basic purposes of U.S. foreign policy is the achievement of a just and lasting peace. This fundamental precept, declared earlier this year by the Senate when it adopted Senator HUMPHREY's resolution, Senate Resolution 96, expressing support for the Government position at Geneva in favoring an enforceable agreement to ban nuclear tests, bears reiteration by Congress, in view of the constant distortion of our aims by our adversaries.

Secondly, the resolution states that there can be no just and lasting peace without the development of the rule of law in the field of war prevention. The same premise was stated by President Eisenhower on October 31, 1956:

There can be no peace without law.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 21, 1959
For actions of July 20, 1959
86th-1st, No. 121

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....5,9
Area redevelopment.....8
Atomic energy.....5
CCC grain.....1
Coconut oil.....6
Conservation.....30
Contracts.....7,18
Copyrights.....3
Credit unions.....31
Education.....12
Electrification.....11,25
Farm labor.....29
Farm loans.....16
Fisheries.....4
Food costs.....20
Foreign affairs.....10
Foreign aid.....24
Foreign currencies.....14
Foreign economic policy.32
Foreign trade.....26
Forestry.....4,23
Hog prices.....21
Housing.....27
Inflation.....13
Leases.....17
Legislative program.....15
Management.....7
Minerals.....17
Mutual security.....24
On-farm training.....16
Personnel.....28
Reclamation.....2
Recreation.....23
Research.....20
Retirement.....28
Textiles.....19
Veterans.....16
Water resources.....22
Wildlife.....1

HIGHLIGHTS: Rep. Flood urged enactment of area redevelopment legislation.

HOUSE

1. SURPLUS GRAIN; WILDLIFE. Passed without amendment H. R. 7631, to make permanent the act of July 3, 1956, authorizing the Interior Department to requisition low-quality grain from CCC for use in the prevention of waterfowl depredations. p. 12490

2. RECLAMATION. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 968, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Bully Creek extension as an addition to the facilities of the Vale Federal reclamation project, Ore. pp. 12496-9
   Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 804, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Spokane Valley Federal reclamation project, Wash. and Idaho. Then passed S. 994, a similar bill, with the language of the House bill substituted therefor. H. R. 804 was then tabled. pp. 12499-500

3. COPYRIGHTS. Passed as reported H. R. 4059, to amend title 28 of the U. S. Code to protect copyrights from Government infringement by waiving the sovereign immunity of the U. S. for infringement of copyrights. pp. 12494-5

4. FISHERIES. Passed without amendment H. R. 5854, to permit the interstate shipment of fish or eggs for breeding or stocking purposes in accordance with State laws. p. 12496
   Passed without amendment H. R. 2398, to authorize the Interior Department to construct a fish hatchery in northwestern Pa. for stocking streams in that area (including Forest Services streams). p. 12496

5. ATOMIC ENERGY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. The Appropriations Committee reported, on July 17, without amendment this bill, H. R. 8283 (H. Rept. 685). p. 12526

6. COCONUT OIL. The Armed Services Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res 441, to authorize the disposition of approximately 265 million pounds of coconut oil from the national stockpile (H. Rept. 686). p. 12526

7. CONTRACTS; MANAGEMENT. Received from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee a report on contracting out Government responsibility for administrative, management, and other services (H. Rept. 688). p. 12526

8. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Flood urged the enactment of area redevelopment legislation to provide Federal assistance to industrial and rural areas, stating that "There are approximately 1 million farm families with an annual income of less than $1,000," and such legislation "would help create off-the-farm jobs to supplement the income of these farm families." pp. 12513-4

9. INDEPENDENT OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 7040. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 12486

10. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Received from the President the 13th annual report on U. S. participation in the United Nations during 1958 (H. Doc. 104). pp. 12486-8

11. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Holifield defended the purchase by TVA and Los Angeles of electric generating equipment in foreign countries. pp. 12509-11

12. EDUCATION. Rep. Roosevelt inserted correspondence opposing the position of HEW Secretary Flemming "to amend Public Laws 874 and 815, the objective of which is to limit and reduce Federal assistance to schools in federally affected areas." pp. 12516-20

13. INFLATION. Rep. Johnson, Colo., inserted an article favoring the control of consumer credit as a means of controlling inflation. pp. 12524-5

14. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Received from the Banking and Currency Committee a report on the use of foreign currencies by that committee. pp. 12525-6

15. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that the conference report on H. R. 7500, the mutual security authorization bill, will be considered on Wed., July 22. p. 12489

SENATE

16. VETERANS; FARM LOANS; VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION. As reported, S. 1138, to provide for readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed forces between Jan. 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963, includes the following provisions: Authorizes VA guaranteed loans until July 1, 1973, and VA direct loans until July 25, 1960, for the purchase of homes, including farm homes, and farmlands, livestock, machinery, etc., to be used in farming operations by the veteran. Authorizes institutional on-farm training, if attended on a full-time basis, with payments ranging from $95 to $130 per month. Authorizes education and training effective Sept. 1, 1959, up to 36 months, provided such program of education and training is initiated within 3 years, and completed within 8 years, after discharge or release from active duty, or enactment of the bill, whichever is later. Authorizes vocational rehabilitation training to veterans

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 105 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 20, 1959 No. 121

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 21, 1959, at 10 a.m.

House of Representatives

MONDAY, JULY 20, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Msgr. Lawrence P. Gatti, St. Mary of the Assumption Church, Upper Marlboro, Md., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, Lord of liberty and freedom, and the just avenger of all forms of license, send the grace of Thy holy spirit upon the members of this august assembly that they may receive the wisdom and guidance necessary to transact the weighty business that comes before them. May they be filled with Thy light so that the laws they enact will be according to Thy precepts and commands. May they always have a keen awareness of those principles and truths that make for true liberty. In a world that has lost, in so many areas, its freedom, and in our beloved country where there seems to be a rising tide of lawlessness, may they be more conscious than ever of their sacred duty to pass enactments that conform to Thy holy will lest unreasonable laws and unhappy precepts tend to bring both Thy holy law and their own legislation into disrepute.

At a time when the whole world is sighing for peace, may they be especially aware of the words of Dante: "In His will is our peace"; and the words of St. Paul: "Who has resisted the will of God and had peace?" May they, then, contribute to the peace of the world by conforming their legislation to Thy holy will.

These favors we ask in the name of Thy beloved Son who lives and reigns with Thee together with the Holy Spirit, God, world without end. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 16, 1959, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 30, 1959:

H.R. 2256. An act to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide additional funds for direct loans; to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans; and for other purposes;

H.R. 7523. An act to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7749. An act to increase the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time.

On July 1, 1959:

H.J. Res. 439. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1960, and for other purposes.

On July 6, 1959:

H.R. 5515. An act to amend the 1956 act authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete locks and dams on the Big Sandy River, Ky.-W. Va., for the purpose of increasing the authorization relating to dam No. 3 on the Big Sandy River, Ky.; and

H.J. Res. 322. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On July 8, 1959:

H.R. 7175. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7176. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

On July 13, 1959:

H.R. 4454. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, to eliminate the requirement that certain District of Columbia corporations be managed by not more than 15 trustees;

H.R. 5534. An act to designate the bridge to be constructed over the Potomac River near 14th Street in the District of Columbia, under the act of July 16, 1946, as the George Mason Memorial Bridge, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5914. An act for the relief of Dr. Radboud Louwrens Beukenkamp;

H.R. 6662. An act to amend the District of Columbia Hospital Center Act in order to extend the time during which appropriations may be made for the purposes of such act;

H.R. 7062. An act to provide for payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of Comptrollers General;

H.R. 7086. An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7343. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7349. An act making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

On July 17, 1959:

H.R. 904. An act to rename the New Richmond locks and dam in the State of Ohio as the Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam;

H.R. 1547. An act for the relief of T. Sgt. Walter Casey;

H.R. 2065. An act for the relief of Arthur J. Dettmers, Jr.;

H.R. 2497. An act to add certain lands located in Idaho to the Boise and Payette National Forests;

H.R. 3368. An act to extend the special enlistment programs provided by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended;

H.R. 4072. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, as amended, and

H.R. 7567. An act to extend for a period of 2 years the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, 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. 836. An act to amend the code of law for the District of Columbia by modifying the provisions relating to the attachment and garnishment of wages, salaries, and commissions of judgment debtors, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6436. An act to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act so as to include nematocides, plant regulators, defoliants, and desiccants, and for other purposes.

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

S. 314. An act to assist the U.S. cotton textile industry in regaining its equitable share of the world market;

S. 864. An act to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes;

S. 1512. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal Land Banks, and for other purposes; and

S. 2162. An act to provide a health benefits program for Government employees.

Omitted from the RECORD of July 16, 1959:

S. 1681. An act to provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6134) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 to eliminate the authority to charge to certain current appropriations or allotments the gross amount of the salary earnings of Federal employees for certain pay periods occurring in part in previous fiscal years."

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 65, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, YATES, CANNON, OSTERTAG, and TABER.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary and subcommittees thereof be permitted to sit this week during general debate.

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

Mr. HALEY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

FATHER OF THE NUCLEAR SHIP "SAVANNAH"

(Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, the world's first nuclear-powered cargo-passenger vessel, the nuclear ship *Savannah*, will be launched tomorrow at the New York Shipbuilding Corp., yard in Camden, N.J. The sponsor will be Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Several persons will have played important parts in bringing this ship into being. All are entitled to much credit. None, however, is entitled to more credit than is the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable HERBERT BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. He can rightly be called the "father of the nuclear ship *Savannah*."

It was his proposal which authorized the construction of the vessel and which was enacted into law. It was his idea that the ship should be a cargo-passenger vessel, and not simply a show boat for demonstration purposes.

It was his thought that a cargo-passenger vessel could be used not only to demonstrate the peacetime use of nuclear power, but could also be practically employed in carrying cargo and passengers to and from foreign ports.

Congressman BONNER was charged with the responsibility of convincing both Congress and the appropriate administrative agencies that his proposal was sound. This he did despite vigorous opposition. The vessel has now been constructed. Within a short time it will be put into actual operation. Eventually, it will have sailed into most of the major ports of the world flying the flag of the United States, and demonstrating to all people that our Nation wishes to use nuclear power for peaceful purposes. I want to be one of the first to pay my respects to the man most responsible for the nuclear ship *Savannah*.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN UNITED NATIONS DURING 1958—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act, I transmit herewith the 13th annual report, covering U.S. participation in the United Nations during the year 1958.

Last year the value of the United Nations as a force for peace was tested and proved anew.

Confronted with a grave crisis in the Middle East, it helped to achieve a peaceful solution, to preserve the threatened independence of Lebanon and Jordan, and to avert the incalculable tragedy of a large-scale conflict.

In the vital field of economic progress for newly developing countries, it opened a promising chapter by establishing the United Nations Special Fund.

In facing the stubborn problem of disarmament it gave influential backing to U.S. policies on a nuclear weapons test ban and on inspection against surprise attack, and again rejected the Soviet demand for mere paper prohibitions without the controls necessary to assure compliance.

At the dawn of man's ventures beyond our planet, it took prompt action to promote international cooperation for the peaceful uses of outer space.

Certain developments during the last year are especially important from the point of view of the U.S. relations with the United Nations.

The Middle East, as in 1957, was again a major focus of danger and of consequent United Nations efforts to preserve peace.

Last spring the President of Lebanon, convinced that the independence of his country was threatened by civil strife instigated and abetted from abroad, appealed for help first to the United Nations and later to the United States. In June the United Nations Security Council, with our active support, responded to Lebanon's first appeal by establishing the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon with the aim of assuring that there would be no illegal infiltration into that country.

In July the situation in the Middle East became more tense. Lebanon requested immediate military assistance from the United States to help it preserve its independence and inegrity. We responded by dispatching units of our Armed Forces to Lebanon and at the same time called for an urgent meeting of the Security Council. The Council met immediately to consider both this problem and a similar situation in Jordan, where the United Kingdom had responded with military assistance to that Government's appeal.

In the Security Council, the United States called upon the United Nations to take whatever action was necessary to preserve Lebanon's independence and permit withdrawal of U.S. troops. The Security Council, however, was unable to act owing to the Soviet Union's veto. The United States therefore proposed an emergency special session of the General Assembly to consider the situations in both Lebanon and Jordan.

In an address to the Assembly, I presented for the United States a series of

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 23, 1959
For actions of July 22, 1959
86th-1st, No. 123

CONTENTS

Administrative management.....25
Agricultural policy.....31
Appropriations.....7
Area redevelopment....9,18
Buildings.....14,30
Civil defense.....13
Commissions.....29,31
Contracts.....25
Electrification.....5
Fair trade.....20
Farm program.....19
Food for peace.....11
Foreign affairs.....4,8
Foreign aid.....1,28
Foreign trade.....12
Forestry.....10,17
Lands.....3,30
Legislative program.....16
Measures.....27
Meat grading.....24
Milk.....32
Minerals.....2
Mutual security.....1
Purchasing.....6
Reclamation.....16,22
Research.....10,29
Rural development.....18
School lunch.....32
Small business.....23
Surplus food.....1,8,28,32
Textiles.....21
Trademarks.....15
Vehicles.....6
Weights.....27

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on mutual security authorization bill. Sen. Stennis urged increased funds for forest research.

HOUSE

1. MUTUAL SECURITY. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7500, the mutual security authorization bill for 1959 (pp. 12771-82, 12748-57). This bill will now be sent to the President. (See Digest 122 for items of interest to this Department.) In response to a question by Sen. Cooper as to whether the authorization on the bill for making surplus commodities available for domestic relief "makes it clear that the Department of Agriculture can make available for our domestic relief program, and for the school lunch program, surplus food which it holds, without waiting for some sale for foreign currency," Sen. Fulbright stated that "It is my belief, and that of the staff and the conferees, that the provision as finally adopted does provide the authority to do that ... We were afraid that if it were made mandatory, the orderly administration of the program might be interrupted, if it became necessary to check every area in the United States before the foods could be made available for export.

But it is very clear that under any reasonable, sensible administration, the foods will be made available to the domestic programs" (p. 12757).

2. MINERALS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6940, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 in order to increase certain acreage limitations with respect to Alaska (H. Rept. 699). p. 12792

3. LANDS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 4697, to provide for the conveyance of certain interests to Clemson Agricultural College in lands previously conveyed to the College (H. Rept. 697). p. 12792

4. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 7072, to provide for U. S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank. p. 12792

5. ELECTRIFICATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution "agreeing to the Senate amendments to H. R. 3460," to amend the TVA Act of 1933 so as to provide for the issuance of revenue bonds by TVA to finance additions to its power system. p. 12792

6. PURCHASING. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 1341, to require passenger-carrying vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards. p. D646

7. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Conferees were granted permission until midnight Wed., July 22, to file a report on this bill, H. R. 7040. p. 12783

8. FOREIGN AFFAIRS; SURPLUS FOODS. Reps. Edmondson and Boland urged adoption of proposals "to establish from our mothballed Navy a new White Fleet of mercy ships, to carry American surplus foods, medical aid and supplies to disaster and distress areas all over the world." p. 12786

9. AREA REDEVELOPMENT. Rep. Carnahan urged the enactment of area redevelopment legislation to provide Federal assistance to industrial and rural areas, particularly as a means of supplementing the income of low-income farmers. pp. 12787-8

SENATE

10. FORESTRY. Sen. Stennis urged increased appropriations for forestry research, stating, "I have recommended that $2.5 million be made available immediately for the construction of several key laboratories ... to replace the makeshift facilities now being used in some places," and proposing an "immediate increase of one-half million dollars for strengthening a few of the most critical basic research programs in such fields as insect and disease research, watershed management, wildlife habitat and recreation, and timber marketing research," and announcing his intention to try to get funds included in the supplemental appropriation bill for these purposes. pp. 12737-8

Sen. Fulbright explained that "millions of acres" of land in Arkansas are being blighted by brush which precludes the healthy growing of grass and merchantable timber, stated that a research project between Forest Service and the University of Arkansas has been proposed to look into methods of controlling this scrub timber, and inserted his letter, a letter from Under Secretary Morse, and an article on the subject. pp. 12579-60

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 7040

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 7040 have until 12 o'clock tonight in which to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE NS "SAVANNAH"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] is recognized for 30 minutes.

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the NS *Savannah*, the world's first atomic-powered merchant ship, was launched at Camden, N.J., and christened by Mrs. Eisenhower. The name for the world's first nuclear-powered merchant ship was chosen by President Eisenhower in 1955 in honor of the SS *Savannah*, the first vessel equipped with steam power to cross the Atlantic Ocean. Belching black smoke and sparks, the half-steam and half-sailing packet steamed into Liverpool on June 20, 1819, after a 29-day voyage from Savannah, Ga. The world hailed that event, and American shipping took another step forward.

I think, Mr. Speaker, there is something else of great significance in the use of the name Savannah for this, the first nuclear-powered ship. And signicant in the development of the merchant marine of this Nation which this ship will now join. I refer to the fact that the gentleman from Georgia, PRINCE HULON PRESTON, JR., represents the First District of Georgia here in the House of Representatives and in that congressional district lies the beautiful city of Savannah and its excellent port facilities. PRINCE PRESTON is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce and Related Agencies which handles the appropriations for the U.S. merchant marine. Mr. PRESTON is a great advocate of a strong and virile merchant fleet. He believes, as I do, that our merchant marine is vital to our defense. He has given much of his time and energy to the development of the NS *Savannah* and other of our merchant ships. It has been my honor, Mr. Speaker, to serve as the ranking minority member of the committee of which Mr. PRESTON is chairman. I have seen him in his work and recognized his devotion to public service. I believe that the State of Georgia is to be congratulated, not only because of this new atomic ship, the *Savannah*, but also because of this great and distinguished American, PRINCE PRESTON, who serves his State and his Nation so well as chairman of this important committee. It was a part of his vision at the dawn of the atomic merchant fleet era that the new *Savannah* is being readied to help the American shipping industry become the undisputed leader on the world's oceans.

The contrast between the old and the new points graphically to the strides made during the last 140 years in U.S. shipping. Whereas the SS *Savannah* could carry enough fuel to run her 90-horsepower deck steam engine—only slightly more powerful than the engine in a small speedboat today—for 90 hours; the NS *Savannah* will be capable of traveling 300,000 miles for 3 years without having to refuel. The first *Savannah* could cross under steam at 6 knots while the nuclear-powered *Savannah* will cross at more than 20. The 320-ton *Savannah* was about the size of a modern harbor tug whereas the 21,840-ton *Savannah* will have an overall length of 595 feet. The SS *Savannah* crossed the Atlantic only 12 years after "Fulton's Folly"—the *Claremont*—steamed from New York City to Albany and back in 62 hours. The voyage of Robert Fulton opened a new era in water transportation. With the NS *Savannah* another is about to begin.

I am sure that my colleagues join me in expressing the gratitude of this Nation to any of our colleagues who have contributed to the merchant marine as they have, and particularly to our distinguished colleague from Georgia, PRINCE H. PRESTON.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Georgia delegation, we appreciate the fine compliment paid the great State of Georgia and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

The Georgia delegation has long recognized the outstanding service to the State and to the Nation which has been rendered by our colleague from the First District. We are pleased now to note that what we have known for so long, is recognized not only here on the floor of the House but throughout the Nation. We are proud of our colleague, PRINCE PRESTON, as we are proud of our delegation from the State of Georgia.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his contribution. May I say that although being on the opposite side of the aisle from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] and his colleagues, I consider the Georgia delegation one of the finest in this Congress. Each one of that delegation in his or her field of service in the Congress render great and distinguished service. The country is indeed fortunate to have them here in these legislative halls.

REVOLUTION AT SEA

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an article.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article concerning the world's first nuclear-powered surface fighting ship recently launched at Quincy, Mass.

The article is as follows:

REVOLUTION AT SEA

Our Navy's and the world's first nuclear-powered surface fighting ship now has been launched at Quincy, Mass. Just christened the *Long Beach*, and scheduled to join the fleet in early 1961, she is a formidable 14,000-ton, 721-foot vessel designed to carry only missiles rather than the guns of a conventional heavy cruiser. Among her other unique endowments, she will have virtually unlimited range on a single fueling of her two great engines, and her speed will be in the neighborhood of 40 knots, which in itself will represent a significant advance.

Thus, as Atomic Energy Commissioner Harold S. Vance has declared, "This magnificent naval vessel * * * will be free to travel the seas for unprecedented distances at high sustained speed. Her endurance and mobility will far outstrip her conventional predecessors." Like the *Nautilus* in relation to atom-driven submarines, she will occupy a special historical niche as the pioneering ship in the revolution that will eventually effect a profound change in the character of our entire surface Navy. Her first followers in that sense will be the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier *Enterprise* and the destroyer leader *Bainbridge*, both of which are now in the process of being built.

Mr. Vance has not exaggerated in declaring that the *Long Beach* serves as yet another reminder that our country "has achieved world leadership in the development and application of atomic power for naval propulsion." This is at least one of the fields, according to the experts, in which we enjoy a distinct advantage over the Soviet Union. Further than that, wholly apart from its military meaning, the lead is one that has a highly important bearing on such things as the progress of our nonmilitary nuclear technology. All hands responsible for the achievement merit the thanks of the American people.

NS "SAVANNAH"—A PRODUCT OF CAMDEN, N.J.

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

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world turned yesterday to Camden, N.J., and the launching of the first atomic-powered merchant ship. The NS *Savannah* went down the ways of the New York Shipbuilding Corp. into the Delaware River after being christened by Mrs. Mamie Eisenhower, wife of the President.

The 21,000-ton *Savannah*, while not the first nuclear-powered vessel, is significant in that she is expected to be the first of a worldwide fleet of ships that will carry cargo and passengers swifter and cheaper than any ship has ever done before. After her completion the *Savannah* will tour the world as an example of the prowess of American shipbuilding. She will carry a crew of 110, will carry 60 passengers and 9,400 deadweight tons of cargo through the seas at a speed of 21 knots. She is 595 feet long, her beam is 78 feet, and her draft fully loaded is 29.5 feet. The *Savannah* is a joint product of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce and the Atomic Energy Commission. The keel for the NS *Savannah* was laid in Camden at ceremonies presided over by Mrs. Richard Nixon, wife

of the Vice President, on May 22, 1958. The NS *Savannah* was named at the suggestion of the President in commemoration of the SS *Savannah*, which 139 years ago ushered in the age of steam when she sailed from Savannah, Ga., to Liverpool, England. The *Savannah* is a credit to all who played a part in her authorization, design, and construction, but particularly to the men and officers of the New York Shipbuilding Corp., of Camden, N.J. Most of the men who worked on the *Savannah* have been in the shipbuilding industry all of their lives and are masters of their craft. Most of them live, and have lived all their lives, in the south Jersey area.

All of Camden, south Jersey, and, indeed, the United States are proud of the skill and know-how of the men of labor and management who cooperated so well in the construction of this ship. She will in the future bring great credit to the city of her birth and the flag of her country.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

AMATEUR ROCKETRY AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EFFORT

(Mr. KING of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the spectacular missile shots which have been reverberating around the world since the Russians orbited their first sputnik have been closely paralleled by another phenomenon.

These big missile shots, known in technical parlance as shoots, have inspiree a rash of much smaller shoots. A craze for amateur rocketry has swept our Nation. Small, though sometimes deadly, homemade missiles have been fired from penthouse windows, in heavily congested streets, on public school grounds, from backyard patios, in vacant lots, and in the wide-open spaces.

Despite the danger, these small, amateur shoots, in my opinion, are in terms of what they represent, no less important to the overall, long-range American space effort than the big satellite shoots executed by our defense scientists. The amateur shoots are an expression of the deep and widespread interest in rocketry which the new age of science and space exploration has kindled in the hearts and minds of imaginative young Americans.

I think we, the Members of the 86th Congress ought to be doing something about eliminating the hazards in amateur rocketry and, at the same time, preserving and nourishing the currently strong interest in it. That interest is, I submit, a foundation on which American space effort, in the years ahead, will be built. On our willingness and ability to simulate and develop that interest may well rest the American destiny in space.

I have introduced a bill today to promote this interest in rocketry by providing basic test equipment in the 50 States, so that young scientists and rocketeers would be able to test their inventions under safe conditions and expert supervision. I commend the bill to your carefull consideration.

More than a year ago, two pioneers in the promotion of amateur rocketry proposed some well-conceived plans which would nourish the interest I have just discussed and, at the same time, minimize the hazards. Lt. Col. Charles M. Parkin, Jr., of the Army's Corp of Engineers, and Col. Kendall K. Hoyt, of the Air Force Reserve, were widely commended for their proposals. But they have received little more than encouraging words. Thus far the work of effectuating more interest in their programs has been left largely to Colonel Parkin and Colonel Hoyt themselves.

Colonel Parkin last year conducted a 14-week rocket science course for teachers and students in Virginia high schools near Washington. With the help of the Army and Colonel Parkin, rocket amateurs from several States gathered at Camp A. P. Hill, Va., last spring to fire homemade rockets under safe conditions.

Colonel Parkin was also instrumental in preparing a rocket textbook for amateurs.

Meanwhile, Colonel Hoyt, who organized the Civil Air Patrol cadet program, which was 100,000 strong in World War II, proposed a general Youth Science Corps, harnessing the enthusiasm of youth for rocketry into studies of chemistry, electronics, aeronautics, and related subjects. He urged that military Reservists throughout the country be authorized to help.

The armed services clearly have the authority to give strong support to programs of the kind proposed by Colonel Hoyt and Colonel Parkin. What seems to be lacking are some simple test facilities which the Congress could provide at a cost which I think would, as measured by the current scale of military costs, prove rather nominal.

As early as June 1958 a directive issued in the Department of Defense recognized the responsibility of the military to aid and promote rocket and science education. The directive authorized the use of military installations and facilities in such education, and thereby help young rocketeers test their inventions under safe conditions.

This directive followed a policy proposed by the President's committee on scientists and engineers. Its intent was communicated by the Army, the Navy and the Air Force to all of their installations and commands. But, to my knowledge, the military have so far done very little to encourage students in this field to use their facilities.

Safe and very adequate test facilities designed expressly for the use of responsible, young scientists could be provided every State, I think, for a total cost of less than a million dollars. And I am satisfied the facilities could be staffed and operated on an annual budget of less than $600,000.

For these amounts, a safe and adequately supervised program could be set into motion for the thousands of young Americans who have shown a keen desire to study rocketry. The costs of such a program should cover—

First. Static test stands: Static test stands, with the equipment to test rockets and rocket components, are the prime need in this program. Military experts assure me that such stands can be assembled at a cost of $10,000 each. Each can be maintained, they say, for another $1,000 a year.

Such stands could be provided every State for the total initial cost of $500,000. Some additional stands might be strategically placed in the more heavily populated areas, where the demand would be the heaviest.

Second. Ranges: Our military bases are, in most States, the logical locations for the test stands and for the necessary rocket test ranges as well. The ranges must provide safe air space and safe impact areas, and in the smaller, heavily populated States, such areas likely will be found only upon military installations. I am confident many bases have suitable areas for which there is no other current need. These areas, I am told, could be improved to serve as launching sites and ranges at an average cost not to exceed $5,000 and maintained at a average annual cost of no more than a tenth of that amount. The same military experts have assured me that 50 ranges and as many as 70 test stands could be provided at total costs within the million dollars I mentioned.

Third. Operating staff: Uniformly succcessful results in the program likely would require a regular operating staff. I think a staff of 60 people—20 civilians and 40 servicemen—could easily coordinate and supervise the program. If their average annual pay was $8,000, the total annual cost would run $480,000. Assuming the staff were scattered among strategically located regional offices, at seven of the participating military bases, I think the office expenses would run no more than $70,000—or $10,000 each—in the first year and $14,000 a year—or $2,000 each—thereafter. The annual costs also should include travel allowances—perhaps totaling $40,000 a year.

I think it entirely possible that a highly skilled and trained instructional staff could be enlisted for the program from the ranks of the military Reserves, at no additional cost to the Government. This reflects the genius of Colonel Hoyt's proposal. The ranks of these "citizen soldiers" include some 20 percent of the Nation's scientists. By Defense Department directive, they might be authorized and encouraged to earn Reserve point credit—without drill pay—by their participation in this program. On the other hand, they might be assigned to help students on the rocket ranges as a part of their regular drill program. I personally am acquainted with many patriotic Reservists who would be delighted to participate on a voluntary basis.

Precedents for such a program have been set in such organizations as the American Rifle Association, whose firing

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 24, 1959
For actions of July 23, 1959
86th-1st, No. 124

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....42
Adjournment.....30
Agricultural commodities.....44
Appropriations...5,16,20,29
Banking.....19
Barter.....41
Buy American.....47
Civil defense.....16
Claims.....9
Commissions.....2
Committee staffs.....11
Conservation.....13
Contracts.....31
Cooperatives.....37
Cotton.....23
Dairy cattle.....19
Economic aid.....21
Electrification....17,33,50
Farm loans.....19,22
Farm program.....34
Federal-State relations...2
Foreign affairs.....1,21
Foreign aid.....20,29,46
Forestry.....8,13,27
Frozen foods.....19
Government obligations...19
Grading.....44
Grain.....31
Health.....43
Hearings.....44
Hog prices.....35
Interest rates.....26
Lands..... 3,25,38,42,48
Leases.....4
Leave.....43
Legislative accomplishments....12
Legislative program..15,29
Loans.....19
Marketing.....37
Milk.....18
Minerals.....4
Minimum wage.....28
Mutual security.....20,29
Personnel.....10,39,43
Property.....2,7,24
Public Law 480.....41
REA.....17
Reclamation.....14,33
Research.....16
Stockpiling.....16
Surplus food....21,36,41,46
Taxes.....2
Trade agreements.....6
Trademarks.....51
Transportation.....49
TVA.....17
Weather.....16
Wheat.....1,31
Wild horses.....25,38
Wildlife.....25,38,45,48

HIGHLIGHTS; See page 7

SENATE

1. WHEAT; FOREIGN AFFAIRS. Received from this Department a proposed bill "to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the authority contained in that act to implement the 1959 International Wheat Agreement"; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. p. 12863

2. FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS. The Government Operations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report): S. 2026, to establish an Advisory Commission on Inter-governmental Relations (with an amendment in the nature of a substitute); and S. 910, to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property. p. D653

20. MUTUAL SECURITY. The Appropriations Committee was granted permission to file by midnight Friday, July 24, a report on the mutual security appropriation bill for 1960. p. 12795

21. FOREIGN AFFAIRS; ECONOMIC AID. Received from the President a communication transmitting a report on Economic Assistance entitled, "Programs and Administration," submitted to him by the President's Committee To Study the United States Military Assistance Program (Draper Committee) (p. 12859). A copy of the text of this report appearing in the New York Times shows one recommendation as follows: "A single agency should be made responsible for administering the major related economic assistance programs and activities now scattered among a number of departments and agencies in Washington."

Rep. Edmondson and others urged the adoption of a resolution to put into use the Great White Fleet in support of American foreign policy and Rep. Edmondson asked, ""how can we justify further delays in the use of our abundant food surpluses, to relieve the hunger of children all over the world?" and stated that these ships that are now standing idle could be used to transport our food surpluses abroad. pp. 12839-45

22. FARM LOANS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7629, to amend Sec. 17 of the Bankhead Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to continue indefinitely the authority of FHA to make real estate loans for refinancing farm debts (H. Rept. 707). p. 12859

23. COTTON. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment H. R. 7740, to provide for the preservation of acreage history and the reallocation of unused cotton acreage allotments. p. D654

24. SURPLUS PROPERTY. A subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 3722, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations. p. D655

25. WILDLIFE; LANDS. A subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 2725, to prohibit the use of aircraft or motor vehicles to hunt wild horses on land belonging to the United States. p. D655

26. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Byrnes, Wis., urged that the President's recommendations concerning the removal of the interest rate ceiling on certain Government Bonds be reported to the floor "so that a majority of the members can work their will," and urged support for such a bill, and Rep. Curtis and others commended and discussed the interest rate proposal. pp. 12845-50, 12853-5

27. FORESTRY. Rep. Porter expressed his thanks to the Forest Service and its junior forest ranger program which it started in 1953, commended these and other firefighting and prevention methods, stated that the Forest Service is "building better access roads to forest areas," and inserted two articles on the subject. pp. 12855-7

28. MINIMUM WAGE. Rep. Teller stated that "we ought forthwith to act on increasing the national minimum hourly wage to $1.25 and extending the wage hour law to the 9 million working people who are now denied coverage under the present law." pp. 12858-9

29. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that on Mon., July 27, the House would probably consider H. R. 7022, to provide for U. S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank, that if the President signs the mutual Securit

86TH CONGRESS 1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT No. 709

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

JULY 23, 1959.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. THOMAS, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 7040]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 15, 21, 37, and 50.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 48, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$4,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert *$1,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$58,500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$250*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$19,120,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$249,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert *$5,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: *not to exceed $13,500,000 for expenses of travel;*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$301,700,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: (*at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $50,000 per housing unit in Alaska*);; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert *purchase of one aircraft;*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$135,200,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$48,725,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$10,550,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$7,218,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$6,840,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$151,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$21,450,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,230,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: , *but total obligations of funds available for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act during the current fiscal year shall not exceed $50,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: *Provided further, That unobligated balances of funds in excess of $50,000,000 as of July 1, 1959, together with any receipts from sales or otherwise, during the fiscal year 1960, are hereby rescinded and shall be promptly deposited into the Treasury*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$12,750,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$400*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert *$3,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$9,052,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$12,830,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the number stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert *thirty-five*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$19,650,000;* and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,529,650*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$1,054,550*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$152,773,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,850,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$8,100,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$61,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$29,278,400*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert *$1,136,600*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$29,349,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$17,344,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$31,659,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$525,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 25, 29, and 39.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
LISTER HILL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
GORDON ALLOTT,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization

Amendment No. 1: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $4,000,000 for civil defense research and development instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House and $4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 3: Inserts Senate language for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and authorizes $1,000 instead of $1,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $58,500,000 for payments to air carriers instead of $57,000,000 as proposed by the House and $60,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Civil Service Commission

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6: Authorize $250 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals instead of $100 as proposed by the House and $400 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate $19,120,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $18,800,000 as proposed by the House and $19,440,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Authorizes $249,000 for administrative expenses from the Employees' Life Insurance Fund instead of $240,000 as proposed by the House and $258,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Aviation Agency

Amendment No. 8: Inserts Senate language for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and authorizes $5,000 instead of $10,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Authorizes $4,500 for the purchase of a passenger motor-vehicle as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10: Restores House language for expenses of travel and authorizes $13,500,000 instead of $12,950,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $301,700,000 for operating expenses instead of $283,200,000 as proposed by the House and $320,200,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided are not to be used for establishing any positions which must be "annualized" in 1961.

Amendment No. 12: Restores House language relating to the cost of housing units in Alaska and authorizes $50,000 per unit instead of $40,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Inserts Senate language for the purchase of aircraft and authorizes the purchase of one instead of three as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $135,200,000 for the establishment of new air navigation facilities instead of $131,200,000 as proposed by the House and $139,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Delete language proposed by the Senate relating to the purchase of three small aircraft; and appropriate $48,725,000 for research and development instead of $47,100,000 as proposed by the House and $50,350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Communications Commission

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $10,550,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $10,400,000 as proposed by the House and $10,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Power Commission

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $7,218,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $7,062,000 as proposed by the House and $7,374,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $6,840,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $6,745,000 as proposed by the House and $6,935,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $151,000,000 for operating expenses of the Public Buildings Service instead of $148,150,000 as proposed by the House and $153,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $3,770,000 for operating expenses of the Federal Supply Service as proposed by the House instead of $3,970,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $21,450,000 for expenses of supply distribution instead of $21,150,000 as proposed by the House and $21,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Authorizes $3,230,000 for operating expenses for the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program instead of $3,150,000 as proposed by the House and $3,310,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Restores House language and provides that total obligations of funds for the stockpiling program shall not exceed $50,000,000 instead of $33,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 26: Restores House language and provides for the rescission of funds in the materials stockpiling program in excess of $50,000,000 instead of $33,000,000 as proposed by the House, and deletes Senate language rescinding $50,000,000.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Authorize $12,750,000 for administrative operations instead of $12,500,000 as proposed by the House and $13,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $400 for newspapers and periodicals instead of $100 as proposed by the House and $900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in disagreement.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31: Insert Senate language for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and authorize $3,000 instead of $6,000 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate $9,052,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Administrator instead of $8,702,000 as proposed by the House and $9,402,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $12,830,000 for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration instead of $12,660,000 as proposed by the House and $13,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendments Nos. 33, 34, 35, and 36: Provide for the purchase of 35 passenger motor vehicles instead of 30 as proposed by the House and 40 as proposed by the Senate; appropriate $19,650,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $19,400,000 as proposed by the House and $19,900,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide $1,529,650 for expenses of railroad safety activities instead of $1,526,100 as proposed by the House and $1,533,200 as proposed by the Senate; and provide $1,054,550 for expenses of locomotive inspection activities instead of $1,051,400 as proposed by the House and $1,057,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Deletes language proposed by the Senate relating to the salary of the Secretary of the Commission.

National Science Foundation

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $152,773,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $143,273,000 as proposed by the House and $160,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed includes funds for studies concerning weather modification, a feasibility study for a National Institute for Atmospheric Research, and dissemination of scientific information as proposed by the Senate. Funds are not

included for a Southern Hemisphere astrograph or university nuclear research equipment.

Amendment No. 39: Reported in disagreement.

Renegotiation Board

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $2,850,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $2,700,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $8,100,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $7,800,000 as proposed by the House and $8,275,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Selective Service System

Amendment No. 42: Authorizes $61,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $72,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $29,278,400 for salaries and expenses instead of $29,000,000 as proposed by the House and $29,556,-800 as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans' Administration

Amendment No. 44: Inserts Senate language for expenses of travel and authorizes $1,136,600 instead of $1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Appropriate $29,349,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses instead of $27,349,000 as proposed by the House and $31,349,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $17,344,000 for medical research instead of $15,344,000 as proposed by the House and $19,344,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $31,659,000 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities instead of $30,159,000 as proposed by the House and $33,159,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Independent Offices—General Provisions

Amendment No. 48: Inserts language proposed by the Senate excepting from limitation travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 49: Authorizes $525,000 for administrative expenses related to public facility loans instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Authorizes $653,000 for administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator for liquidating programs as proposed by the House instead of $755,000 as proposed by the Senate.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

O

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

Mr. GROSS. Then, it is definitely understood that the mutual security bill, the foreign giveaway bill, will not come up until the authorization bill is signed at the White House?

Mr. McCORMACK. I might state to the gentleman that the mutual security appropriation bill will not come up until the authorization bill is signed.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to ask the majority leader, Has there been a request to go over until Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; not yet.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When is it going to be made? I would like to be here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I will ask it now. Will the gentleman yield for that purpose?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object. I hope maybe the labor bill will come up.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman is not on the floor, will he object to my making unanimous consent request later on?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I like always to keep my word.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, you do. And, if you say you are not going to make it again today——

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, I did not say I would not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I will have to stay here, then, I suppose.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. THOMAS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 709)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry indenpendent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered, 15, 21, 37, and 50.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9 and 48, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert, "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4; That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$58,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,120,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$249,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "not to exceed $13,500,000 for expenses of travel;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$301,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "(at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $50,000 per housing unit in Alaska);"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "purchase of one aircraft;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numebred 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$135,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$48,725,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the seme with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,218,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,840,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$151,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$21,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,230,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", but total obligations of funds available for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act during the current fiscal year shall not exceed $50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That unobligated balances of funds in excess of $50,000,000 as of July 1, 1959, together with any receipts from sales or otherwise, during the fiscal year 1960, are hereby rescinded and shall be promptly deposited into the Treasury"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amend-

ment insert "$3,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,052,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$12,830,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "thirty-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,650,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$1,529,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,054,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$152,773,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$61,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$29,278,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,136,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$29,349,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,344,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$31,659,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 25, 29, and 39.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
LISTER HILL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
GORDON ALLOTT,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

Executive Office of the President

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization

Amendment No. 1: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $4,000,000 for civil defense research and development instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House and $4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Independent offices

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 3: Inserts Senate language for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and authorizes $1,000 instead of $1,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $58,500,000 for payments to air carriers instead of $57,000,000 as proposed by the House and $60,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Civil Service Commission

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6: Authorize $250 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals instead of $100 as proposed by the House and $400 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate $19,120,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $18,800,000 as proposed by the House and $19,440,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Authorizes $249,000 for administrative expenses from the Employees' Life Insurance Fund instead of $240,000 as proposed by the House and $258,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Aviation Agency

Amendment No. 8: Inserts Senate language for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and authorizes $5,000 instead of $10,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Authorizes $4,500 for the purchase of a passenger motor vehicle as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10: Restores House language for expenses of travel and authorizes $13,500,000 instead of $12,950,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $301,700,000 for operating expenses instead of $283,200,000 as proposed by the House and $320,200,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided are not to be used for establishing any positions which must be "annualized" in 1961.

Amendment No. 12: Restores House language relating to the cost of housing units in Alaska and authorizes $50,000 per unit instead of $40,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13: Inserts Senate language for the purchase of aircraft and authorizes the purchase of one instead of three as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $135,200,000 for the establishment of new air navigation facilities instead of $131,200,000 as proposed by the House and $139,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Delete language proposed by the Senate relating to the purchase of three small aircraft; and appropriate $48,725,000 for research and development instead of $47,100,000 as proposed by the House and $50,350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Communications Commission

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $10,550,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $10,400,000 as proposed by the House and $10,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Power Commission

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $7,218,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $7,062,000 as proposed by the House and $7,374,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $6,840,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $6,745,000 as proposed by the House and $6,935,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $151,000,000 for operating expenses of the Public Buildings Service instead of $148,150,000 as proposed by the House and $153,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $3,770,000 for operating expenses of the Federal Supply Service as proposed by the House instead of $3,970,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $21,450,000 for expenses of supply distribution instead of $21,150,000 as proposed by the House and $21,550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Authorizes $3,230,000 for operating expenses for the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program instead of $3,150,000 as proposed by the House and $3,310,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Restores House language and provides the total obligations of funds for the stockpiling program shall not exceed $50,000,000 instead of $33,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 26: Restores House language and provides for the rescission of

funds in the materials stockpiling program in excess of $50,000,000 instead of $33,000,000 as proposed by the House, and deletes Senate language rescinding $50,000,000.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Authorize $12,750,000 for administrative operations instead of $12,500,000 as proposed by the House and $13,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $400 for newspapers and periodicals instead of $100 as proposed by the House and $900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in disagreement.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31: Insert Senate language for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and authorize $3,000 instead of $6,000 as proposed by the Senate; and appropriate $9,052,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of the Administrator instead of $8,702,000 as proposed by the House and $9,402,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $12,830,000 for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration instead of $12,660,000 as proposed by the House and $13,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendments Nos. 33, 34, 35, and 36: Provide for the purchase of 35 passenger motor vehicles instead of 30 as proposed by the House and 40 as proposed by the Senate; appropriate $19,650,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $19,400,000 as proposed by the House and $19,900,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide $1,529,650 for expenses of railroad safety activities instead of $1,526,100 as proposed by the House and $1,533,200 as proposed by the Senate; and provide $1,054,550 for expenses of locomotive inspection activities instead of $1,051,400 as proposed by the House and $1,057,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Deletes language proposed by the Senate relating to the salary of the Secretary of the Commission.

National Science Foundation

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $152,773,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $143,273,000 as proposed by the House and $160,300,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount allowed includes funds for studies concerning weather modification, a feasibility study for a National Institute for Atmospheric Research, and dissemination of scientific information as proposed by the Senate. Funds are not included for a Southern Hemisphere astrograph or university nuclear research equipment.

Amendment No. 39: Reported in disagreement.

Renegotiation Board

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $2,850,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $2,700,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $8,100,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $7,800,000 as proposed by the House and $8,275,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Selective Service System

Amendment No. 42: Authorizes $61,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $72,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $29,278,400 for salaries and expenses instead of $29,000,000 as proposed by the House and $29,556,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans' Administration

Amendment No. 44: Inserts Senate language for expenses of travel and authorizes $1,136,600 instead of $1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Appropriate $29,349,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses instead of $27,349,000 as proposed by the House and $31,349,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $17,344,000 for medical research instead of $15,344,000 as proposed by the House and $19,344,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $31,659,000 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities instead of $30,159,000 as proposed by the House and $33,159,000 as proposed by the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 48; Inserts language proposed by the Senate excepting from limitation travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 49: Authorizes $525,000 for administrative expenses related to public facility loans instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $550,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Authorizes $653,000 for administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator for liquidating programs as proposed by the House instead of $755,000 as proposed by the Senate.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned with an item in this bill relative to a Veterans' Administration hospital at Martinez, Calif. The Senate has written a sentence in its report which I would like to read:

> The committee is convinced that there is urgent need for the new veterans' hospital to be located at Martinez, Calif. It is understood that plans are proceeding for this hospital, and it is hoped that it will be finished under the highest priority.

Mr. Speaker, this hospital has been a matter of controversy. The Veterans' Committee of this House has taken a long look at it. They do not like the location, which is on the periphery of the area to be served.

I believe that veterans hospitals should be built in locations where they best serve the veterans, and for no other reason. There is no great group of medical specialists in this vicinity. The University of California now has its Graduate Medical School at Berkeley, Calif., and it is very anxious to have this hospital located where it would be convenient to the school so that its staff specialists are available to care for the hospitalized ex-servicemen.

I would like to know whether the committee subscribes to the statement made to which I have referred.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to our distinguished colleague from California, No. 1,—and mark this well—there is nothing in this bill making any appropriation for any new hospitals. No. 2, the language the gentleman read was written in the report of the other body and, of course, the House cannot control what the other body writes in its report. As far as the committee of the House is concerned, may I say to my friend that in this instance the committee is relying upon the House Veterans' Affairs Committee regarding the location in this particular instance because they have been actively working on this problem. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. It does. May I say that I should like to associate my colleague from Alameda County, Calif. [Mr. COHELAN], in the remarks that I made.

Mr. THOMAS. We are delighted to have our friend [Mr. COHELAN] with us.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add to the remarks of my distinguished senior colleague from Alameda County in California, Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, that there are at least three major points to be noted in the needed restudy of the Martinez site.

First, there are sites available near the Berkeley campus of the University of California where, in the words of Dr. Hardin B. Jones, professor of medical physics and physiology, "both institutions might combine resources and provide a great medical service to veterans and simultaneously provide a clinical resource to the great laboratories of medical science at our university." Dr. Jones adds:

> This would maximize the real usefulness of the hospital to veterans wholly aside from political considerations of the hospital site and eliminate the disservice to the veterans that a rural location of this hospital would entail.

Donald H. McLaughlin, chairman of the board of regents of the University of California, has expressed the university's interest in working with the Veterans' Administraton to create such a joint use facility.

Second, there are sites available within the general Alameda County area now containing no less than nine major hospitals, an area in which vital auxiliary facilities already exist in considerable number and an area from which adequate personnel and staff can be obtained. This point has been raised by the Alameda-Contra Costa Medical Association which is among organizations urging a restudy of possible sites, despite the fact that it represents both Alameda County and Contra Costa County where the suggested Martinez site is located.

Third, there are sites available in Alameda County where a majority of the patients and their families now reside. This point has been made by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors in its resolutions urging restudy of possible sites for this facility.

These three points provide the basis for a restudy of site location. Following such a restudy, a final determination of site for the new hospital can be made on the basis of objective findings. Civil defense directives which originally resulted in consideration of a Martinez site away from metropolitan centers are no longer in effect, so these considerations now warrant a full and complete review.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I am delighted to yield to the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HARRIS. You will recall that when the appropriation for the Federal Aviation Agency was considered by the House I raised some questions about the sufficiency of the funds to operate the airways. Can the gentleman advise us, since we have not had the opportunity to see the conference report, what the final result is with reference to personnel to operate the new or increased facilities for which appropriations were made some 2 years ago, the money having been spent, the facilities installed, and which will be coming into operation during this fiscal year?

Mr. THOMAS. I should be delighted to answer the question, in cooperation with my able and distinguished friend who, with his committee, know as much about this problem, if not more, than anybody else in the House.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the high compliments the gentleman is paying me, but I am interested in results too.

Mr. THOMAS. In 1956 the predecessor agency had 23,763 employees, a nice little army. Then in 1959 we raised that to 30,383, an increase of about 30 percent. For this year they came in and wanted another 5,000, which would make a total of 35,252. At the time of the hearing on the House bill, which was in March or April, they had about 3,000 unfilled jobs. We can argue about unfilled jobs; we all know the answers. An agency of this size can never keep all of its jobs filled, particularly with a turnover in the Federal service of something like 16 percent.

What we did in the House was to increase that figure about 500 above the vacancies. Then the bill went to the other body and they raised the amount to about the budget figure. We compromised that figure by splitting it half in two. So, any way you look at it, they are going to have between 2,500 and 3,000 more employees this year than they did last year. And this year they had 7,000 more than they had the year before that.

Mr. HARRIS. What is actually needed is 2,790 above last year. Of course, we could deal in total numbers, as the gentleman has explained, but it does not give the correct picture, as I see it; because, when this agency was reorganized, and the new agency, the Federal Aviation Agency, was established by this Congress, we took over certain personnel of the military for this purpose.

Mr. THOMAS. We did what?

Mr. HARRIS. Took over personnel of the military for operation of the Airways facilities.

Mr. THOMAS. Not on the civilian payroll.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; and will the gentleman permit me to continue. This new agency, the Federal Aviation Agency, was established by the Congress in 1958.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. Prior to that time the Civil Aeronautics Administration had its own operation with a set number of personnel, something like 16,000 to 18,000.

Mr. THOMAS. It was 23,000.

Mr. HARRIS. When we reorganized and took over the military phase of it, too, in the operation of the airways, we merged the operation of the civil and the military and it was then, which the record shows, estimated that both military and commercial civilian operations would require something like 40,000 employees to do the job.

Mr. THOMAS. I am not sure that the word "merged" is exactly correct.

Mr. HARRIS. That is precisely what happened.

Mr. THOMAS. We are working in conjunction with the military, sometimes side by side with them, using some of their facilities and they use some of ours. They use our personnel and we use theirs.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is simply in error about that. Under the reorganization and the reestablishment of this program this is precisely the point I am raising here. For example, the long-range program which started with some tragic accidents, as the gentleman knows, and to which this Congress gave a great deal of attention, became a 3-year program which was proposed by the Executive and the Congress approved. That is now coming into operation. Now this year from the $73 million which this Congress appropriated over 2 years ago there are to be 17 long-range radar facilities, 19 terminal radar facilities, some 28 traffic control tower operations and 166 VOC put into operation. And this is the national program to operate civilian, commercial, and military planes. Can the gentleman tell the House whether or not there are sufficient funds in this conference report to operate these facilities for which we have already paid?

Mr. THOMAS. I think there are sufficient funds and if anything there might be $3, $4, or $5 million more than they need.

Mr. HARRIS. I would question that on the basis of what I understand is in this conference report—and I have not had a chance to examine it.

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly there is no disposition on the part of this committee to endanger the lives of any people who are going to use air travel. All we are trying to do is to get them to use what they have wisely.

Mr. HARRIS. I commend the gentleman for his objectives in that regard. I want to compliment him for it. But I seriously question whether you are going to use $73 million worth of facilities that have already been bought and some installed by a lack of appropriations to operate them in the interest of aviation safety for the American people. It is something that concerns me considerably.

Mr. THOMAS. I am sure that the gentleman will not be disappointed in the operation. I think they will do a good job with this personnel. You have to assemble these various scientific implements. They go to the warehouse. I think if you will read the hearings carefully you will find they admit that from the time they receive these implements in the warehouse they may stay there for 6 months before they are sent to the field for installation. That is a period of 6 months and it is their figure and not my figure.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the assurance that the gentleman has given us in that connection, but I respectively disagree with him as to the results and hope he is right in his conclusion.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. BOW. With reference to this question of whether they can do a good job with this money that was appropriated some time ago to buy these instruments and as to the 6 months that have gone by and whether or not the installations are now in being, I would like to know this, whether there is enough money in this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think there is any doubt about it, I say to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. May I ask the gentleman this question. Is there enough money in this bill now to man all the installations that have heretofore been provided for by the Congress?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; and there will be a surplus, in my judgment. Certainly if there is not they can come back for a deficiency appropriation.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] having withdrawn his objection, that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia, who is chairman of the Subcommittee for Commerce of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PRESTON. I dislike very much to take exception or to take issue with the gentleman from Texas as to his state-

ment that there are ample funds provided in this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Reasonable men can reasonably disagree, and my friend from Georgia is a most reasonable man.

Mr. PRESTON. I assure the gentleman that my own subcommittee handled this appropriation in 1958 when we appropriated funds to buy this equipment and they are now installed. They are very essential devices for safety. In the judgment of Mr. Pyle, the Deputy Administrator, we are short $17 million of having enough money in this conference report to man the facilities that we have bought and installed.

Mr. THOMAS. I have seen these estimates made before and may I say to my friend we have been buying these items for a long time.

This is a continuing program. The lead time is 12, 16, or 18 months. Whenever they buy some equipment it is shipped to a central warehouse and sometimes it lies in the warehouse for 6 months before it is shipped out to be installed. That is their testimony, now mine, it lies there for 6 months before it is sent to the field for installation.

The gentleman from Georgia knows we are not going to do anything to jeopardize anybody's life, and when it gets to the place that they need more money we know what they are going to do. That does not mean that this is an invitation for them to come back here on the first day of January, but the gentleman knows what will happen.

Mr. PRESTON. What the gentleman says reminds me of the old fisherman who said to the catfish: "Do not worry; we are not going to hurt you very much; we are only going to skin you."

Mr. THOMAS. Nobody is going to get skinned. We all do a little flying and none of us want to get skinned.

Mr. PRESTON. But we are getting skinned in this conference report.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand the gentleman to say that if any of these installations are necessary to the airways of the country they should go ahead and if they find they do not have sufficient money on an annual basis——

Mr. THOMAS. No; we did not say that.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the committee, then, intend for the agency to go ahead with those new installations that are necessary to the operation of the airways?

Mr. THOMAS. We are not telling them how to run their business or what installations to put in. They know a little bit more about that than we do.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me what the total appropriations are under the terms of this conference report?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I am delighted to get to that. I wanted to yield to my distinguished friend from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] to get this straightened out before we went into the figures.

The bill as passed by the House called for $6,457,657,800; and, in round figures, considering a rescission we made on stockpiling it was about $240 million less than the budget.

The bill went over to the other body and the other body raised the House figure in some varying forms through some 50 amendments, but in round figures by $102 million.

The House conferees met with the conferees of the other body and when we got through we saved $57,196,400 of the $102 million increase. Does that answer my friend's question?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Yes; but I would just like to congratulate the conferees on the result of their effort. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not agree with me that firm insistence on the part of the House is necessary if we are to hold expenditures down and that if the Appropriations Committee and the appropriations conferees would in all instances insist as the gentleman and his conferees insisted, that we could save six or seven hundred million dollars further?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say that my friend, the gentleman from Wyoming, has made a most valuable addition to the Appropriations Committee. We are delighted to have him with us, for he is a hard worker and has been very helpful.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman state to the House how much more this conference report requires than the bill when it passed the House?

Mr. THOMAS. I thought I did answer that. The Senate raised it $102 million and we took off of that $102 million $57 million. It results in a net increase of about $48 million over the amount the bill carried when it left the House.

Mr. GROSS. A $48 million increase?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; the other body raised us $102 million and we reduced that to $44 million.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In answer to the question just raised by the gentleman from Iowa, according to the figures I have at hand the conference report presents a total figure of $44,494,400 over the original House figure.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman mentioned my name in connection with the bill carrying some $5 billion or $6 billion. I wanted to make it very clear that the only item I was questioning here was what was absolutely necessary to operate the airways of this country in a safe condition.

We have run out of air space; we ran out of air space a long time ago and we have had tragedies in the air because of it, and certainly I think there is probably something in this matter of appropriations. I am just as much interested in saving money as anyone.

Mr. THOMAS. There is no question about that.

Mr. HARRIS. I also submit that he wants to be fair in that regard. I think there are many places where money can be saved and applied where roads are involved. I think we could save many millions of dollars we are sending to many places around the world, and many things. We do not have to place the roads at stake.

Mr. THOMAS. I did not intend to imply anything but the very highest motives and principles to my able and distinguished friend from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to take the time of the House on conference reports, and I did not object to the unanimous-consent request this morning although I think it is proper for the House to have printed reports in full detail. Otherwise we sometimes get confused.

I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question in regard to amendment No. 1. When we passed the bill on the floor of the House there was an item for $25 million, requested by the Bureau of the Budget, for civil defense. As I understand, at the present time this amendment is in disagreement between the conferees of the House and Senate. What is the amount involved—$12½ million?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, may I say to my distinguished friend from North Carolina that, of course, he has really written the authorization bill, so I say this in great humility and with great respect for him, because he knows as much about the subject as any man in the House.

It will be recalled that this item is a matching item. The Budget sent up an estimate for $13 million on a matching basis of 50–50 for supplies and material. There was a great deal of argument in this body and in the other body as to whether or not the tremendous amount of money we have been spending for 10 years for stockpiling on a matching basis has been properly used or if it has been gainfully used. Anyway, they came up with a new program this year to put in the State capitals and in the city halls a total of 6,000 to 6,500 men to be paid partly by the Federal Government and partly by the local community.

May I respectfully say that the House turned this down, the other body reinserted it, and the only item in disagreement in this entire bill of 50 items is this item.

Mr. DURHAM. May I say to the gentleman, for whom I have great respect, that I disagree with him in the operation of this type of civil defense. The gentleman from Arkansas talked about the loss of life because of the lack of safety instruments for aviation. We have just gone through lengthy hearings on what we face if and when an attack should happen. This item is primarily

for the benefit of our local communities throughout the whole of the United States in order to learn and to determine what can be done if and when we have an attack by atomic weapons on this country. That is the whole story.

I do not see how this country can afford not to participate in some kind of local instruction service to the people in local communities. I do not know how else you could do it.

We brought this bill out in 1951. We adopted the act at that time, and so far it has not been implemented at all by any funds to carry out the intent of that act. Each year we have asked for additional funds or for some funds to start this program. I we do not want to have any civil defense at all, I think the best way to do would be to get rid of it and say to the local communities: "Take you own responsibility." As a Member of this body I am not willing to do that. We have a responsibility because we are the heads of the U.S. Government. Radiation could destroy every man in the whole world, as far as that is concerned, if it is once laid down, and I say that on the basis of knowledge as to what exists.

In arriving at some kind of a solution it strikes me that we should instruct these people with this type of procedure, try to let the local policemen and other officials in local communities have some kind of instructional service. We set up the personnel who have the qualifications to do this, and how you can do it without giving some kind of help to the local communities I do not know. This is not to plan a political organization. But whatever it is or may become it is disseminating valuable information to every community for survival if we are faced with the modern weapons.

Mr. THOMAS. We have paid the transportation and tuition and let local people pick out their students, so to speak, to go to school. But it is my understanding that the school program from the local point of view did not go over too well.

Mr. DURHAM. Well, I do not think that was the fault of the Congress at all.

Mr. THOMAS. No; it was not. That is the point I was making. But, we put up the money.

Mr. DURHAM. I think we have a responsibility here to try to put into the hands of the local communities throughout the country some kind of instructional service to tell them about the dangers. We print volumes and volumes and volumes of radiation hearings in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, but nobody takes the time to read them. They do not realize the hazards that exist today.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my beloved friend, I do not know of any man who is more genuine and sincere on matters affecting legislation and makes less noise about it. Still waters run deep. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] knows as much about the subject matter as any Member in this House.

Mr. DURHAM. I appreciate those compliments, but as much as I appreciate compliments, what I desire and want is the $12 million or more for the purpose of instructing our people factually in the means of survival.

Mr. THOMAS. But, I do not know what they are going to do with this money, and they have no more of a program than a goose has an instep. Are they just going to put the people on the payroll and send them to school?

Mr. DURHAM. No. That was never the intent of it. They come here and participate in the program and learn something. Everybody does.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope we can learn a lesson in another year or two, when it comes to making progress in this field, and if the gentleman will be patient, we will come to some solution of it.

Mr. DURHAM. We have to have some kind of knowledge back in the local communities. Suppose you had an atomic weapon drop in Houston tomorrow. Who is going to tell the people down there what to do?

Mr. THOMAS. The people of Houston or Durham or Chicago or New York are going to save themselves on their own ingenuity, and there is no bureau in Washington that is going to save them.

Mr. DURHAM. But we have to make some kind of a beginning.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina who has been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception, as have I, and who has studied this problem and participated in the hearings which have taken place in regard to the hazards of nuclear war. Now, I do not think there is a Member of this House who has been more critical of the Federal civil defense program than the gentleman from California now speaking. And, I certainly have been critical, because the program did not face up to the realities of the nuclear hazard which we are told exists, and we are spending $40 billion a year on the basis that it does exist. And, I can say to this House—and I do not want to be a prophet of doom—that notwithstanding the $40 billion that is being spent annually, the defensive military forces of the United States cannot protect the people from the hazards of a nuclear attack. This has got to be done through some type of civil defense program, a better program than we have ever had presented to the Congress. It grieves me to see a continuous denial of funds on these small steps, which are all the steps we can take at this time. I admit that they are not enough, but I would say with great earnestness that I feel that this is a problem which the House should consider under its own obligations to the people of the United States. And, if there is not a program forthcoming from the Federal civil defense officials, the Office of Defense Mobilization, this House should take up legislation to bring forth an effective program, and I hope at that time that the gentleman from Texas would look upon it with the degree of concern that some of the rest of us who have studied the program so long look upon it.

Mr. THOMAS. We have been wrestling with this problem every year. I do not think we have missed a year since April 1950, when it started.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to associate myself with the views of the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from California. Our people have not yet waked up to the fact that the United States today cannot be defended against atomic attack. No country today can be defended from attack. I believe we would be able to pull through an attack and survive and destroy the attacker; but we cannot entirely prevent his getting through our defenses. Our people have not been told this harsh truth as emphatically as it needs to be made clear to them. They have not realized, they have not quite taken it in, that an enemy can break through and deliver utterly devastating blows to the United States of America. Our people will not take civil defense seriously until they do realize that all our billions for defense cannot protect them against attack. Just yesterday we voted $3.5 billion to help other countries strengthen their capacity to defend themselves—and I urged approval of that. And then to choke on a small increase in appropriation for civil defense to prepare our people for atomic attack and how to protect themselves in the event of it, I just think is not good judgment. This involves our own survival.

Mr. DURHAM. We held hearings in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on simulated attacks of 150 weapons, I believe, laid down on strategic spots in the United States. We did it in our own country for that purpose. And, it is a most amazing thing to see what could happen with only that number. Now, that was only a small number involved, not what may exist in our own country but probably in the hands of those people who do not like us. I hope the gentleman, when he goes back to conference, will take this item seriously and put in this sum of money so we may tell and instruct the local people in our local communities how to survive in case of an atomic war.

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

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

It is a most unfortunate situation when a great and generous nation such as ours must stumble over $12 million for civil defense, but during the same year spend $40 billion for a shooting defense.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I joined with many others just this week in voting $3.5 billion in mutual security aids. These funds will be used by our friends and allies for their own protection as well as ours. I do not make this point in

objection, but rather to speak up for the defense of our own people.

We are justly proud of the outstanding civil defense program in Minnesota under the able leadership of Col. Hubert Schon.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I want to get a little history of what happened in the conference committee regarding the vote on the cut here.

As I understand it, the Senate added to the House figure and then by a vote of 3 to 2 that figure was cut. Does the gentleman understand what I said?

Mr. THOMAS. I must confess I do not; I am sorry. Would the gentleman be good enough to repeat it?

Mr. WIER. I understand that when the House bill went over to the Senate, the Senate added some substantial amount to the item for civil defense.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct. The item left here with a figure of $10 million and they came back with $25 million, so there was a difference of $15 million.

Mr. WIER. I understand that there was a vote in which the sum was cut, which the Senate had added, by a vote of 3 to 2. That was the information that I got. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not mind telling what went on. The conferees for the other body, on their part, were adamant. May I say that the House conferees were, likewise, a little hardheaded; but I do not recognize the figure of 3 to 2.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There was no disagreement on the part of the House conferees.

Mr. THOMAS. That is my understanding, nor was there any disagreement on the part of the conferees for the other body.

Mr. WIER. On the sum that is now in the report?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WIER. That has been agreed on by both the House and the Senate?

Mr. THOMAS. No; the House conferees agreed, but the conferees for the other body disagreed with the House position. There was no division of opinion on the House side and there was very little division of opinion in the other body.

Mr. WIER. That is what I wanted to get clear. I was led to believe that somewhere along the line there was a booby trap in this.

Mr. THOMAS. No; none whatsoever.

Mr. WIER. I want to associate myself with the need, because in Minnesota we do have an excellent 87-county live organization on civil defense. Without any ammunition, they are helpless.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not know about that, but I can say that Minnesota has a fine Member of Congress by the name of Mr. WIER.

Mr. WIER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 3, line 5, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: On page 17, line 9, insert: "*Provided,* That any funds received as proceeds from sale or other disposition of materials on account of the rotation of stocks under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act shall be deposited to the credit, and be available for expenditure for the purposes, of this appropriation except that, to the extent materials sold under section 3(d) of said Act to prevent deterioration are excess to stockpile needs, the proceeds of sale may be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and thereupon the replacement requirements of said section 3(d) shall not be applicable: *Provided further,* That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical facilities."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "to the extent materials sold under section 3(d) of said Act to prevent deterioration are excess to stockpile needs, the replacement provisions of said section 3(d) shall not be mandatory: *Provided further,* That."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 29: On page 20, line 11, strike out "a building in Portland, Oregon" and insert in lieu thereof: "buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise:".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the word "otherwise" insert ", including prepayment of purchase contracts".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39: On page 25 after the word "expended" insert ", of which $1,890,000 shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, for an additional amount to complete the construction of a secondary road to the Optical Astronomy Observatory on Kitt Peak in Arizona:".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

RECORD NONSTOP FLIGHT FROM NEW YORK TO MOSCOW

(Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to make what I think is a most important announcement to the House. I read a press report from Moscow:

PRESS PLANE

Moscow.—America's biggest commercial jetliner today streaked nonstop from New York to Moscow in the record time of 8 hours and 45 minutes.

The flight of the intercontinental version of the Boeing 707 knocked 63 minutes off the flying time of the Russian TU–114 prop-jet that set the previous New York-Moscow record when Soviet First Deputy Premier Frol Kozlov returned to Russia earlier this month.

The new record was set by a Pan American World Airways jetliner, under charter to the U.S. State Department carrying 96 persons, most of them American newsmen assigned to cover Vice President NIXON's 11-day tour of Russia.

The recordbreaking flight began last night at 10:35 p.m., eastern daylight time, when the Boeing 707 took off from Idlewild International Airport in New York.

The Pan American jetliner arrived over Moscow at 7:20, eastern daylight time, circled for 7 minutes before getting landing clearance, and 2 minutes later, at 7:29 a.m., eastern daylight time, was on the ground.

The newsmen left New York about 90 minutes after NIXON left Friendship, Md., aboard an Air Force UC–137 jet transport—the smaller and slower version of the Boeing 707. They beat NIXON into Moscow.

The press plane flew nonstop from New York. The Nixon plane refueled at Reykjavik, Iceland.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I understand that I am not recorded on rollcall No. 115. I was present and voted yea. I ask unanimous consent that I be recorded as voting yea on rollcall No. 115.

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

There was no objection.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 318), providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 115, a joint resolution to reserve a site in the District of Columbia for the erection of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to provide for a competition for the design of such memorial, and to provide additional funds for holding the competition, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) to reserve a site in the District of Columbia for the erection of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to provide for a competition for the design of such memorial, and to provide additional funds for holding the competition. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution, House Resolution 318, provides for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 115 to reserve a site in the District of Columbia for the erection of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The committee is to be congratulated; they have worked tirelessly for the last 2 years. Sites have been examined and formative plans for the memorial to our late great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, have been made. The committee has finally come up with a site and a program which I believe the Congress should adopt at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] and ask unanimous consent that he may proceed out of order.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable concern expressed recently in the press and by mail that Members have been receiving relative to the condition of the roads program and particularly the trust fund. This has come about since our Commerce Department appropriation bill for 1960. I think the record should be made straight so that Members can reply to that mail and so that we understand just what has happened. Unfortunately one of the divisions of the executive department of Government has indicated it is because of language in this year's appropriation bill that the program in States like Virginia, Ohio, and other States are now going to have to shut down as money that has been allocated to those various States is not being paid.

The fact of the matter is, and I think it should be made clear, that when this budget was presented to us in January there was an estimated appropriation of $2,840 million which would be necessary to take care of the requirements of 1960. This appropriation was authorized from the trust fund.

Those expenditure requirements actually totaled $3,002 million, and the difference would be met from estimated unexpended trust fund balances brought over from 1959 of $162 million.

The income of the trust fund last year fell below the January estimate, so there is a greater deficit in the trust fund than was anticipated when the budget was submitted to your committee for consideration.

Today the deficit is $500 million.

I would like to tell you the reason for this. The budget appropriation language, following the form of the previous year, reads as follows:

For carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, which are attributable to Federal-aid highways, to remain available until expended, not more than $2,840,000,000, to be derived from the highway trust fund.

So you see that if the money is not in the trust fund there is no money available to the States under the allocation.

Your Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, recognized this fact. We knew there would be a deficit; nevertheless, we made the appropriation from the trust fund and carried that same language because under the authorizing legislation in the 1956 act there is authority for appropriations to be made from the general fund, and that can be done if needed. However, another committee of the House is now considering legislation to implement the trust fund. There has been a request made by the President for increase in taxes to replenish the trust fund. No action has yet been taken on his request.

If no action is taken, the Appropriations Committee may be called upon to proceed under section 209(d) which provides for repayable advances from the general fund to the highway trust fund. It states:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the trust fund, as repayable advances, such additional sums as may be required to make the expenditures referred to in subsection (f).

Now, subsection (f) says in pertinent part:

Amounts in the trust fund shall be available, as provided by appropriation Acts, for making expenditures after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972, to meet those obligations of the United States heretofore or hereafter incurred under the Federal-Aid Road Act which are attributable to Federal-aid highways.

Now, as I understand this, the repayable advances provision does not operate automatically, but rather requires separate and distinct appropriation action by the Congress. In other words, if the general fund is to be temporarily used to meet current expenditure requirements for obligations already apportioned, that would require appropriation action in addition to the provision to which I have referred which was carried in the Commerce Department Appropriation Act for 1960.

The language in the act this year is no different than that which has been carried in the past; the only difference is in the state of the highway trust fund. There being a deficit this year, it becomes the responsibility of the Congress to find some way to replace that fund.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished son of our late beloved President, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD following the legislative business of the day.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to include a letter from the National Park Service and a statement therein referred to in connection with his remarks on the pending resolution.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD remarks prepared by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 318 provides for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 115, which would reserve a site in the District of Columbia for the erection of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The House Administration Committee which reported this Joint Resolution concurs with the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission in the designation of a site for this memorial at that portion of West Potomac Park which lies between Independence Avenue and the inlet bridge as a more suitable and proper location for the erection of the same.

It has now been almost 15 years since the passing of this great President and leader who guided our country successfully through the darkest economic depression in our Nation's history. He was also our President and in fact the world leader during the time that two potential world dictators and tyrants, Hitler and Mussolini, led millions to believe that the world should be enslaved under their tyranny. It was through his dynamic leadership as a statesman that our country was restored to prosperity in the 1930's and it was through his wartime leadership that these two dictators and the warmongers in Japan were defeated and eliminated as a world threat to global liberty.

Older Members of this Congress vividly remember the dark days of March 4, 1932, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt assumed the leadership of this Nation. Fourteen million men and women were unemployed and the vast majority of our industries and business were either closed or operating on part time. Bankruptcies were armpant not only in the

July 30, 1959

16. ADJOURNED until Mon., Aug. 3. p. 13563

SENATE

17. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1960. Received and agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7040, but refused to recede from its amendment to increase financial contributions to States for civil defense from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000 (after rejecting a motion by Sen. Young, Ohio, 12 to 71, that the Senate recede). A further conference was requested and Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 13421-40, 13442, 13448-9. (See Digest 124 for a summary of items in the conference report of interest to this Department.)

18. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1960. The Appropriations Committee voted to report (but did not acutally report) with amendments this bill, H. R. 7978. p. D690

19. FOREIGN AFFAIRS; AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES. Ratified a protocol of amendment to the Convention on the Inter-American Institute of American Sciences. Sen. Mansfield stated that "The main purpose of the protocol is to reorganize and strengthen the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences as recommended by the Inter-American Committee of Presidential Representatives established at the meetings of American chiefs of state in Panama in 1956. To this end, the protocol reconstitutes the membership of the Institute's Board of Directors to include more agricultural experts and revises the method of financing the Institute to put it on the same basis as the Pan American Union." pp. 13444-7, 13452-3

20. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Both Houses received from the President the semiannual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480 during the period January 1 through June 30, 1959 (H. Doc. 206). pp. 13383, 13466
Sens. Keating, Scott, Javits, and McGee expressed their support for S. Con. Res. 66, to launch a Great White Fleet for the purpose of transporting food surpluses and other forms of aid to foreign nations. pp. 13400-1, 13402

21. BUDGET; PERSONNEL. Sen. Byrd, Va., as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, submitted and inserted a report on the Federal personnel in the executive branch, June and May 1959, and Pay in May and April 1959. pp. 13384-8

22. EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE; INFORMATION. Sen. Johnson inserted an article by Sen. Hennings, "Constitutional Law: The People's Right to Know," stating that a law was enacted in 1958 making it "clear" that the provisions of the U.S. Code allowing department heads to prescribe regulations for their departments, does not include withholding information from the public and that only in cases "where it is necessary in the effective exercise of another executive power and where divulgence of information would constitute a 'clear and present danger' ..." can information be withheld. pp. 13415-20

23. PURCHASING. Sen. Keating submitted amendments to S. 2391, the civil rights bill, including one with a section on a Commission on equal job opportunity under Government contracts. pp. 13392-6

24. TRANSPORTATION; TAXATION. Sen. Wiley inserted several letters from businessmen urging his support of legislation designed to limit the power of States to tax business engaged in interstate commerce. pp. 13412-3

Sen. Magnuson announced that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee planned to include Sen. Aiken's suggestion to study rural transportation in the overall transportation study.

Sen. Aiken stated that with this information he would not press for action on his resolution, S. Res. 151, to provide for a study of transportation in rural areas. p. 13421

25. RECLAMATION. Conferees were appointed on S. 994, to authorize the Interior Department to construct, operate, and maintain the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, and requested a conference. House conferees have not been appointed. pp. 13453-4

26. FORESTRY; RECREATION. Sen. Douglas stated that he hopes "The save-our-shorelines bill /S. 2460, to save and preserve, for the public use and benefit certain portions of shoreline areas of the United States/ which includes the Indiana Dunes, Padre Island, Tex., the Oregon Dunes, Cape Cod, and a number of other regions, may be speedily considered and passed." pp. 13458-9

27. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson announced that Congress would be in session until "we have an effective ... labor reform bill," that Congress planned to take up civil rights, housing and roads before adjournment, that in the near future it would take up S. 1748, extension of Public Law 480, S. 812, the Youth Conservation Corps bill, S. 1282, relating to acreage allotments for durum wheat, S. 747, to provide for the conveyance of certain lands known as the Des Plaines Public Hunting and Refuge Area to Illinos, S. 1855, to increase certain limitations in Alaska, several private bills (listed in Record) that probably on Mon. it will consider the supplemental appropriation bill (H. R. 7978), and that the Defense Department appropriation bill (H. R. 7454) would be considered as soon as the House acts on it. pp. 13454, 13458

28. ADJOURNED until Mon., Aug. 3. p. 13462

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

29. FOREIGN AID; SURPLUS FOOD. Extension of remarks of Sen. Johnson inserting a statement by Sen. Williams, N. J., and two editorials favoring the proposed "White Fleet" program. pp. A6582-3

30. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Smith, Miss., inserting a letter to the editor of Life magazine critical of their article on farm subsidies as being "replete with distortions regarding Federal farm programs designed to turn city people still more against farmers," and suggesting that farm subsidies be placed in their "proper perspective." p. A6584

Extension of remarks of Rep. Curtin inserting the results of a questionnaire sent to his constituents including the question of a "new farm plan." pp. A6602-3

Extension of remarks of Rep. Hosmer inserting additional extracts from letters favoring his proposed farm plan. pp. A6635-6

31. INTEREST RATES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Simpson criticizing the delay in the passage of legislation requested by the administration on interest rate ceilings. pp. A6589-91

Extension of remarks of Rep. Flynn stating "... let us vote against inflation by refusing to increase the interest rate on the national debt." p. A6607

My interest in the Veterans' Administration appropriation stems from the fact that the Veterans' Administration has indicated its intention to skeletonize the rehabilitation and educational portions of the facilities in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and Rhode Island. I have no authority to speak for New Hampshire, Rhode Island, or Maine, but I can speak for Vermont.

I have never received more vigorous protests over anything proposed by a Government agency since I have been in the Congress. What is proposed would not only inconvenience thousands of veterans, but it would also mean that while there would be an adviser and a skeleton outfit left in Vermont, all that could be done would be to give advice. All decisions would have to be made in Boston from that time on. We know what a delay that would cause.

The boys for whom we are speaking want to sign up for schools and for vocational training and other things, and a few days' time can make a great deal of difference. It may mean the difference between some of them going to school and not going to school.

The excuse given for making this move is that in all New England a saving of $90,000 can be made. I do not know how many thousand veterans would be inconvenienced, but certainly there would be an extremely small saving in relation to the inconvenience caused to the number of individuals involved, even if a saving were made. I do not believe the Veterans' Administration would save $90,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If my friend will yield to me, that is what the saving is estimated to be, but I have found, after years of experimenting and experience in this matter, that actually in the long run consolidations do not save money.

Mr. AIKEN. I fully expect that it would cost more money to have two offices than to have one in a State to deal with the same subject. The State facility now makes the final decision in regard to vocational training and the educational programs. I do not know of anyone, other than the statisticians in the Veterans' Administration office, who think any savings would be achieved, much less a saving of $90,000.

I have received vigorous protests from our State officials, from the veterans' organizations in the State, from the labor organizations, and from the industrial organizations, as well as from innumerable individuals. They have protested as vigorously as they know how the skeletonizing of a part of the veterans' facilities, and a very important part, and moving it out of the State.

It is said, "Oh, yes, we will take care of the people who might be laid off. We will take some of them to Boston. We will send one to Cleveland." Who wants to leave his home and go to Cleveland? These jobs would be filled with other people who were more amenable.

I do not wish to imply that Cleveland is not a good place, but if one's home is in Vermont, and one has lived there all his life, one does not want to go to Cleveland.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Who wants to leave Reno to go to Los Angeles?

Mr. AIKEN. It is likely that more people leave Los Angeles to go to Reno than leave Reno to go to Los Angeles. [Laughter.]

I appreciate to the full what the chairman of the subcommittee has said. I add that I had already prepared a bill for introduction, until I learned that the conference report was to come before the Senate today. I should like to read the bill, and, if necessary, I shall introduce it. The title of the bill is "To prohibit the delegation by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to employees in any State of supervisory authority over employees in any other State."

The bill reads:

> That, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no authority to exercise supervisory control over employees of the Veterans' Administration who are assigned to duty in any State shall be delegated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to, or otherwise conferred upon, any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration who is assigned to duty in any other State.

If necessary, I shall introduce the bill. As I said, I came to the Senate Chamber expecting to introduce it.

In view of what the Senator from Washington has stated, I think the Veterans' Administration would be very silly indeed to ignore his words.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator from Vermont, I must agree that the Veterans' Administration is in a little different category from an ordinary business operation of the Government. It is like the Post Office Department or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It was created to give service. Sometimes it may cost a little more to give service when there are a number of offices.

If we were to follow the same principle in regard to hospitals of the Veterans' Administration, we would build only one veterans' hospital.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We would not have hospitals all over the country, to which veterans can have easy access. Probably we could take care of the obligation of the Government more cheaply by having only one large hospital, in one large building.

Mr. AIKEN. I am fearful that some persons have that very thought in mind.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. We regard the skeletonizing of the local staffs in the handling of the educational and vocational training features of the Veterans' Administration program as simply a whittling process which will go on and on, until eventually we will find our veterans' facilities located in a half dozen of the larger cities of the land.

We know our veterans. They want their service at home. Some of them would rather die than go 1,000 miles from home to get treatment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Some professional statisticians whom we have in Washington think centralization would be better for the veterans.

Again I thank the Senator from Washington, because he has performed a most valuable service.

TRANSPORTATION IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. MAGNUSON. While the Senator from Vermont is present I should like to bring to his attention a resolution which he submitted. I think it contains a very fine suggestion. It was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It relates to transportation in rural areas, areas other than urban.

I took the matter up informally with some committee members. Although it is not specifically spelled out in the resolution, we have agreed the proposal would be a good addition to the transportation study. We intend to make it a part of the study.

Mr. AIKEN. I had the feeling that perhaps the committee already had sufficient authority to cover that point, but I submitted the resolution to give emphasis to the peculiar needs of the rural areas. I was sure the Senator from Washington, understanding the rural areas as he does, would incorporate it in his study if it were possible to do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We shall be glad to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems that it is included. Therefore I shall not ask for formal action on the resolution.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I understand that last night, when the Senator from Washington was discussing the conference report relating to the independent offices appropriation bill, he referred to the civilian defense features of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I wonder if the Senator will permit me to bring the conference report formally before the Senate. Then I shall be glad to yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill is ready for submission. If we are to have the yeas and nays when it is acted upon by the Senate, let us ask for them while there is a good attendance of Senators.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, for the information of the majority leader, I propose, after the conference report is submitted, to move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered one, relating to the civil defense feature. I should like to have the yeas and nays on that motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. At the proper time, if the Senator will remind us, and if Senators will remain in the Chamber, we can ask for the yeas and nays. The Senator from Ohio can make his motion as soon as the report is laid before the Senate and the Senator from Washing-

ton [Mr. MAGNUSON] completes his statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 23.)

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

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the conference report as submitted shows four amendments in disagreement, namely, amendments Nos. 1, 25, 29, and 39.

Amendment No. 1 restores $15 million to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, for Federal contributions. Three million dollars of the restoration is to provide the full amount of $13 million requested for continuing the program of matching State funds for the procurement of civil defense equipment, education, training, and other technical assistance. Twelve million dollars of the restoration is to implement Public Law 85-606 by matching funds of State and local governments for personnel and administrative costs.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that item?

Mr. MAGNUSON. First, let me finish my statement.

Mr. JAVITS. I simply wondered whether the Senator expected to ask the Senate to stand firm on that item and seek a new conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what I intend to do.

Amendment No. 25 inserts language to allow the use of receipts from the rotation of materials in the stockpile, and provides that materials need not be replaced in such rotation program if they are excess to stockpile requirements.

Amendment No. 29 provides that funds for the construction of public buildings shall be available to GSA for the acquisition of buildings and sites by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise.

Amendment No. 39 transfers $1,890,000 from the National Science Foundation to the Bureau of Public Roads for the construction of a mountain road up Kitt Peak in Arizona.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. I simply wanted to make the motion.

Mr. President, the House has concurred in Amendment No. 39, for the transfer of funds for the Kitt Peak road, and has amended amendment No. 25 to deny the use of rotating receipts in the stockpile, and amended amendment No. 29 to make public building funds also available for prepayment of purchase contracts. The House has insisted on its disagreement to amendment No. 1, the Federal contributions item for civil defense.

We now propose to clear 49 of the 50 amendments in the bill, and to go back for a further conference on the civil defense item in amendment No. 1.

Mr. President, I ask that the message from the House be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first order of business is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Is not the first order of procedure before the Senate to agree to the conference report, that is, that part as to which both Houses are in accord on all the items?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Florida will permit me to do so, I was about to ask that that be done.

Mr. HOLLAND. The second order of procedure is the amendments of the House in which the distinguished Senator from Washington is asking the Senate to concur. Then we shall hold for later disposition the amendment in dispute which is amendment No. 1 of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first order of procedure is for the Senate to agree to the conference report.

Without objection, the conference report is agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7040, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S., *July 23, 1959.*

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39 to the bill (H.R. 7040) entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes", and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: to the extent materials sold under section 3(d) of said act to prevent deterioration are excess to stockpile needs the replacement provisions of said section 3(d) shall not be mandatory: *Provided further*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

After the word "otherwise" in said amendment, insert: ", including prepayment of purchase contracts."

That the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 25 and 29.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The bill has now been cleared except for amendment No. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. This item includes $12 million for civil defense funds to meet the matching funds of the various States. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Are we not running out to some degree on our commitments to the local civil defense organizations by not providing many of the States with the matching funds to which they are entitled under this program?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. The Senator from Michigan may recall that last year this program was promoted by civil defense officers in order to secure local participation. Last year the program was not quite in shape at the time the Committee on Appropriations held hearings, but the civil defense group felt that they had gone far enough to ask for some money for grants-in-aid under the law. So an amendment to that effect was adopted on the Senate floor.

At the time we went to conference, it was pointed out that some of the States needed more money. About 16 or 17, as I recall, had not submitted to the Federal Civil Defense Administration the sort of master plan which the Administration had in mind. The other States had done so.

Second, the House committee had some misgivings about an item which they said would start some patronage in the local courthouses, city halls, or State capitols. But the Civil Defense Administration had told us all along that the grant-in-aid money would be given to persons who came under the merit system, which every State has in this particular matter.

The merit systems were established in the States under the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the National Institutes of Health. So the States have fairly good civil service merit systems. Some of the States do not call them that.

But now comes this appropriation. In every single State—all 50 of them—the plans have been approved. Every person who will be employed by the State government will be qualified under the same rules and regulations that exist for other Federal agenices which receive

grants-in-aid. It is usually the government of the State which acts, not the city or county government, although in some of the larger cities it may be the local authorities.

The Senate has passed this appropriation the second time. We went to conference this time with a long, complicated bill. There were many amendments and many disagreements. We finally agreed to every item but this one.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], other Senate members of the conference, and I felt that we were duty bound to stand by this amendment, because the Senate had said, not once, but twice, that it wanted this provision in the bill.

The more testimony we received, the more we became convinced that this procedure was the core of the whole matter, that unless we moved this program of civil defense out to the people, and unless they administered it themselves, we would never have any cooperation.

The fire chief in Seattle would not pay as much attention to an official coming from Washington, D.C., and telling him how to take care of the city of Seattle in case of an attack, as he would to a local person, one appointed by the Governor of the State, in handling the general plan of civil defense.

I suppose there is not a member of my subcommittee who does not agree that much money has been wasted in civil defense activities. That may be because we have not effectuated the plan. If the plan is to work at all, it will have to work as it is now proposed. The personnel in the Civil Defense Administration are very competent. I am certain that all Senators know the persons who are responsible for the operation of the program in the respective States. Those persons are also very competent.

The Federal Government will simply provide the grants-in-aid to the State or city, and the State or city will decide on the salaries which are to be paid. There is a liaison. If training is required, the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization can provide it, if the local authorities have the advantage of some equipment.

I would rather not have any civil defense unless it is along the line of the kind of plan I have mentioned in which the people have a local interest. No plan will ever work without local interest. It will never be made to work from the office of a group sitting in Washington or in Battle Creek, telling somebody in Denver what to do. That is why we were so anxious about this particular amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks today on the matter of civil defense, some tables connected therewith.

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

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

Program and financing

	1958 actual	1959 estimate	1960 estimate
Program by activities:			
1. Attack warning	$1,360,142	$1,135,000	$950,000
2. Communications	8,970,522	7,475,000	6,235,000
3. Public safety devices	454,672	378,000	385,000
4. Medical supplies and equipment	355,888	295,000	310,000
5. Education services	673,378	560,000	480,000
6. Mass care equipment	9,630	10,000	10,000
7. Engineering supplies and equipment	1,209,259	1,010,000	860,000
8. Construction and general equipment	3,716,819	3,107,097	3,340,000
9. Preservation of vital records		300,000	430,000
10. Personnel and administrative costs		(1)	12,000,000
Total obligations	16,750,310	14,270,097	25,000,000
Financing:			
Unobligated balance brought forward	−14,021,528	−14,270,097	
Unobligated balance carried forward	14,270,097		
Unobligated balance no longer available	1,121		
Appropriation	17,000,000	(1)	25,000,000

[1] Supplemental request for 1959 in amount of $3,000,000 for personnel and administrative costs is included in President's 1960 budget as item proposed for later transmission.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Federal contributions appropriation provides Federal funds to be matched with State and local funds for civil defense organizational supplies, equipment, personnel, and administrative costs. The stimulus thus presented through the matching fund device has greatly influenced the participation of the States and of a great many cities in securing organizational supplies and equipment for civil defense purposes. Through fiscal year 1959, Federal contributions of approximately $96.3 million will have been made to State and local governments for various civil defense matching-fund programs. Recent passage of Public Law 85-606, is expected to greatly increase the momentum of this program.

In addition to declaring that the responsibility for the civil defense of the United States is vested jointly in the Federal Government and the several States and their political subdivisions, Public Law 85-606 provides authorization for the Director to make financial contributions to the States for necessary and essential State and local civil defense personnel and administrative expenses.

This new authorization together with that already provided in Public Law 920 to make financial contributions to the States for civil defense materials and facilities makes it possible to present a coordinated program directed toward improving the civil defense capability of the Nation.

MATERIALS AND FACILITIES

Obligations under the contributions program amounted ot $16,750,000 in fiscal year 1958. This represents a sizable increase over past years. It also reflects increased participation by the States, who are attaining an operational capability not heretofore realized. This has occurred despite the difficulties States and local governments have encountered in their limited financial capability.

OCDM accepts applications for matching funds in the following major areas: (a) attack warning, (b) communications, (c) public safety, (d) medical supplies, (e) education, (f) mass care, (g) engineering supplies and equipment, (h) construction and general equipment, (i) preservation of vital records.

Changes in concepts caused by advanced instruments of warfare have necessitated a change in the criteria established for the procurement of many items. For example: It is now desirable to permit the construction of emergency sites of government within the so-called aiming area boundary. Increased blast resistance construction is required but this is offset by the fact that the facility is accessible with only minutes of warning time.

Items of personal equipment (authorized by Public Law 85-606), duplication and storage of vital records, and the cost of rehabilitation of surplus property have recently been made eligible for matching funds.

PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Federal support for personnel and administration to States and local governments will provide the additional personnel required by these governments to plan and carry out measures necessary for survival. Operational plans at each echelon of government coordinated with the national plan are essential.

The Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives said in its report (No. 694, 85th Cong.), "With a few exceptions the States and their political subdivisions have felt it impossible to support and maintain, by themselves, such a civil defense staff."

To assist the States and to assure maximum utilization of funds available under Public Law 85-606, regulations and guidance material have been prepared by OCDM in accord with the provisions of the law.

The States and political subdivisions are prepared to cooperate with the Federal Government in the development of unified civil defense plans.

JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATE

Attack warning, $950,000: The attack warning program consists of: (1) Warning devices, (2) interior warning systems, (3) voice sound equipment, and (4) recurring costs and maintenance of devices and control equipment.

To provide the Nation with adequate warning of attack is one of the most important functions of the OCDM. Research into the development of more efficient devices is continually in progress. As improved equipment is introduced it is made available for matching funds. The major portion of the past year's obligations under this activity was spent in public outdoor warning systems. Other substantial amounts were spent on interior warning systems for schools, hospitals, and public buildings; for the recurring costs of the alerting and control circuits and for voice sound systems.

Communications, $6,235,000: The communications program is designed to assist the States and local governments in establishing control centers, procuring adequate telephone and radio equipment, emergency power supplies for communications facilities,

and local communications systems to provide channels for command, control, and coordination. These systems are a vital requirement to effect mobilization, movement, mobile support, fallout intelligence, rehabilitation, and to maintain continuity of government during an emergency.

Public safety services, $385,000: Funds appropriated under this heading are to provide the materials and equipment required for the development of a nationwide uniformly equipped civil defense auxiliary. Items purchased from these funds include rescue trucks and equipment, police uniforms, operational equipment, and helicopters used for aerial reconnaissance, traffic control, etc.

Medical supplies and equipment, $310,000: The medical supplies and equipment program is designed to encourage States and localities to develop their own organizations and facilities for (*a*) casualty care, (*b*) protective health services, including communicable disease controls and chemical and biological warfare defense, (*c*) radiological warfare defense, and (*d*) emergency sanitation. Casualty care organizations and facilities include first-aid stations, emergency treatment centers, emergency hospitals, and reserve supplies for existing hospitals. Supplies include blood collection equipment, blood plasma and blood plasma expanders.

Education services, $480,000: States and political subdivisions are developing programs of training and education and public information designed to implement their emergency plans.

Federal funds are made available in training and education for conducting courses for leaders in skills which are essential to the civil defense program; for purchasing capital items of training equipment needed in the training courses; and for conducting training test exercises to determine operational capability of Government in emergency.

Funds are also made available in public information for the promotion of civil defense activities and to disseminate information on individual and community survival as related to a particular civil defense condition.

Considerable progress has been made in the initiation and conduct of programs in leadership and skills, training, and informing and educating the public. Continued participation by States and localities is anticipated in these programs during fiscal year 1960 because of the more definitive directions coming from operational survival plans. Concerted efforts will be made to inform and educate the public with the contents of these plans and to train them in the skills needed for implementation.

Emphasis will be placed on the testing of the operational capabilities of Government through training exercises. OCDM will encourage States and localities to conduct exercises to test their plans and also to participate in national exercises to test the national plan.

Mass care equipment, $10,000: The objective of this program is to provide assistance to State and local governments in procuring basic items of supply and equipment for the emergency feeding and housing and general welfare of disaster victims. Since the equipment procured under this program is costly and limited in use and expensive to store, it has been difficult to encourage the States and local communities to participate.

Engineering, supplies, and equipment, $860,000: Under this program funds are provided for the purchase of equipment to supply emergency electrical power and safe water supplies. Such equipment includes generating sets, water purification equipment, portable water pumping equipment, lightweight quick coupling pipes and numerous other items which can be quickly pressed into service to provide essential facilities during emergencies.

Funds are also available under this program for civil defense highway signs, road markers, and minimum modification of traffic control systems to provide for a maximum movement of vehicles during an emergency.

Construction and general equipment, $3,340,000: Funds under this activity are to provide financial assistance for the construction or protected facilities (control centers), from which governments may continue to operate during an emergency, and for the construction of training centers. A recent change in the criteria established for the construction of control centers now permits their location within the aiming area boundary.

Preservation of vital records, $430,000: The preservation of essential records is an integral part of the continuity of government program, which is designed, in the event of attack, to preserve leadership and authority, to preserve State and local government, and to strengthen State and local emergency operations. The classification "essential" is extended to those records which are required to:

1. Protect the rights and interests of the individual,
2. Conduct operations of government during an emergency, and
3. Reestablish normal governmentive functions and to protect the rights and interests of governments.

Records preservation, as a major program objective, will be stimulated through the distribution of informational materials, technical assistance by OCDM regional staff and financial assistance through Federal matching contributions. State and local governments will be afforded guidelines for selecting and protecting records vital to continuity of government. Governments will be eligible for matching Federal contributions when they preserve records determined to be essential to emergency operations in a manner insuring availability when and where needed, and by methods providing economical protection and utilization with the necessary degree of record permanence.

Personnel and administration costs, $12,000,000: Public Law 85–606 provides authority for making Federal contributions of not to exceed one-half of the total cost of necessary and essential State and local civil defense personnel and administrative expenses. These contributions will be made on the basis of approved plans for civil defense of the States which are consistent with the national plan for civil defense mobilization.

As was pointed out in the House report on H.R. 7576, the task of developing an adequate civil defense capability at State and local levels requires a staff of experienced, trained, full-time specialists. Through this program the Federal Government will provide a stimulus to State and local efforts. In this way the principles of joint responsibility enunciated in the law will be realized.

Meetings with State and local officials were conducted in order to determine the most acceptable and desirable methods for implementation of this legislation. Items discussed during these meetings included: (1) Functional areas represented, (2) minimum staffing required to carry out responsibilities, (3) number of civil defense employees now available at the various levels of government, and (4) availability of State and local funds to support this program. A list of functions inherent in a national program was prepared and discussed. It was further agreed that the emphasis to be given individual functions would have to vary depending on such factors as terrain, climate, geographic location, etc.

Mr. McNAMARA. Will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator from Washington indicates that in the matter of civil defense we did have a commitment with the people at various local levels, whether it be State or city, and that they were encouraged to set up local groups to cooperate in their areas.

They have now spent their money. They have acted on the basis of the promise from Congress that they were to have matching funds. How can we run out on them at this point?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I recognize that there are a great number of cities, although it is mainly States, which have done just that. I know my State has. It has set up an organization under a very fine man.

Mr. McNAMARA. We have General Dougherty in Detroit. He set up an organization on the strength of the commitments from the Federal Government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In my State the director happens to be Colonel Ralls who, as Senators may recall, was head of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. He is trying to get the cooperation of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I would rather cut the appropriation for this agency in half than to cut this, I will not say little item, because $15 million is not small, although it is in comparison with the amount which is being spent nationwide, much of which, I must agree with my friend from Ohio, is being wasted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator may recall that last year I offered an amendment in the Senate providing for the expenditure of $4 million at that time. The Senate adopted its amendment, but it was lost in conference.

Congress enacted Public Law 85–606, which sets up the matching formula. As has been indicated, the States and the localities need the program of expanded training.

I for one feel that the civil defense program goes much farther than some persons seem to think it goes. Let me say that in my State civil defense has saved the people millions of dollars, because those enrolled in it go into action when disasters occur. They have proven themselves efficient in such matters as handling large crowds of people at times when there have been community activities on a large scale.

From the standpoint of emergencies and disasters, exclusive of war, civil defense saves the taxpayers millions of dollars. The volunteers are not paid. What is more, it seems to me such service is a fundamental of good community organization, and I for one think that $12 million is a very, very small sum of money for a Nation of 175 or 180 million people, and the $12 million, of course, is matched by the States.

In our State the State director of civil defense is Col. Hubert Schon, an outstanding man, who has rendered distinguished service. In the city of Minneapolis, the director is Walter P. Halsted, who is nationally recognized as one of the eminent authorities in the field of civil defense organization and administration.

I have received a number of telegrams from my home State of Minnesota, from the Mayor of St. Paul, the Mayor of Minneapolis, and the Governor of the State. I have other messages, all urging the Senate to support the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and his subcommittee to uphold the Senate amendment in the conference. So I hope that will be done.

I went to some length to prepare a statement on this subject. It was my privilege to address a civil defense meeting in New York City a year ago. I returned just 2 weeks ago from the U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was the Senator's amendment that resulted in this item being included last year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might say to the Senator, too, that we should consider that Public Law 85-606 makes civil defense a joint responsibility of the States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The reason for that is, as my friend the Senator from Ohio has said on this issue, that we are wasting a lot of money. There is no question about that. But our proposal, I think, furnishes the only hope to make civil defense effective. On top of that, we have found in the past that some of the well-trained local bodies have been pretty effective when local disasters occurred.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what I mean. In fact, within the past year in my State we have had to use our civil defense organization two or three times in great emergencies.

I wish to add a word about waste. I suppose some money has been wasted, but I recall reading a few years ago about a Navy contract for motors for airplanes, the cost running into the hundreds of millions of dollars, motors which, by the time they were produced, were useless, outdated. Where they are now I do not know. I suppose they are being stored in some toy store somewhere. I did not hear one word of complaint about that. Somebody says, "Well, we miscalculated." We can also miscalculate a little bit on civil defense.

One of the best things we have in this country today, in terms of keeping the American people alerted to their responsibilities, is the civil defense organization. Without civil defense in our State, our State budget would have to be substantially expanded, because we need this kind of community organization to take care of our community needs. I hope that the recommendations of the Senator from Washington will be supported.

Mr. President, a week ago I reported on my attendance at the 1959 conference of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. As a former mayor of Minneapolis, I was invited to participate.

One resolution unanimously adopted by the 400 mayors of our larger cities attending the conference dealt specifically with the stand the Senate and its conferees have taken on the Federal contributions for State and local civil defense agencies which is contained in the independent offices appropriation bill, H.R. 7040, now before us.

The mayors, as did the Governors' Special Civil Defense Committee, headed by Governor Rockefeller, of New York, urged that Congress appropriate the funds for civil defense purposes previously authorized by Congress when it unanimously adopted Public Law 85-606. Governors, mayors, and county commissioners, as well as all State and local civil defense directors, took our unanimous passage of Public Law 85-606 seriously. They expect the matching funds needed to implement it.

I point out most emphatically that the heart of the civil defense program embraces the State and local governments. It takes all governmental units, Federal, State, and local to do this job—which is to protect America—national survival in other words. What is at stake is Federal support of a small, professional staff in the States and localities which will rally and coordinate the support of all governmental personnel and resources—all governmental departments and functions—at the State and local level.

Twelve million is a small price to pay to coordinate and direct the resources of our State and local governments, their personnel and some 4 million volunteers. The alternative is outright Federalization at a probable cost of $500 million, or more.

Canada has recently established an OCDM to coordinate Dominion and Provincial functions with most of the operational functions turned over to the military. The first table of organization calls for 40,000 military to do the job now being done in the United States by less than 2,000 State and local civil defense personnel—the "city hallers" referred to by the House subcommittee chairman. Canada has one-twelfth our population. If we should follow in Canada's footsteps and militarize or federalize civil defense, we can look forward to 500,000 military and Federal personnel doing the job at a cost of billions. Let us be sensible.

Let me summarize what I said last August when the Senate stood firm on this issue. I pointed out then that in passing Public Law 85-606, the Senate took one of the most forward steps in nonmilitary defense in 8 years. Among other things, the bill authorized the expenditure of Federal matching funds of not more than 50 percent toward the cost of personnel and administrative expenses of State civil defense employees.

As the senior Senator from Massachusetts pointed out at the time of consideration of the bill, civil defense is lagging in many States. In more than three-fourths of them there are less than 12 full-time civil defense employees. He pointed out quite clearly that no matter how many civil defense volunteers there might be, the services of these men and women may not be used effectively without a strong nucleus of trained leaders, professional people, available for civil defense or national disaster relief activities. The bill authorized a maximum of $25 million appropriations in any single year. President Eisenhower recommended $12 million for this program for fiscal year 1960.

In its report last August on the supplemental appropriation bill, 1959, the Senate Committee on Appropriations said that the appropriations for this purpose should await "the approval of State plans." However, to start the program, the Senate recommended an appropriation of $4 million. This item was lost in conference when the Senate acceded to the House wishes.

Please note now the following paragraphs from the Senate report on fiscal year 1960 appropriation:

EXCERPT FROM SENATE REPORT, OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION, FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION:

The committee recommends the restoration of $15 million to provide the full budget estimate of $25 million for Federal contributions. Of this restoration, $3 million is to provide the full amount requested for continuing the program of matching State funds for the procurement of civil defense equipment, education, training and other technical assistance, and $12 million is to implement Public Law 85-606 by matching funds of State and local governments for personnel and administrative costs.

As to this new program, enacted on August 8, 1958, the committee is advised that each State has a civil defense agency in being, that each State has submitted a plan which has been approved as in accord with the national plan, and that each State has a civil service system or a joint merit system under standards similar to those now participated in by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Department of Labor. The committee understands that if such merit standards are not complied with, the law would prohibit the matching of funds in that event.

The committee is assured that these funds are required in order to build a workable nonmilitary defense program for the Nation, and trusts that the quality of the program will warrant such expenditure.

The administration has completely endorsed the position of the Senate conferees.

In my own State our Minneapolis director, Walter Halstead, is the president of the U.S. Civil Defense Council, which is composed of 1,000 county and city civil defense directors. The council has unanimously supported this item. If you have not heard from your mayor or county commissioner—you will, because the U.S. Civil Defense Council, the National Association of County Officials, and the Governors' conference think the Federal Government—our National Government—should financially support nonmilitary defense. This is a burning issue in every State, county, and city in the land. Please don't forget it.

Support for this program has come from my city director, my Governor, who has served as a member of the Governors' Civil Defense Committee, once headed by Governor Harriman and now chaired by Governor Rockefeller, my State director, Col. Hubert Schon, and Mayor Peterson, of Minneapolis. This is a bipartisan issue.

Those who know—our Armed Services Committees, Representatives Carl Durham and Chet Holifield, Senator Russell, Senator Kefauver, the President, the Gaither report, the Rockefeller Bros. report, General Sarnoff, Senator Magnuson, and the committee—all have urged approval of this proposal.

We must support the Senate position. Senator MAGNUSON has taken a position, as have all the conferees, and they deserve our support. If we do not provide Federal financial support as authorized by Public Law 85-606 and by the Senate on August 23 last year, as well as when the Senate enacted Public Law 85-606 on July 23, 1958, we will break faith with Governors, mayors, and State and local civil defense directors.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD telegrams which I have received, a statement I made before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations, and a fact sheet in regard to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

There being no objection, the telegrams, the statement, and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN., *July 27, 1959.*

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senator from Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I urge you to again support Senator MAGNUSON's conference committee's recommendation relative to $12 million OCDM administrative matching funds which I understand will be voted on again tomorrow.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Governor.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *July 27, 1959.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Would appreciate your continued support on the implementation Public Law 85-606.

JOSEPH E. DILLON.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *July 27, 1959.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The action of the House in supporting the stand taken by Representative THOMAS to delete the $12 million for OCDM administrative matching funds is of grave concern to all State, county, and municipal officials. All levels of government in Minnesota are looking to you for continued leadership and support to provide that assistance that can only come from the Federal Government. Your continued effort in support of Senator MAGNUSON's conference committee's recommendation to sustain the $12 million when it comes before the Senate on Tuesday July 28 is solicited.

H. A. SCHNO,
State Director, Department of Minnesota Civil Defense.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *July 23, 1958.*

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

The 1958 act making civil defense Federal responsibility instead of solely State and local will be tremendous step toward effective national defense if implemented by Federal matching funds for administration. City governments of United States strongly urge you support Senate conferees favoring $12 million for this purpose in H.R. 7040.

A. J. CELEBREZZE,
President, American Municipal Association, Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *July 24, 1959.*

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I understand the conference committee on OCDM appropriations to implement Public Law 85-606 is deadlocked. Please contact Senate members on conference committee and request they hold firm for this assistance for State, county, and municipal civil defense.

H. A. SCHON,
Director of Civil Defense, State of Minnesota.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND SENATOR EUGENE MCCARTHY, BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE, MAY 1959, IN SUPPORT OF ADEQUATE APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for this opportunity to present this statement in support of the requested appropriation for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. I am sure you are aware of my tremendous insterest in civil defense and of my efforts to include funds for this purpose in the supplemental appropriations bill for 1959. I am still interested in this matter, and I shall continue to press for an adequate civil defense program. By adequate I mean a program capable of realistically defending the civilian population against the horrors of a thermo-nuclear deluge.

A big stride toward realizing this goal was taken last year in the reorganization of OCDM, the adoption of the national plan, and the passage of Public Law 85-606 which set up the program of Federal matching contributions for State and local civil defense units.

The necessity for planning for national survival through military and civil defense was brought clearly into focus by the advent of thermo-nuclear weapons capable of showering catastrophic destruction upon any part of the earth at any time. We are cognizant of the fact that it is now possible for powerful nations to destroy each other without either gaining any semblance of a victory.

Faced, as we are, with the dilemma of destruction or survival in a thermo-nuclear holocaust, I cannot help but be deeply concerned about efforts to delete from the independent offices appropriations bill for 1960 the President's proposed $12 million appropriation to assist State and local civil defense agencies in meeting personnel and administrative expenses. I am concerned because this proposal seeks to establish an adequate civil defense program. Also, I am disturbed by charges that have been leveled at this aspect of the OCDM program. I cannot believe that a Federal contributions program such as that proposed could be wasteful or could create an independent bureaucracy.

The facts which are at my disposal refute such charges. The requested appropriations would provide qualified personnel to carry out the important jobs involved in civil defense planning. Inadequate staffing is presently one of the biggest headaches of our civil defense program.

It is my understanding that Federal matching funds would be allocated to State civil defense directors on the basis of the vulnerability of the target areas and the responsibility of the support areas involved. Funds would be allocated only after local directors have indicated by written plan (1) the purposes and responsibilities of any persons to be hired or already hired, (2) that these persons are qualified to hold their respective jobs, and (3) that the proposed civil defense program is in accordance with the State and national plan for survival and that the proposed program will implement existing State and national plans for survival. If local directors do not live up to these qualifications, Federal funds would be withdrawn by State and Federal authorities.

It is my firm belief that these qualifications would result in standardization of the civil defense program on a national level, thereby making the program more efficient and more effective. I cannot see waste in such a program; neither can I see where the proposed Federal-State-local coordination would lead to independent bureaucracy.

These are the immediate and surface facts, Mr. Chairman. I shall go further. As planned, the newly initiated program would eliminate any evils, kinks or bugs in the program. This must be done if there is ever to be a really effective civil defense program capable of withstanding the devastation of a nuclear attack.

In my opinion, the intent of Congress in enacting this program of Federal contributions to State and local civil defense organizations for administrative expenses was to eliminate impediments and to create an atmosphere in which our civil defense program can attain its peak effectiveness.

For every dollar the Federal Government spends under this matching grant program, a civilian dollar is spent. If the proposed $12 million Federal grant is considered wasteful, then, by the same reasoning, we must also consider the proposed $12 million civilian contribution as wasteful. Certainly this is not the case.

Civil defense officials are definitely in favor of stepping up the program from Federal, State, and local standpoints. But what is more indicative of the value of this program and of the attitude toward it is that the individual citizens involved in the actual work of civil defense also favor such a program step-up. This is evident in the fact that they are willing to spend their time, money and to dedicate themselves unselfishly to the national cause of civil defense. One civil defense director in my State told me recently: "We have many people driving as much as 120 miles in an evening to attend these training sessions."

I made this point to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a game someone is playing, nor is it a scheme to swindle the Federal Government out of money. This is serious work. Civil defense participants realize that what they are doing today may well affect national survival tomorrow.

How long can this wholesome attitude be expected to last under the present conditions of the program?

Without increased Federal participation and assistance, I am afraid that local participation in civil defense will decline and that maybe we will be faced ultimately with the problem of trying to develop a Federal civil defense force.

I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that there is a feeling some local civil defense directors that if the Federal Government does not consider civil defense necessary, why should they assume entire responsibility. I submit that this is not the attitude of a shirker. This is the attitude of a person who, having given his all for the team, feels down and out because he realizes that the team only made a token effort. One man does not make up a team; local participation is only a part of civil defense.

This matching grant program could be a positive indication of the role the Federal Government intends to play in civil defense, and I am sure that this program would prompt an equally positive attitude from local authorities.

Mr. Chairman, civil defense programs at all levels of government in Minnesota require the assistance that is projected in the proposed appropriation. Without it, I know that many proposed activities will be nipped in the bud and that some programs will be curtailed.

Several months ago, Mr. H. A. Schon, director of civil defense for the State of Minnesota, reported to OCDM that Minnesota has 71 political subdivisions which would participate under the matching funds pro-

gram. He also reported that it is anticipated that by July 1960 the number of participants would include 87 counties and 95 towns.

Briefly, Mr. Chairman, this new assistance would enable us to: continue planning, perfect organization, provide training on the State and local levels. In order to undertake these and many more tasks in our civil defense program, it is imperative that adequate equipment and adequate, full time, trained staff workers be on hand.

Despite its limited budgets, OCDM has assisted the State of Minnesota and its political subdivisions as best it could. This assistance has resulted in great dividends, but it has not been sufficient. The program must be accelerated now and much more must be done within the next few months if we are to adequately protect the people of Minnesota.

I realize that although Federal assistance must be maximized, it should not be a substitute for local responsibilities. But without adequate Federal assistance, the localities cannot be expected to expand their efforts. It is sufficiently clear to me that sincere efforts have been put forward by civil defense agencies and that these agencies have demonstrated their willingness to institute and perpetuate realistic civil defense programs.

In view of present world situations, I am convinced that we cannot afford to curtail funds either for military defense or civil defense because our national survival is so greatly dependent upon both of these programs.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee on Appropriations to favorably report an appropriation in the amount requested in the budget for OCDM. I sincerely hope that each aspect of the OCDM program, including the provisions for Federal matching grants for equipment and personnel and administrative costs, will be fully implemented.

Thank you.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION—FACT SHEET

On August 8, 1958, the President signed Public Law 85-606, which, for the first time, establishes civil defense as a joint responsibility of the Federal, State, and local governments. The law authorized the expenditure annually of $62.3 million. However, the President requested only $20.8 million for fiscal year 1960, of which $12 million would be for sharing the administrative costs of civil defense with State and local governments. The only item now in controversy pertains to this item.

The House reduced OCDM's overall requests for fiscal year 1960 from $74,970,000 to $43,735,000—a cut of more than 40 percent. The Senate restored $16 million of the $31,235,000 House cut. The $12 million for matching the administrative and personnel costs of State and local civil defense was denied by the House, and but $1.5 million was authorized for donation of radiological instruments to the States. Funds for research were reduced, and the $5.5 million to educate the public on the effects of radiological fallout was denied. Despite the authorization set forth in Public Law 85-606, the House refused to appropriate funds to carry out the intent of the act which is to strengthen civil defense at the State and local level by providing Federal financial help for personnel and administrative costs.

Public Law 85-606, and the appropriations to support it have the endorsement of the Governors' Conference, Mayors' Conference, American Municipal Association, the National Association of County Officials, and many other organizations, including the AFL-CIO. For civil defense to be effective it must be strengthened at the State and local levels. For that reason it is necessary that Congress provide the funds requested. The alternative is a complete Federal civil defense and disaster relief program at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars.

The Senate Independent Offices Appropriations Committee restored $15 million cut by the House at the hearing on the OCDM budget on May 25. These appropriations are vital for the strengthening of the Nation's civil defense. Of this amount $12 million was for administrative matching.

The administration favors the matching of Federal funds with the State and local governments in order to strengthen civil defense.

Please let me cite some history. The Senate will recall that last year the Congress passed and the President approved Public Law 85-606, to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States for civil defense personnel and administrative expenses.

Public Law 85-606, was passed for the express purpose of modernizing and strengthening the State and local civil defense organizations throughout the country. Federal financial contributions were authorized to enable the States and cities to increase their capability to effectively carry out their responsibilities in a war emergency. The primary means of accomplishing this was the authority contained in the act to permit the Federal Government to share expenses with State and local governments for the personnel and administrative costs of civil defense which had heretofore been prohibited by the terms of then existing law.

Authority for assisting the States and cities in this most vital activity was recommended by the administration as well as by all serious students of the question of the organization and operation of civil defense in our country. Notable among these was the specific recommendation of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—the Kestnbaum committee—that the Federal Government increase its financial participation in the personnel and administrative costs of civil defense at the State and local level. The Governors' Conference for the past 3 years has unanimously supported such a program.

It is essential that the Congress demonstrate to the State and local governments, and through these local governments to the public at large, its increased support of the vital programs of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The most effective fashion in which the Congress can do this is by appropriating the funds to assist in the support of civil defense at the State and local level. This is the place where the demonstrated support of the Congress is made known to the citizen.

I am convinced that an effective civil defense program makes an important contribution to our overall defense posture and will have a material bearing upon the position of strength from which the United States can effectively conduct its affairs at the foreign relations conference tables.

A great many Members of the Senate have received messages from persons in State and local civil defense affairs urging the support and approval of the Congress of appropriations for this purpose. Members of the Senate should keep faith with those dedicated State and local civil defense workers—and with the public itself—when the Congress approves and enacts the authorizing legislation for the conduct of the program and then fails to provide the money to support it.

The authorizing legislation contained in Public Law 85-606 was approved in August 1958. The Congress has denied supplemental appropriations for the implementation of the program. Last year the reason given for denying funds was that the States had not all submitted their plans required by the terms of the authorizing legislation. All States have now submitted to the OCDM approvable plans according to the recent testimony of Gov. Leo A. Hoegh, Director, OCDM, to the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Another reason given was that no assurance appeared that political consideration, in the appointment of State and local employees would not take precedence over such factors as competency and general qualifications. In this connection Governor Hoegh indicated to both committees considering this matter that State civil defense employees who were to be supported in part by Federal funds from this appropriation were required by the terms of the authorizing legislation and OCDM regulations to be appointed under, and covered by, an approved merit system. All the States submitting plans have indicated compliance with this requirement. I hasten to point out that this does not mean that the Federal Government can tell the States or their political subdivisions that a certain person must be placed in a job. It means rather that the person selected by the State or political subdivision must meet the qualification prescribed by the State Merit System.

The Senate should sustain the members of its conference committee which restored funds for financial contributions for State and local civil defense personnel and administrative expenses.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that data I have had collected with reference to Federal expenditures for civil defense be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

The 85th Congress appropriated $45,285,000[1] for civil defense expenditures for fiscal 1959. This included $2,785,000 for the Office of Defense Mobilization which was merged with the Federal Civil Defense Administra-

[1] In addition, FCDA had $14,270,000 available in unobligated funds for contributions to States on a matching basis at the beginning of fiscal 1959. Thus, total funds available for fiscal 1959 amounted to $59,555,000.

tion July 1, 1958, as indicated in the following table:

1959 appropriations for civil defense

Appropriations of $45,285,000 were made by Congress for operations of civil defense programs during fiscal year 1959 as follows:

Program:	*Amount*
Salaries and expenses	$23, 285, 000
Research and development	2, 000, 000
Emergency supplies and equipment	20, 000, 000
Total appropriations	45, 285, 000

The above consists of appropriations made to:

FCDA, Public Law 85–844	$38, 500, 000
ODM,[1] Public Law 85–468	2, 285, 000
OCDM (supplemental), Public Law 85–766	4, 500, 000
Total	45, 285, 000

[1] Federal Civil Defense Administration and Office of Defense Mobilization were merged to form the Office of Civilian and Defense Mobilization by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958, effective July 1, 1958.

In fiscal 1958, the Congress appropriated $41,514,000 for civil defense (including ODM activities); for fiscal 1957, $95,760,000 and for fiscal 1956, $70,900,000.

Since enactment of the Civil Defense Act of 1950, FCDA and ODM, now OCDM, have requested $2,195,277,000. They have been granted $509,460,250, or 23.2 percent of the funds requested as the following table reveals:

Funds appropriated for civil defense, 1951–59

Fiscal year	Funds requested	Funds appropriated	Percent
1951	$403, 000, 000	$33, 969, 000	8. 4
1952	537, 000, 000	77, 021, 250	14. 3
1953	601, 550, 000	44, 250, 000	7. 4
1954	153, 250, 000	49, 275, 000	32. 2
1955	88, 511, 000	51, 486, 000	58. 2
1956	78, 170, 000	70, 900, 000	90. 7
1957	125, 483, 000	95, 760, 000	76. 3
1958	132, 380, 000	41, 514, 000	31. 4
1959	76, 473, 000	45, 285, 000	59. 2
Total	2, 195, 277, 000	509, 460, 250	23. 2

Of the total appropriated to date, 46.6 was for stockpiling of emergency supplies, 24.7 for administrative expenses, 22.8 for contributions to States and 1.2 for civil defense functions delegated to other Federal agencies.

STATE EXPENDITURES FOR CIVIL DEFENSE

In fiscal 1958, the States spent an estimated $7,603,000 for civil defense. Per capita expenditures ranged from 26 cents in Delaware to 0.006 of a cent in South Carolina for a national average of 0.045 cent.[1] Mississippi reported no expenditures in fiscal 1958, but 0.012 of a cent in 1957. The following table shows expenditures by State governments for fiscal 1957 and 1958:

State	Total expenditures (thousands of dollars)		Per capita expenditures	
	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1957	Fiscal year 1958	Fiscal year 1957
All States	$7, 603	$9, 044	$0. 045	$0. 053
Alabama	61	41	.019	.013
Arizona	20	20	.017	.018
Arkansas	84	82	.047	.046
California	1, 232	1, 286	.089	.092
Colorado	46	42	.028	.025
Connecticut	287	426	.127	.189
Delaware	115	73	.264	.167
Florida	40	37	.010	.009
Georgia	200	200	.053	.053
Idaho	16	10	.025	.016
Illinois	109	124	.011	.013
Indiana	79	62	.017	.014
Iowa	27	27	.010	.010
Kansas	25	33	.012	.015
Kentucky	45	31	.011	.010
Louisiana	244	144	.079	.047
Maine	236	206	.250	.218
Maryland	152	354	.053	.122
Massachusetts	651	611	.134	.126
Michigan	193	182	.025	.023
Minnesota	152	308	.046	.093
Mississippi	0	26	-------	.012
Missouri	50	67	.012	.016
Montana	21	21	.032	.032
Nebraska	17	17	.011	.012
Nevada	16	15	.060	.056
New Hampshire	36	37	.063	.065
New Jersey	260	432	.046	.077
New Mexico	10	11	.012	.013
New York	1, 464	1, 536	.092	.097
North Carolina	228	322	.051	.072
North Dakota	17	53	.026	.082
Ohio	135	425	.015	.046
Oklahoma	75	28	.033	.012
Oregon	130	229	.073	.129
Pennsylvania	432	430	.039	.039
Rhode Island	62	38	.072	.044
South Carolina	14	15	.006	.006
South Dakota	14	11	.020	.016
Tennessee	122	155	.035	.045
Texas	103	150	.011	.016
Utah	30	41	.035	.048
Vermont	31	28	.083	.074
Virginia	76	97	.020	.026
Washington	135	164	.050	.060
West Virginia	30	23	.015	.012
Wisconsin	58	349	.015	.090
Wyoming	23	25	.072	.079

[1] Federal expenditures for civil defense in fiscal 1958 amount to 0.24 cent per capita.

Source: Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

CIVIL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES OF MAJOR CITIES

The 18 major cities in the United States having a population of more than 500,000 in 1950 expended $4,311,000 for civil defense in fiscal 1958, as indicated by the following table. Average per capita expenditure was 0.15 cent.

City	Fiscal year 1958 expenditures	
	Total	Per capita
Baltimore	$254, 000	$0. 268
Boston	66, 000	. 083
Buffalo	[1] 237, 000	[1] . 263
Chicago	162, 000	. 045
Cincinnati	[1] 160, 000	[1] . 221
Cleveland	120, 000	. 132
Detroit	450, 000	. 243
Houston	69, 000	. 116
Los Angeles	434, 000	. 220
Milwaukee	223, 000	. 349
Minneapolis	89, 000	. 170
New Orleans	115, 000	. 201
New York	1, 383, 000	. 175
Philadelphia	124, 000	. 060
Pittsburgh	20, 000	. 030
San Francisco	247, 000	. 319
St. Louis	72, 000	. 085
Washington, D.C.	86, 000	. 107
Total	4, 311, 000	[2] . 159

[1] This figure represents combined city-county expenditures.
[2] Average.

Source: Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I take the floor to make a motion which has priority over the pending motion, and I propose to speak rather briefly in support of my motion.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield, without losing the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Senator's motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We can proceed with the discussion of the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So that a vote against the motion would be in support of the position of the Senate conferees in the matter of the restoration of the amount and a vote for the motion would be to accept the position of the House.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. May I say, Mr. President, that I agree with my friend, the distinguished Senator from Washington, and may I say also that it had been my intention to ask for the yeas and nays upon my motion that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1. I am pleased that the Senator from Washington has made that request, which has been granted. There is a clearcut issue presented here.

May I say that I am asking for the yeas and nays on this motion, because this presents the matter directly before the Senate.

Those who vote "yea" vote in favor of eliminating $15 million from the independent offices appropriation bill which is allocated for civil defense, $12 million of that for personnel to add to the already bloated bureaucracy of some 1,800 Federal officials in the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and $3 million for equipment. I shall speak on both of those items.

Quite by coincidence, Mr. President, shortly before I left my office to come to the Senate Chamber this noon, I received a telephone call from Mayor Wilson G. Stapleton, of the city of Shaker Heights, Ohio. Mayor Stapleton is a dean of the Cleveland Marshall Law School. He is also the mayor of Shaker Heights; and he is a leading member, in the State of Ohio, of the Grand Old Party, of which I am not a member. The city of Shaker Heights is a municipality near Cleveland, and has a population of approximately 38,000.

Mayor Stapleton telephoned me, and stated that he was in full accord with my views on civil defense. He stated that during the past 3 years his city of Shaker Heights, Ohio, has contributed $6,300 to civil defense, which the Federal Government has matched.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair).

Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I should like to complete my statement on this point, because in a way I am adverting to a statement which the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] made about the Federal Government's running out on a commitment to local governments.

Mayor Stapleton stated that he had in mind urging the city council to act in such a way that no longer would the city of Shaker Heights pay anything whatsoever for civil defense. He said the sirens were sounded last Monday from 12:15 to 12:30, as has been done every week, and that they are continuing this practice. Mayor Stapleton said, "If I permit my community to pay anything further toward this boondoggling outfit, all we can get out of it in the event of an emergency is the doggonedest traffic jam you ever saw."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield now to me?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. While we are talking about Ohio mayors, I wish to state that I hold in my hand a telegram which I have received from the mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, A. J. Celebrezze. It may be a strange paradox that my colleague, the Senator from Ohio, has cited the views of the Republican mayor of a small Ohio city, and I am citing the views of the Democratic mayor of one of the largest cities in Ohio.

Mayor Celebrezze's telegram reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, *D.C., July 23, 1959.*

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight act making civil defense Federal responsibility instead of solely State and local will be tremendous step toward effective national defense if implemented by Federal matching funds for administration. City governments of United States strongly urge you support Senate conferees favoring $12 million for this purpose in H.R. 7040.

A. J. CELEBREZZE,
President, American Municipal Association, Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. President, all I can say is that Mayor Celebrezze has a great many more hundreds of thousands of citizens to protect than does the other mayor, and probably Mayor Celebrezze is more worried. I would rather rely on his views.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in referring to the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] let me point out that the fact that I received that telephone message from the great mayor of Shaker Heights, one of the leading Republicans in the State of Ohio, shows conclusively that once in a while a Republican is correct. [Laughter.]

Let me also say that I received a similar telegram from my personal friend, Mayor Tony Celebrezze, the mayor of Cleveland.

By the way, Mr. President, I take exception to what the senior Senator from New York said. He said Cleveland is one of the largest cities of Ohio. Mr. President, Cleveland is the largest city in Ohio. Cleveland has been very good to me throughout the years; and I am proud that I live in the city of Cleveland, and I am proud to have the friendship of the mayor of Cleveland. I have said to him, and I have stated on this floor, that in view of the fact that purse snatchings are occurring in Cleveland and women in Cleveland have been subjected to crimes of violence on the streets, it seems to me that it would be far better if my friend, the mayor of Cleveland, would take from Civil Defense the six able-bodied policemen he has assigned to civil defense, and would place them on active duty, patrolling the streets of Cleveland.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to proceed to argue briefly in support of my motion that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1.

When the appropriation bill containing the appropriation items for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization came before the Senate for debate and vote, my vote was the only vote cast against it. I did so in protest against the superannuated bureaucracy of this agency, with its obsolete attitude toward our civil defense program and its inept management of the program.

The other body had originally slashed $15 million from the bloated budget request submitted by this agency. The Senate—my vote notwithstanding—voted to restore this $15 million item. Of that restoration, $3 million was for matching State funds for the procurement of civil defense equipment. The part which I, as a Senator representing the State of Ohio, violently object to is the item for $12 million to match State and local funds for additional salaried personnel.

The other body has insisted on its disagreement to this particular item. I commend the House of Representatives for the stand it has taken in defending the public purse; and I urge the Senate today to concur in the action taken by the House, by supporting the motion I have made that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I know that the distinguished Senator from Ohio has studied this issue very carefully. I should like to have his opinion about the item of $12 million for additional personnel.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I shall give it immediately.

Let me say that at the present time there are, under Federal authority, nearly 1,800 high-salaried civil-defense officials. They are employed under Federal authority alone. If my motion is rejected, and if the $12 million is finally appropriated, it is contemplated by the civil defense authorities to add 4,000 more paid local and State employees—although it seems to me to do so would be unthinkable—to the present number of approximately 1,800 high-salaried bureaucrats, who now are feeding at the public trough, but are not rendering any useful service. In a few moments I shall speak on that matter in detail.

Those are salaried officials. They have not made a single sacrifice in any time of flood, fire, windstorm, or other emergency.

I pay tribute to the fine volunteer workers who, without receiving any salaries, have been called out and have made sacrifices. Two of those civilians workers, let me inform the distinguished Senator from Colorado, were drowned only a few months ago, in the flood in Ohio.

Not one single civil defense official has made any sacrifices. I may say, that the Federal Director of Civil Defense, I am informing the Senator from Colorado, although he may also know it, Leo A. Hoegh, was Governor of the State of Iowa. He enjoyed a salary of $10,000 per annum as Governor. He was defeated, on his record, presumably, when he was running for a second term. Instead of expressing sympathy for his defeat, and it was not necessary to do so, President Eisenhower then appointed him, at a salary of $22,500, to head the civil defense organization in this country. He certainly is one person who is not making a sacrifice.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. I was very much impressed by the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Washington about getting support for the program at the grassroots and by his remarks on the question of new personnel. I have two questions to ask. First of all, let us talk about the $12 million. This is a matching program, is it not?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. If a State does not want to pay or participate in the program, the Federal Government cannot force it to do so. I ask the distinguished Senator from Washington if that is a correct assumption.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator from Ohio agree with that assumption?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. In the State of Ohio the civil defense officials are politicians, or ex-politicians, having been defeated for reelection to public office. It may be that in the State of Washington the situation is entirely different. Judging the future by the past, I apprehend that, if the officials of the civil defense organization in the State of Ohio are doubled in number as the result of the passage of this appropriation, the additional employees will be for the most part politicians.

Mr. CARROLL. Perhaps the junior Senator from Colorado has not made himself clear. Let us talk about Colorado, because I know nothing about the situation in Ohio. Let us assume that a part of the $12 million will go to the State of Colorado. If the Governor or the State legislature of my State does not want to participate, the State will not get any of these funds and there will be no new employees. Is that correct?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. In my opinion, the Senator is absolutely correct in his

conclusion; but let me say it is a tempting morsel to hold before the governor and legislature of any State that if his State appropriates $100,000 or $500,000, the U.S. Government will add that much.

Mr. CARROLL. The main point I wish to make, which I think is a very good point, is that merely because the Federal Government provides an incentive, the State government does not have to take the bait unless it wants to.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. That is correct. It is a tempting bait. I am glad the Senator used that term.

Mr. CARROLL. The second question I wanted to ask is, How are these personnel to be selected, by whom, and under what system?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. The only way I can answer the question of my distinguished colleague from Colorado is by saying that in Ohio these appointments outside the civil service have been made by mayors and county commissioners, and in every instance in the State of Ohio they have been political appointments.

Mr. CARROLL. The junior Senator from Colorado has been led to believe, as he understood the remarks of the Senator from Washington, that in the event a State desires to match funds and participate in the program, it must base its selection of employees on the merit system. That is the new concept in this program.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Washington if that statement is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is correct, and the merit system is exactly the same merit system which exists in similar programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Department of Labor where Federal contributions are made for personnel and administrative costs. All the States have set up a merit system for this purpose. All the employees would have to be under the local or State merit system, based upon an examination and recognized criteria set forth in the approved Federal standards, and not upon political considerations, or otherwise the Federal matching of funds appropriated by the local government would not be permitted under the law. Every State must submit a plan, and the plan must be approved and must conform to the overall Federal plan.

As the Senator from Washington stated in answer to the question of the Senator from Colorado, no State would be forced to join this plan if it did not desire to do so, and if it did not it would not be eligible to get Federal funds.

I have in front of me a table of the costs in all of the States, the total amount of the expenses and the amount of Federal contributions. In no case does the Federal contribution go over 50 percent, but in many cases the State pays more than 50 percent.

In Colorado, for instance, the number of personnel presently is 22. The State spends $136,000. The plan for the State of Colorado is for 54 employees and the estimated total expense would be $285,000, of which the Federal Government would contribute only $119,000. That is the plan for Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. How much would it cost Colorado?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Two hundred and eight-five thousand dollars.

Mr. CARROLL. And the Federal Government would contribute how much?

Mr. MAGNUSON. One hundred and nineteen thousand dollars.

I may state that I am reading the 1957 and 1958 figures.

In Ohio there are 90 employees. Ohio spent $554,000. Under the plan submitted, Ohio would have 200 employees in that activity and would spend $1,097,000, of which the Federal Government would contribute $535,000. Ohio is participating on a 50–50 basis.

I think these figures should be placed in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

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

State and local personnel and administrative costs for Civil Defense

State	Actual costs during 1957		Estimated costs for 1960 with Federal assistance		Amount of Federal contributions [1]
	Number of personnel	State personnel and administrative expenses	Number of personnel	Total personnel and administrative expenses	
Alabama	17	$110,000	100	$435,000	$176,000
Alaska	3	15,000	15	80,000	40,000
Arizona	11	76,000	36	258,000	86,000
Arkansas	13	82,000	39	195,000	97,000
California	458	3,238,000	1,100	6,184,000	1,481,000
Colorado	22	136,000	54	285,000	119,000
Connecticut	61	499,000	112	886,000	240,000
Delaware	9	56,000	32	151,000	53,000
District of Columbia	13	78,000	23	138,000	60,000
Florida	22	212,000	99	691,000	233,000
Georgia	34	286,000	78	613,000	239,000
Idaho	2	10,000	15	94,000	47,000
Illinois	33	282,000	250	1,343,000	512,000
Indiana	26	180,000	46	287,000	107,000
Iowa	7	45,000	21	124,000	67,000
Kansas	11	85,000	22	170,000	85,000
Kentucky	7	44,000	31	148,000	74,000
Louisiana	37	262,000	80	511,000	204,000
Maine	18	101,000	85	319,000	86,000
Maryland	45	394,000	139	890,000	251,000
Massachusetts	160	832,000	405	1,763,000	467,000
Michigan	125	776,000	206	1,286,000	510,000
Minnesota	34	233,000	84	449,000	204,000
Mississippi	5	35,000	125	442,000	120,000
Missouri	51	359,000	87	626,000	267,000
Montana	3	23,000	15	98,000	49,000
Nebraska	9	60,000	20	150,000	75,000
Nevada	3	19,000	12	68,000	34,000
New Hampshire	5	38,000	12	84,000	42,000
New Jersey	73	$689,000	131	$1,203,000	$426,000
New Mexico	3	16,000	9	60,000	30,000
New York	586	4,259,000	1,022	6,723,000	1,741,000
North Carolina	20	141,000	225	923,000	247,000
North Dakota	3	15,000	20	98,000	49,000
Ohio	90	554,000	200	1,097,000	535,000
Oklahoma	18	89,000	50	256,000	128,000
Oregon	31	234,000	65	443,000	148,000
Pennsylvania	99	756,000	400	2,187,000	719,000
Rhode Island	13	71,000	51	193,000	76,000
South Carolina	5	25,000	30	180,000	90,000
South Dakota	3	12,000	21	100,000	50,000
Tennessee	27	170,000	54	340,000	170,000
Texas	47	338,000	310	1,404,000	491,000
Utah	9	47,000	21	130,000	65,000
Vermont	4	29,000	36	161,000	45,000
Virginia	16	102,000	40	260,000	130,000
Washington	39	216,000	95	454,000	184,000
West Virginia	6	28,000	37	115,000	57,000
Wisconsin	44	407,000	83	727,000	268,000
Wyoming	3	23,000	15	85,000	38,000
Hawaii	11	64,000	40	171,000	63,000
Puerto Rico	107	139,000	182	300,000	150,000
Samoa [2]					25,000
Guam [2]					25,000
Virgin Islands [2]					25,000
Total	2,501	16,990,000	6,480	36,378,000	12,000,000

[1] Distribution made on the basis of OCDM formula devised to consider the factors enumerated in Public Law 85-606:

(1) The criticality of the target and support areas with respect to development of the total civil defense readiness of the Nation.

(2) The relative state of development of civil defense readiness of the State.

(3) Population.

(4) A minimum of $25,000 per year for planning purposes.

Adjustments to the distribution based on this formula were then made as necessary to conform to the current planning for fiscal year 1960. Further adjustments to these allocations will be made during fiscal year 1960 as required.

[2] Provides for the minimum of $25,000 for planning purposes only.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Those figures were correct as of 1957. As of this time, they have been very much augmented for the State of Ohio.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The last figures we have were the estimated costs of the plans submitted by all the States, and every State submitted a plan.

Mr. CARROLL. Now we are coming to the crux of the matter. According to the report, there are 22 new employees on the payroll in Colorado.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. The proposal could increase the number by as much as 100 percent, but if it were increased by 100 percent, and we increased the cost by approximately $135,000, our State would have to be the activator. The Federal Government does not press down on it and say it must accept the program. The State accepts it voluntarily.

I should now like to ask another question. If, in the judgment of the people of the State of Colorado, it is wise to participate and spend the sum of $135,000, I ask whether the merit system put into effect will be that of the State of Colorado or a Federal plan.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The merit system would be that of the State of Colorado, which probably has enacted a separate law prior to this time, setting up standards for the people who work in Colorado, the same sort of system that applies to employees in the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Institutes of Health, and similar agencies. Employees in Colorado will come under whatever merit system the State of Colorado has adopted. It would be subject to the Federal standards required under the civil service.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, the Federal Government would set up standards?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. But the examination would be held by the State under the State merit system, if it coincided?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would be held by the local people.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I wish to give my humble opinion on this matter. On the basis of my own research into this subject, which I have tried to make thorough, I assert that the increase in personnel, if my motion is not agreed to, and if finally the $12 million is appropriated, will be more than a 100 percent increase. Without a doubt in most of the States, and perhaps in all the States, a merit system will operate, which will apply so far as the lower echelon employees are concerned, according to the law of each State. However, I assert that it is true at the present time, and in my opinion it will continue to be true, that the topmost officials are political appointees, given appointments by the Governor, by the mayor, or by the county commissioners.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Ohio is, of course, correct.

I have in my hand the figures for the 1957 personnel. Of course, many of these people were only recently hired, but nationwide the figure is 2,501. Under the proposed plan for the various States, the personnel would be increased to 6,480. That is an increase of more than 100 percent.

The total cost is estimated at $36,378,000, of which only $12 million would be a Federal grant. That would mean a grant of less than one-third, rather than half.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has made a very important point, and I should like to follow through, if he will yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I was under the impression that the State civil service commission set the standards. Is it true that the State would not set the standards, but that the municipality might set the standards? Does the municipality have to match the funds? Does the county match the funds, or must that be done by the State? What is the matching system? Can matching funds be appropriated by a city?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The plans come in from the States. I would suspect that the State of New York would submit a plan, which would be in cooperation with the city of New York. If we were going to employ, let us say, 10 people in New York, they could very well take the New York civil service examination under the merit system in New York for this sort of thing, if it is based upon the so-called Federal standards.

In the State of Wisconsin much of the early work was done in Milwaukee, as a city. The State is now struggling with a small organization, trying to make it more statewide. There the plan would be submitted by the State, naturally in cooperation with, in conjunction with, and after conferences with, let us say, the Milwaukee organization, but Milwaukee might hire a man. That man would come under the merit system of Milwaukee.

If the city does not have a system, then the Federal Government requires and the law requires that the State give an examination similar to the civil service examination, under Federal standards.

Mr. CARROLL. I believe the Senator from Ohio has made a very good point. I was particularly interested in the city of Denver.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know what the Senator from Ohio has reference to, and the Senator is absolutely correct. That is why this is so important. In the past few years many of the jobs have been simply political. There have been loose organizations, run in a loose way. As I have said, a great deal of money was wasted.

But I am sure the Senators will agree with me when I say that what we propose is the way to make something out of the program. I think this plan is the core. I suppose there will be some political influence even if the persons take the examination.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I pursue my argument further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. With regard to a new position, naturally if a man knows the Governor, and if he is intelligent enough to take the examination and pass it, and if he likes the work, the Governor may put him on the list for appointment. Somebody has to make up the list. That would not mean that simply because one happened to have some interest in politics or knew somebody in politics, he might not be a very good, competent employee.

Mr. CARROLL. I was not thinking so much of that problem as I was thinking about Denver as a city. Would the city match the funds, or would the State match the funds? That is the problem. The people who match the funds will obviously have much to say about who gets the position. Which jurisdiction will do the matching?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It can be either, or both.

Mr. CARROLL. I see.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. It can be the State, or the city.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It can be the State or the city. In the State of Washington the State appropriates X number of dollars, and the city of Seattle, for example, appropriates X number of dollars. It could be either, or both.

In most States, except where there are large urban areas such as New York, or as Milwaukee or Chicago, it is primarily a State operation, by necessity.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, pursuing my argument further, I assert that even if there were a requirement in every State of the Union that every added employee in the civil defense set up were to be compelled to be a civil-service employee before he could secure appointment, Senators should support my motion and vote against the appropriation of $15 million.

I say that because it is my belief that the eligible civil-service employees who are on the lists in the States and nationally can be employed in more useful service, and can render more real and needful public service than would be possible in the civil defense organization.

Civil defense, Mr. President, might have been of some value during World War II and for some years thereafter. However, we are now in an age of intercontinental ballistic missiles, hydrogen bombs, and space satellites. Civil defense as it is now being operated in this country is about as useful as flintlock muskets, tallow dips, mustache cups, or Civil War cannon balls. Mr. President, I was about to say it was as useless as women's bustles, but those might come back into style and be of some use.

Civil defense is a useless bureaucracy at the present time.

Speaking very seriously, Mr. President, we and our potential enemy, the Soviet Union, have discovered the secrets of nuclear energy. We have jet aircraft and intercontinental ballistic missiles. We have none in operation at the present time, but the Soviet Union presumably has some in operation. We have ships and submarines to carry the destructive powers of the atom with a speed and directness which stagger the imagination.

It is a fact that the Soviet Union has intercontinental ballistic missiles in operation, which they say can travel at the speed of 20,000 miles an hour. If they were sent from the Soviet Union itself, we would probably have from 15 to 20 minutes' warning.

More horrible to contemplate is the fact that if a missile with a nuclear warhead should be fired off our seacoast by some "trigger happy" Soviet Union submarine commander, and if it were a missile capable of traveling 1,400 miles before striking its target, we would have scarcely any warning whatever.

Yet, with these facts staring us in the face, we continue to fool ourselves and our taxpayers with a civil defense program which is not only childish in its concept of defense in this nuclear age, but wasteful and extravagant in its implementation.

It was stated here today that at present there are more than 2,500 employees on State and local civil defense payrolls, in addition to 1,800 in the Federal bureaucracy. Now we are asked to provide $12 million more to put probably some 4,000 paid jobs in city halls and courthouses. This proposed $12 million—and this is an important matter to which I am referring—represents a waste of Federal funds. It is also an encouragement to State and local governments to waste money. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] aptly referred to the Federal contribution as "bait." This is at a time when our States and municipalities are desperately in need of revenue.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio for his presentation. He is sincere. He has been working on this problem for many months. He is a dedicated and devoted public servant.

However, it so happens that I cannot go along with him. My senior colleague from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], on the basis of his work on this program with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], has given me a great deal of information. He, too, is sincerely dedicated to sustaining the principle of civil defense.

I thank the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Washington, and the senior Senator from Colorado for their patience. There is one thing which convinces me that I must resist the motion of the Senator from Ohio. I have enough confidence in the Governor of my State, the officials of the State government, and those charged with the responsibility of handling the affairs of our cities in the event of some great catastrophe to cause me to believe that, so long as the Federal Government does not force the States and municipalities to take this money, I can continue to have confidence in the judgment and ability of State officials. I do not believe that they would spend the money unwisely.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is a matter of regret to me that the distinguished Senator from Colorado and I are in friendly, but absolute, disagreement on this subject, because we agree so many times. We served together in World War II, in North Africa and Italy. Over there we saw the nuisance and the danger involved when civilians seek to interfere with the movement of armies.

I very seriously question whether Colorado or any other State would have any greater degree of security in the event of a nuclear attack if 4,000 more people were added to the civil defense payroll to propagandize and perpetuate our already ineffective civil defense organization.

I feel certain that the people of Ohio would not be any more secure if we doubled or trebled the number of salaried civil defense employees in the State of Ohio.

At the some time, I cannot say enough in behalf of the fine volunteer workers. The distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] referred to the volunteer civil defense workers who have made sacrifices and rendered great service in connection with forest fires, floods, and windstorms. They have rendered distinguished service without even the thought of compensation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if it is not true that it requires some kind of full-time paid staff to obtain and organize the volunteers who are so essential. I have talked with the mayor of Milwaukee, Frank Zeidler. He tells me that this money is desperately needed, and that the civil defense program in Milwaukee can mean a real beginning in saving lives with this appropriation. It is based entirely on the merit system. It is not politically handled in Milwaukee. He tells me that the money is needed for two purposes: First, for the instruction of civilian personnel; and second, for training and organizing volunteer workers.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I shall try to answer as briefly as I can the questions of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, who is my good friend. I wish to yield the floor soon.

In my judgment the Armed Forces of the Nation should take over civil defense, because civil defense is a part of the defense of our country. In Canada, where a civil defense system was formerly in operation, the Canadian Government recently abolished civil defense on the part of civilians. The defense of the Dominion has been turned over to the militia of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am not sure the Senator is wrong about that; he may be correct. We might have a far more efficient defense program if the Armed Forces were entrusted with that responsibility. At any rate I think it is shameful that we have devoted so little of our resources to civil defense in the nuclear age. However, in the meantime, until we can devise some sort of program for the armed services, some civil defense program must function. We shall not be in a position to have the armed services take over that responsibility for some time. Meanwhile there is the prospect that millions of Americans may be killed. We in Congress have the responsibility of spending this relatively small amount of money—small in terms of the number of people to be protected—to protect the American people until the armed services come forward with a program which will have a chance of being approved.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. In answer to the very strong argument made by the Senator from Wisconsin, let me say that we have the means at hand, before the adjournment of this session of the Congress, whereby, with the expenditure of perhaps a few hundred thousand dollars, instead of $12 million, we could do a great deal. We could appropriate money for a series programs over television and over the radio, under the auspices of the American Red Cross and similar agencies, whereby the people could be educated as to the defense of their homes in the event of a nuclear attack or a great disaster.

In addition, under the law enacted by the Congress when we extended the draft for 4 years, we are enrolling young men in the armed services, and every month young men are leaving the armed services for civilian life. Those young men could be trained, while they were serving in the Armed Forces, in first aid and in defense against nuclear attack, as well as in the fundamentals of what to do in their homes, what policy to follow, and what course of conduct to follow, so as to avoid panic. When they return as civilians, as many of our friends who are members of the American Legion have done, they could become leaders, and direct affairs in the event of nuclear attack.

At the present time we have a confused situation. In my home city of Cleveland—and I could go further than Cleveland—not one paid civil defense official in the entire city—or in the entire State of Ohio, so far as I know—has a shelter in his backyard or basement. I believe that in an urban community a civil defense shelter, such as was proposed by the distinguished Governor of New York, which would have to be built in the basement if it could not be built in the backyard, and which he proposed to force people to provide, might become a huge fire trap, resulting in the death of those who occupied it, when otherwise they might be saved by falling on their faces or hiding somewhere.

In Cleveland we have an evacuation system which goes into operation when the sirens sound. The people of Cleveland flee from Cleveland to Lorain. In Lorain there is an evacuation system, and the people of Lorain flee from Lorain to Cleveland. In places such as New York, which has as good a civil defense system as any I know of, the evacuation system has been abandoned, and consideration is now being given to shelters. The State of Ohio and in Washington, D.C., we have evacuation systems plus shelter systems in case of nuclear attack, and

a civilian is supposed to run or hide, or both.

The Senator from Wisconsin and others of us who have witnessed the ordinary traffic congestion at 4:30 or 5 o'clock on an ordinary day can imagine the terrific situation if there were a nuclear attack.

These are Federal funds and State-matching funds. We have provided millions of dollars for identification bracelets. The teenagers in the Cleveland schools, in Columbus, and some other places, exchange them as tokens when they are "going steady."

In Columbus, Ohio, they had $76,000 worth of penicillin with an oil base. The medical men have found that that is deadly to many persons. That has deteriorated. The pure food inspectors condemned the whole lot, and there was $76,000 of the taxpayers' dollars down the drain. Some say, "That is only $76,000." Examples like those are too numerous to mention in detail and yet we are proposing to add some $15 million.

Only recently, we had another tragic situation in Ohio. In one county, with the possible exception of two generators of doubtful utility, there was not a single item that would be of any value to a community recovering from a nuclear assault.

The auditor of the State of Ohio, who is a Republican, by the way, has had reports upon the shameful waste and embezzlement of civil defense equipment and maladministration by civil defense authorities resulting in the loss of tremendous sums of money contributed by American taxpayers. Thousands of dollars worth of civil defense equipment could not be located by his auditors. Even worse, there isn't a community in the county that would be even a remote target for the missiles of the Soviet Union in the event of war.

The little county of Champaign, in Ohio, with probably only 40,000 or 50,000 people in the entire county had shaving kits, barber kits, garbage cans, outdoor lampshades, typewriters, adding machines and untold other gimcracks as civil defense equipment with which to protect its populace in case of a nuclear attack.

Still, the civil defense agency ask for $3 million more of the taxpayers money for such foolhardy projects that I feel confident are duplicated in hundreds of counties throughout the Nation.

The Nation has permitted itself to be frightened into dumping huge sums of money into any silly scheme which appears to offer some sort of civil defense. Of course, we do have defense in this Nation. It is a well known fact, and testified to positively before the committees of Congress, that in jet-manned airplanes we have a marked superiority over the manned airplanes of the Soviet Union. We have the capability of instant retaliation. If suddenly, after maybe 20 minutes' warning, or without any warning whatever, some of the missile installations in this country should be bombed, our manned jet bombers would be on their way instantly, and that is much better than a wasteful shelter program.

The New York Times, commenting on the Rockefeller shelter program, reported on July 12, 1959:

> A Maginot-line psychology might be created and funds badly needed for offense or active defense might be earmarked for purely passive defense.

Mr. President, today civil defense in our country is, for all practical purposes, a myth.

I assert that the Department of Defense is the proper Department of Government to handle this problem. Let the armed services take over, as they certainly will in the event of a nuclear attack. They have the know-how and the facilities to do the job efficiently and at much less cost to the taxpayers.

Civil defense should be made an integral part of our total defense effort. The draftees who will return to civilian life can be trained in the elements of civilian defense in a nuclear war.

The Red Cross and similar agencies could, at a comparatively small cost, instruct the American people what to do to protect themselves and to recover from a nuclear attack.

Some years ago, shortly after World War II, there was to be an enormous shelter program. Then the shift was to evacuation. The confused Civil Defense Agency has even advocated shelters and evacuation at the same time. Now it is back to shelters. No wonder Americans are bewildered and disgusted with our civil defense program. No wonder that the conferees of the other body are apparently adamant in insisting that they will not increase the $10 million appropriation. I sincerely hope that they will continue that course. If the motion I have made is rejected, I hope that their conferees will continue to try to work out something which will save the taxpayers a great deal of money.

Recently, as I have stated, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, recommended compulsory legislation which would force all homeowners in his State to construct shelters in their basements, just as the frontiersman built his log cabin against the Indians. But if the Soviet Union should suddenly attack this Nation, we would not be fighting Indians, TV programs to the contrary.

Very seriously, I say that more than one-half the people of the Nation live either in apartments or in rented homes. Therefore, they cannot provide their own shelters in backyards or within the buildings.

We are not living in the days of the wild west and the frontiersman. This is the nuclear age. We ought to adopt a realistic, sound civil defense program to conform to it. We should have a defense program of which the Armed Forces will be in charge.

On other occasions I have spoken in the Chamber on this subject. Many Senators who have worn the uniform of their country in time of war, as I apprehend a majority of us have done, understand this situation. We know not only from our own experience but also as students of history that immediately upon the outbreak of a great conflict, the Armed Forces of the Nation will take over, and the President of the United States will become a dictator, just as Abraham Lincoln became a dictator in the War Between the States.

When he drafted his Emancipation Proclamation, did he ask Congress to sanction it? The truth is, as we know from our reading of history, that he did not even ask the members of his own Cabinet for their views on it. He simply laid it before then, and that was that. That was the Emancipation Proclamation of a President who had, by the cruel necessity of war, become a dictator.

A young lawyer from Ohio named Clement Vallandigham was the Democratic candidate for Governor of the State of Ohio in 1864. He had never worn the uniform of the Union at any time. But President Abraham Lincoln ordered the military to arrest this civilian. He was tried at a court-martial, was convicted, and was conducted behind the Confederate lines. Later, in some manner, he entered Canada and then came back into Ohio. There he served with distinction, I am told, although I am not quite so old as to be able to remember the circumstances. I simply cite this incident to show that even in a war, which today might be considered a limited war, though there was terrible, ferocious fighting, brother against brother, the President of the United States had to become a dictator, just as the President of the United States would take over in the event we were attacked today.

I assert that a vote in favor of the motion I have made is a vote for the taxpayers. It is a vote not only for their pocketbooks, but it is a vote for their safety. A vote against the motion, in my judgment, is a vote for a further waste of hard-earned tax dollars. It is a vote for more jobs, for more high-salaried bureaucrats feeding at the public trough, and for more foolish spending.

With the threat of a nuclear war only minutes away at any given moment, we can no longer afford the luxury of one more unnecessary and ineffective Government agency.

I assert that we cannot afford the agency of civil defense as it is presently conducted. We cannot afford to permit it to expand and to do further harm and waste. We should do as our allies have done, as Canada has done in turning over the defense to the military, as England has done in turning over the defense to its Home Guard.

Mr. President, we in America should turn all matters of defense of this Nation over to the Armed Forces of our country, pull in our belts, and avoid needless spending such as has been imposed upon the people of this country to the extent of more than $1 billion to date by civil defense authorities, which giving the Nation nothing whatever to show for it. We should authorize and instruct the Armed Forces of our country to do what is essentially an important function in the defense of our Nation.

I hope that my motion will be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I will make my remarks very brief. I see the senior Senator from Florida, a member of the committee, who has been waiting on the floor for some 2 hours, as well as other Senators, and therefore will make my own remarks very brief on this subject. The briefness of my remarks is certainly no guide as to how intensely I feel about this subject.

The President requested $13 million for this purpose, and we in the Senate now are proposing to provide $3 million for equipment and $12 million for personnel.

Public Law 85-606 of 1958 fixed the responsibility for civil defense in the Federal, State, and local governments. It established a joint responsibility, a partnership.

Public Law 85-606 authorized $25 million annually for matching State and local civil defense and administrative expenses. The President requested $12 million for this purpose for the fiscal year 1960.

I might say that the total budget of civil defense was $75 million. The Senate cut this to $59 million, which included $3 million equipment funds and also the $12 million of matching funds for the States.

Regardless of what has been said here, Mr. President, this proposal does require of all personnel in the State or in the county or in the city a rating under a merit system, and if it is under a city or a State merit system, the merit system has to come up to certain standards set by the Federal Government.

The act requires that the Office of Civil Defense approve all plans, and by this contribution program the Nation will obtain the full use of all Government personnel and resources at the State and local levels. It would mean approximately 5 million people now serving those governments would be required to serve the people in case of nuclear attack. I hope that my friend from Ohio realizes that this is true. If there is a more economical way of doing it, it is certainly not by putting it in the hands of the military.

Mr. President, because of the lateness of the hour and the desire of other Senators to speak, I shall conclude by saying that we have spent a great deal of money on civil defense. We have spent much money on equipment for civil defense. I would be the last to say that the results which have been produced are those I would personally desire. Neither the President nor any Member of this body can walk away from this session of Congress without realizing that it is his own individual responsibility to do what he can somehow to jell the whole civil defense program and make it work. No one from the President on down in this Government can avoid here and now the responsibility for making a civil defense program which will be effective.

I noticed particularly that my colleagues who have been governors of States are much concerned about this matter because as governors they realize that their successors as governors cannot avoid responsibility for their States. As Members of the Senate we cannot avoid the responsibility of seeing to it that the civil defense is implemented in such a way that it will work effectively.

This item is not for the employment of numerous people to run civil defense, to do every little odd job connected with civil defense. It is only a provision to match funds, to staff civil defense offices at the State, county, and local level—only to staff them, not to man them—and by staffing them adequately and by giving this program a big push at the local level, it is my hope and desire—and if this does not do it, then let us do it in another way—that we will finally set in motion this great program which we must have in this country.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] made the remark a few moments ago about the fact that we have retaliatory power. We do have retaliatory power, but that is not going to help anybody in this country who comes under attack.

So I urge my colleagues to take up the cudgels on this matter and let us pursue this program to see if we cannot somehow, instead of trying to impose civil defense upon local communities from the top, try to make the local areas of our country pick up this problem themselves and carry it, because that is the only way we will ever have successful civil defense.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the bill on which the conference report has been filed is one of the largest appropriation bills on which the Congress has to pass; it calls for appropriations of approximately $6,500 million.

If this item of $15 million were located in any of a number of other parts of the bill, it would not cause the grave concern on the part of every Senate conferee that this item has occasioned. As a matter of fact, many agreements which have been reached in conference have covered much greater compromises in connection with appropriations than the one involved in this case.

The reason for this attitude on the part of the conferees is that we do not wish to subscribe to any philosophy which would make it seem that we take the position that civil defense is not a matter of great importance to our people.

The military forces of approximately 2 million men have important duties to perform, and those duties will fully occupy their time and attention, in the event of hostilities of any sort.

As for the 173 million or more civilians, not only are they entitled to have their part in the common defense of the country—which they will wish to take part in if there is trouble—but it is also completely necessary, for the protection of their homes and businesses and families, that they be trained to take some part in the immense machinery of civilian defense which would have to be established if war were to come again.

Mr. President, this item of $15 million is not of too great consequence, insofar as the appropriation of funds is concerned; $3 million of it has to do with hardware, and that amount will be subject to matching by the State governments; and the entire amount will be used for the purchase of equipment, to be distributed and made available to the States. Even the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] does not complain about that item.

The $12 million to which we are addressing ourselves is to be used for the pay of personnel; and the total number would amount to about two for every county in the Nation.

It seems to me that all of us must realize that any threat of war now involves much greater implications and much greater possible dangers to civilians than ever heretofore has been true—particularly in the case of any previous type of war.

For instance, if there were a nuclear attack, not all the people adversely affected by the attack would be killed; many more would be wounded, burned, or otherwise injured for an appreciable period of time. It would be just as idle to say that the military could take care of such a situation, if it were to develop, as it would be for us to attempt to wish ourselves out of the crisis which then would confront us.

So it is necessary that there be trained men and women in the various communities which might be affected, in order to make sure that first aid could be rendered, that medical supplies which were not contaminated would be made available, and that food and water which were not contaminated would be made available. After all, all of those things are entirely necessary in the event of such a war or such an attack.

It seems to me to be completely idle for anyone to take the position that the small amount of money which would be spent in helping coordinate the civil defense effort—and this amount of money is only half or less than half of the total amount needed for this purpose—should not be regarded as an insurance fund, which we would hope would never have to be used in an actual emergency of that sort. But if such an emergency actually developed, it is quite conceivable that every penny we spend now for that purpose would be the equivalent of a dollar or more spent after the emergency actually had developed. So I regard this fund as an important and necessary insurance investment.

I wish to state that I, for one—and this is true of every conferee on the part of the Senate—feel that so much is involved in this instance that we simply cannot afford to surrender not only the position of the Senate on this matter, but also the position of the Congress in assuring the States that the Congress stood ready to contribute with the States on a 50-50 matching basis.

Mr. President, a considerable number of Members of the Senate have had the responsibility of serving as Governors of their States in time of war or in time of the fear or prospect of war. I think they know perfectly well, as I do, having served in such a position, that it is perfectly idle to say that the radio announcers will take care of the situation, by telling the people where to go, what to do, and the like. It is also perfectly idle to say that the Armed Forces—which certainly are not equally distributed in all parts of the country, and in any case would have more than they could do in such a situation—would be able to take

care of the function for which the civil defense personnel are now being trained. Certainly it is essential that civilians be ready and prepared to step into the breach.

In my State, during World War II, 338,000 citizens were trained to take some part for their State and their country in the event of such a necessity. We had to protect every foot of the coastline of the State—approximately 1,200 miles—when it was found that saboteurs were being landed from submarines.

Mr. President, does anyone think for a moment that our present potential enemy is more poorly equipped with submarines than was our enemy in World War II, and that there would be less danger to us from saboteurs? That one task, which confronts the 24 maritime States, presents a tremendous responsibility which the Armed Forces could never handle, but which must be shouldered by civilians who are willing to contribute of their time and their energies for the protection of their own families and their own homes.

Mr. President, there are so many other ways in which civil defense necessarily served—and did so with success and effectiveness—during World War II, and there are so many other ways in which it might be called upon to serve in the event of future hostilities, that I think the matter is hardly arguable at all.

I do not base my case for this appropriation item on the fact that we have made commitments which all the States have accepted, although I think that is a sufficient basis for my position. I am strongly of the conviction that we would be doing much less than our duty to our own people if we did not offer them the means of having an adequate and a coordinated program, in which the Federal Government, which has so great a stake, would have certain powers of coordination and certain powers of distribution of the necessary equipment, and would take a part which would show that it was directly interested in the organization of the people on the county and the local levels.

Not only does the Federal Government have a general interest in the program and in coordinating it—and the program is vital to the protection of the Nation—but the Federal Government also has contributed to meeting the need. In my own State, every urban center of great importance has also located in or near it some vital defense establishment.

For instance, I do not have to remind my colleagues that the great Canaveral Guided Missile Base has implications which extend over a considerable part of the heavily populated area on the east coast. I do not need to remind my colleagues of the great installations at Jacksonville and at Mayport. Let me say that when I was last there, four great aircraft carriers were there; and it is obvious to all that the presence of those vessels and the presence of those defense installations involve great burdens and implications which are of vital concern to all the people of that area.

I do not have to remind my colleagues of the great Strategic Air Command base in the area of Homestead, or of the similar situation which obtains in the vicinity of Tampa, where McDill Field is located between Tampa and St. Petersburg. I could also refer to the developments and installations at Pensacola and at Orlando. Great and vital defense installations are located in all those areas. We are happy and proud to have them located there; and I think the Congress should do its part in protecting the populations which serve them and the populations which are affected by them. Our people stand ready to do their part.

So let it not be said that the Federal Government has no interest in cooperating in a program, which it has made necessary in large degree, in some of the communities I have named, or that it has no interest in seeing that the people who work at those defense installations shall have assurance that in the event of some calamity—for instance, even the explosion ahead of time of an atomic weapon or a guided missile, which would have such adverse effects upon all the people—there will be available an adequate number of trained personnel who will be prepared to render the help which will be needed.

I feel deeply about this matter. With all due deference to the convictions and sincerity of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Ohio, I hope the Senate will not even think of adopting his proposal to recede from our amendment and to postpone until next year the taking of any effective step to show that the Federal Government not only proposes to stand by its commitments in this matter but recognizes that it has a very great stake in it. We should make it clear by our vote that the Federal Government proposes to do all in its power to assist in the organization of our people so that they can play their part in protecting themselves, their businesses, and their firesides.

I hope the motion of the Senator from Ohio will be defeated.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I enthusiastically support the position taken by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who just spoke so eloquently, and, of course, the position of the committee and the chairman of it, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

While I disagree with my colleague from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], I am sympathetic with one aspect of the amendment, namely, that it would save money. He says it would save $15 million, and indeed it would. But, as the Senator from Florida has said, the $15 million, out of a total of $6½ billion, represents about one-fourth of one percent of the amount in the bill, and amounts to about 4 percent of the cost of the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier which the Senate saw fit to approve a short time ago.

While the Senate seemed to think that aircraft carrier was of some use, it seems one twenty-fifth of the cost of the carrier which this appropriation will cost could be of far greater use in terms of saving American lives.

I think the Senate should disagree to the motion of the Senator from Ohio in the first place because no one has challenged the statement of the Senator from Michigan that the Senate has made a commitment and that the States and cities have acted in good faith on the basis of the commitment that the Senate would make the necessary appropriation.

Secondly, not only will the funds be matched, but, as appears on page 48 of the hearings, the State of Wisconsin has authorized about 63 percent of the cost of the program, and the Federal Government only about 37 percent. Furthermore at least 90 percent of the work done in this program is volunteer. So this is a good investment in defense. It is the one kind of defense appropriations out of which the Federal Government gets a great deal more than it appropriates for the program. In my own State of Wisconsin, General Carlton, in Milwaukee, and Major General Olson, Adjutant General of Wisconsin, have done an outstanding job. The mayor of Milwaukee has told me that this appropriation is essential if we are to have an effective program of civil defense. He says in Milwaukee they will be able to do something for the first time in an effective way in educating the public on radiation and in monitoring radiation. If we cannot do that, no kind of a civil defense program will be effective in this nuclear age.

Secondly, in rescuing casualties, they will be able to have a competent trained staff man teach the public how to conduct rescue under the terrible conditions of nuclear attack. Also, Milwaukee will be able to hire an administrator who will be able to train full time in civil defense techniques of all kinds. Finally, they will be able to have a full-time person in charge of communications in the seven counties which surround Milwaukee, so our biggest city can maintain an effective, orderly communications system in the event of an attack, and thus save lives and maintain order. Without that kind of expert communications advice, the civil defense program would be quite ineffective.

Mr. President, there may be a better way to conduct civil defense than the way we are doing it, and I am sure there is. The Rockefeller report and the other reports made to the American people and the Congress insist that we should do far more in civil defense than we have been doing. In view of the tensions existing in the world today, in view of the increased threats by Soviet Russia, I cannot see any justification for our deciding to do less and burying our heads in the sand.

The Senator from Ohio says that we may not have any warning. It seems to me that is an argument for greater not less concern with civil defense. We may not have any warning, but we should try to have some survivors. The way to have survivors is to keep people alive. The way to keep people alive is to have some kind of warning system so that they may take warning and try to stay alive.

The experts tell us we are going to have, in the case of a nuclear attack, from 10 million to 50 million or more casualties. If we could save just 1

percent of the lower figure, namely, 100,000, it would certainly be an eminently sound investment for the Senate to make.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I, too, wish to oppose the motion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered one.

Our very distinguished and very friendly colleague, the Senator from Ohio, has undertaken quite a campaign against civil defense. When we undertake a campaign, we have to expect opposition similar in size and in character.

It seems to me the one basic fallacy in this whole campaign, of which the present motion is a part, and a quite proper one, in order to maintain his position, is that our friend from Ohio wants to turn civil defense over to the military.

Our colleague from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has referred to that. If that is to be done, it is a major and considerable step in the direction of operating our country on a different level from the way in which it has been operated heretofore. Personally, I would oppose that step, because it would increase the size of our military forces and give them greater participation in and control over everyday activites in our civilian life than we have tolerated in our country. It represents a very fundamental change, and we had better have our eye on the ball before we fall into something that is going to cause great mischief.

The fallacy of the argument of the Senator from Ohio is that we should stand still, that we should not do anything, that we are wasting money, that we are boondoggling. Well, Mr. President, I am sure I waste money in taking certain trips and doing things that cost me money. But we have got to keep alive. The point is we are dealing with the question of survival.

The estimates of all the authorities show that the expenditure of this money would be a tremendous benefit in removing people from the hazards of radioactive fallout, in teaching them to leave the outdoors and to exercise a little discipline, which would result in enormous dividends in terms of human lives.

The greater the number of casualties according to the estimates, the greater will be the dividends in terms of the leverage of money spent for civil defense. If it be true that in the event of a nuclear attack there will be millions of casualties, it is also true that a modicum of money spent for civil defense will result in saving hundreds of lives. Of course, what we spend for that purpose simply cannot be compared to the amount we are talking about today.

Another point which I think involves a very grave fallacy relates to the fact that we are not living in a vacuum. How many times must that be repeated on the floor of the Senate? Whether it is with regard to foreign trade, with regard to internal economic policies, or with regard to military and economic assistance abroad, we are not living in a vacuum. The greatest superpower on earth which has ever faced any other superpower is competing with us actively, diligently, with great zeal and vigor, and indeed with evangelism, in every field, including this one.

The Russians have a highly disciplined country. When they tell people to go to a certain place in the Soviet Union, the people go. Their necks are very much accustomed to the yoke. That is not true in our country. Hence we must have this kind of preparation. We must undertake to train the people in a voluntary way, in a way very different from what the Russians can do under their system, where it is simply necessary for an order to be blared out over the radio which goes into every Russian town and village. I understand one of the real blights of Russian life is that the radio "cackles" all day long.

Theirs is an absolutely national system of control. When the Russian citizen is told to go here, to go there, or to go someplace else, in the event it is necessary to go, he will do so. We simply cannot say that about the American citizen, and we do not want to. That is not the way we live. We have to pay for some substitute, and that substitute is the civil-defense program.

Finally, if we needed any further evidence upon the subject, we have the evidence of the experts that this is a very important program even in regard to our relations and bargaining position with the Soviet Union. I am very much impressed, for example, with a statement made in the report of the Committee on Government Operations, which gives us an excerpt from the findings of the study of the Rand Corp., which states:

> There is an enormous difference in the bargaining ability of a country which can, for example, put its people in a place of safety on 24 hours' notice and one which cannot. If it is hard for the reader to visualize this, let him just imagine the situation where the Russians had done exactly that, and we had not. Then let him ask himself how he thinks we would come out at a subsequeent bargaining table.

Let us remember that we have an enormous, complex urban country. The Russians do not. They have comparatively few very large cities. In addition, they have an enormous land mass and an enormous forest area. That is very different from the realization that between Boston and Washington, D.C., a population of approximately 30 million people live in a highly congested area.

I only point these things out, Mr. President, to show that we have a unique problem and that the solution of this problem counts very heavily in the cold war. Let nobody kid himself about the fact that the Russian strategists and the Russian CIA are evaluating exactly what we are doing about civil defense as a very critical element with regard to how vulnerable we are either to attack or with regard to threats. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota. What is more important is the threats. In other words, we do not have to wait for an attack if we are susceptible to threats, for that is even more satisfactory to the Russians than an attack.

Mr. President, though it be a small amount, as our colleague from Florida says, the stakes are very great, because this item represents our dedication to a policy. Are we going to carry out the public law, the so-called Durham Act, for the reorganization of the civil defense system, or are we going to junk it in its most important element, which is the getting of cooperation from local communities?

Mr. President, let us get an understanding of the size of this problem. For example, the civil defense personnel in New York State alone, in the State and local governments, totals 305,167. I will say that in Ohio the figure is 137,652. The number of people in New York who are paid from civil defense funds is the enormous number of 800. The number of people in Ohio who are paid from civil defense funds is the enormous number of 76.

With that kind of leverage, Mr. President, we certainly cannot complain about the fact that much money is wastefully going down the drain. Suppose we pass the bill and make the appropriation. What are we going to do? We will add about 600 employees in my State, to the 800 I have already mentioned. We will still have considerably more than 300,000 volunteers.

All of us know the genius of American organization is that when volunteers have a central cadre for planning and technical operations, they can really do a job. When there is simply a group of volunteers nothing can be done.

Any Senator who has waged a local campaign knows that he can have 10,000 volunteers but if he does not have a few professionals to organize them and to tell them what to do they will be absolutely wasted. That is the fundamental intent and purpose of this item in the bill.

Finally, Mr. President, as to the question of wasting money, I wish to point out, as my friend and colleague from Wisconsin pointed out, that in the State of New York the total personnel and administrative expenditures involve $6,723,000, and our contribution from the Federal Government is $1,741,000. In short, we are spending about $5 million net on civil defense. The minor contribution we would get from this $12 million would certainly not break down that relationship. In the first place, the money has to be matched on a 50–50 basis immediately. In the second place, there are many expenses in the $5 million the Federal Government will not help us carry.

In short, this is not a boondoggle for the States. This is no boondoggle for the people concerned with it. On the contrary, for the United States of America it is the grimmest kind of grim business, both in terms of bargaining with the Russians and in terms of the defense of our country and the defense of our people.

This will be a very important vote, Mr. President, because it will represent what we intend to do on a major national policy. Do we intend to step away from the problem and leave the people to fend for themselves? I think that would be shocking in terms of the posture we hold in the world. Or do we intend to show a sense of responsibility?

I hope very much, Mr. President, that the Senate will back the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in showing a sense of responsibility by sustaining the committee and standing fast on item one in disagreement.

THE TRUTH ABOUT MICHIGAN

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a colloquy in this Chamber earlier today between the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

According to the transcript, the Senator from Wisconsin had been discussing how well his State government was functioning—despite a governor of one party and a State legislature of another.

At this point—again according to the transcript—the junior Senator from Pennsylvania injected himself to suggest that the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin be read by the Governor of Michigan.

I do not know, Mr. President, why the Senator from Pennsylvania saw fit to inject himself into a Michigan situation about which, as it is plain from his remarks, he knows nothing.

Speaking from a wealth of ignorance, the Senator from Pennsylvania makes slighting reference to the State of Michigan by repeating the canard about "Michigan on the rocks."

Mr. President, I might call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania to rule 19 in the Senate rule book which states that "no Senator in debate shall refer offensively to any State of the Union."

However, in the interest of his own education on this subject, I would rather refer the Senator to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD issues of March 24 through April 8 in which I inserted a number of articles from the Detroit Times giving the "Truth About Michigan."

If the Senator from Pennsylvania is sincere about learning the truth, he will find that the only thing really on the rocks in Michigan is his Republican Party.

STIMULATION OF PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF COAL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6596) to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1 to the independent offices appropriation bill (H.R. 7040).

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the 85th Congress appropriated a very substantial sum of money for civil defense, and yet that Congress, as indicated, did not provide the funds required under Public Law 85-606, the Federal-State sharing program for civil defense expenditures.

Mr. President, I addressed the Senate earlier today on this subject matter, because I support the Senate conferees on the item for civil defense expenditures. I placed in the RECORD at that time a number of exhibits which I believe justify this expenditure.

The Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations has, through its competent staff, made an analysis of the Federal expenditures for civil defense since the inception of the program, in the postwar years.

I wish also to compliment the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] on his remarks relating to civil defense. The Senator from Wisconsin is most fortunate in having as mayor of the city of Milwaukee one of the outstanding exponents of civil defense organizations and activities, Mayor Frank Zeidler. This man has truly given worthy leadership to the program of civil defense.

I indicated earlier today that in Minnesota the present president of the Civil Defense Officers Association is Walter P. Halstad. He is Civil Defense Director for the city of Minneapolis. He has earned for himself a splendid reputation for outstanding administrative ability, program direction, and program creation.

Col. Hubert Schon, Minnesota State Director of Civil Defense, has been an adviser to the Federal Office of Civil Defense, and has prepared one of the most elaborate, and yet one of the most practical programs of civil defense in the country.

We ought to remember that civil defense is not something separate from our general security structure. It is a fundamental part of it. I have often thought that if the Soviet Union really believed that this country was not only prepared in terms of massive retaliation, not only prepared in terms of a balanced military force—and when I say that, I mean a modern Army, Navy, and Air Force, with strategic as well as tactical weapons, and also conventional arms and conventional weapons—but also that our country was prepared to take a blow, terrible as that blow might be, and that the civilian population was prepared psychologically as well as physically for the terrible blow which would come in any kind of nuclear warfare, although I realize that the preparation, at best, would be inadequate, nevertheless, such preparation would strengthen our position today in the power struggle which is so evident in every conference in which we participate.

Civil defense is part and parcel of our national security policy. Civil defense for a great Nation such as ours, which is industrialized, which is literally a nation on wheels, a nation of communication and transportation, is as vital to the security of the country as the supply system is to the mobility of an army, an air force, or a navy. Therefore, I believe that the appropriations being asked are timely, are needed, and are, indeed, very modest.

Of course, I could point to examples of waste. But after all, let us not forget that civil defense is, in a sense, a part of the military structure, even though it is civilian in its character. When we look back over the billions of dollars we have spent on our military, we might term some of it waste, too. The B-36 bomber fleet hardly saw action. Hundreds of those planes have been junked. They cost millions of dollars. It might be said that we never needed them, and therefore they represent a waste.

The truth is that possibly those fleets of bombers prevented or forestalled a struggle, and that they represented a premium paid on insurance for our freedom and liberty. I think we should look upon this item as another one of such insurance premium payments.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] on April 15, again on June 23, and for a third time on July 29, called to the attention of the Senate the very real reasons why we in this country should be thinking constructively with respect to possible programs for shelters which would go underground to depths which we know must be practical yet effective. The Senator from New York has made a real study of the subject. I have read his remarks very carefully. I listened today to what he said on the subject.

It had been my hope that prior to this time I might discuss with the Senator a very illuminating article on the subject of deep shelters and the success of that type of program in Sweden. We had contact with his office, but I was unable to discuss in detail the article which was published in Industrial International. This magazine is issued monthly in Sweden, in the Swedish language. Once a year there is an International Review, printed in English. In the material for the years 1958 and 1959, there is a most persuasive article on the subject of bomb shelters and the success of that program in Sweden itself. This magazine is published by the Federation of Swedish Employers. The articles are authoritative and have as their authors individuals who have made considerable study of the subjects under discussion.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I am certain the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has knowledge of the fact that there has been testimony before congressional committees to the effect that a Federal shelter program to provide adequate shelters of sufficient depth and with filtering processes which would absolutely filter the fallout, to be effective in the United States would cost between

$12 billion and $20 billion. I believe the Senator has read something to that effect.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am not certain of the amount which would be necessary. We know that in Sweden approximately $20 million has been used in the construction of shelters. One of the shelters which has been most successful has been the underground garage, which serves a dual purpose, as the Senator from Ohio well knows.

An editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 25, 1959, commented on such shelters as those being used in England, Norway, and Sweden. But the editor said that nowhere in the United States were public or private shelters being built.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from West Virginia for saying what he did about me. I hope, even more, that the Senator from West Virginia will interest himself in this subject.

As the Senator knows, in the State of New York a commission has been appointed by Governor Rockefeller. The commission has issued quite an interesting report on the subject of shelters.

The amount spent by Sweden for civil defense has been about 2 percent of the military budget. If the United States did that, we would be spending about $800 million a year. When we begin to think of what we are spending for military defense, the figures we are talking about indicate that we are falling far short of the amount which is necessary for a matter of such great importance. That is exactly what the Senator from West Virginia, the Senator from Washington, and other Senators have argued.

All of us respect the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. I have affection for him. I served with him in the House.

But I think the cardinal point which the Senator from West Virginia is making is that if we cannot do everything—and no one wants to spend $10 billion or $12 billion if he can avoid it—if we cannot do everything, then we must do something. That is what I think we are all seeking to do.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Sweden spends some 21 percent of its total budget on defense facilities for that nation. I ask unanimous consent that portions of the article from the magazine to which I have made reference, because of the informative material contained therein, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ALL TO SERVE

Not just a rallying call, "If War Comes" defined the conditions which would constitute a state of emergency, set up a system of alarm signals, alerted the populace to the dangers of espionage, threatened stiff penalties for spies,[1] and issued detailed instructions for all civilians if war sould come. The main point: all ablebodied citizens, women as well as men, would be expected to play a military, civilian defense or war production role. Even if occupied, the nation would fight on, in the pamphlet's phrase, "with weapons other than weapons."

In the coming fiscal year, Sweden will spend one-half billion, or 21.1 percent of its entire budget, on defense. The figure represents an increase of 20 millions over this year, although an actual decrease in the size of the military is envisaged to adjust to technical progress, mainly in missiles, which Sweden will both make and buy. The question of forging atomic armaments for the military arsenal has been tabled for the present, but kept in constant preparedness are the nation's sleek, defensive Navy, its 750,000-man Army which can be fully mobilized in several days, and what is reputedly the third largest Air Force in Europe, equipped with jet fighters made in Sweden.

Traditionally, the objective of Swedish foreign policy, pundits have said, has been to have no foreign policy at all, or non recognizable by a potentially antagonistic foreign power. Most Swedes maintain, however, that political neutrality doesn't imply moral neutrality. Although Sweden will not compromise herself in Russian eyes by joining NATO, her neutrality, says a conservative member of Parliament, is "a neutrality against communism—as everyone knows." A doubt does exist, however, as to whether the Communists, or even all of his colleagues, know it. But in the matter of military preparedness, at any rate, the notion that the defense issue is above party strife has characterized Swedish politics since even before the outbreak of World War II.

IN PERSPECTIVE

Seen against this military and political backdrop, the Swedish civilian defense effort, which has attracted avid attention throughout the world, takes on a significance misunderstood by most of the press, which simply sees the famous below-ground shelters as either impressive engineering feats or humanitarian hide-aways from the world of intercontinental ballistic missiles and hydrogen warheads.

But the effort, according to the men who are making it, is anything but escapist. Based on the premise of survival without surrender, the latest program, recently submitted to the Parliament for approval, calls for the expenditure of $148 million in the next 10 years, will involve around 200,000 conscripted workers, and make use of some of the best administrative and technical brains in the country.

"We're paying a damned high price for protection," says one high CD official. "The cost of capitulation would, at least in the financial sense, be a lot cheaper. We're not pouring all this money into holes in the ground to escape reality. This is our way of trying to accommodate reality. We don't think it's an ostrich attitude."

To foreigners, the most spectacular—and probably the least understood—part of the elaborate CD program is the planning of 14 huge man-made shelters for nine of the nation's biggest cities. The bill for the 14 will come to $20 million, with Stockholm's four shelters accounting for about half the amount. Although the financing varies somewhat from installation to installation, the Government roughly defrays two-thirds of the cost, the community the rest.

THE USES OF PEACE

Built in peacetime for possible wartime use, all the shelters are designed to make the most of the present. Perhaps overoptimistically, as it has turned out, the original plan foresaw the revenues realized from the peacetime function as actually paying for the community's share in the project.

"Some shelters, especially those in favorable sites, will pay for themselves 100 percent," predicts Gösta Smitt, in charge of the shelter program. "We have one in Stockholm that's being used by the warehouse over it. With real estate as high as it is in the center of the city, it would cost the firm a fortune to get comparable space aboveground. With most shelters, though, we'll be happy, and so will the communities, if 40 percent of total cost is paid by the peacetime use."

In addition to creating new real estate values, the shelters are located, the CD claims, so as to coordinate the basic requirement of protection with the peacetime building plans of the district. As far as possible, the peacetime uses are allowed to decide the form of the shelters, sometimes even the location.

Already finished, or projected for the near future:

Stockholm's Katarinaberget, the world's largest shelter, can hold 20,000 people—in sitting position—in case of attack. To build it, 110,000 cubic meters of rock had to be blasted out of the hill in which the shelter is located. Currently leased to an oil company, the Katarina installation has room for a drive-in bank, a service station, and 550 parked cars which line the 500-meter tunnel that winds through three floors. Cost: $4 million.

Like the Katarinaberget, Stockholm's three other big shelters are designed primarily as garages. The Johannes shelter, known as the Rock Garage to residents of the city, can hold 10,000 people in wartime, 250 cars in peace. Located under the Klara Church near the Central Railroad station, the so-called Klara Garage's 225-meter-long tunnel can hold 15,000 persons or 300 cars. Built for about $3 million and directly connected with the nearby underground railroad, the installation will also serve as a columbarium for cremated parishioners when completed next year. The fourth Stockholm man-made cave will accommodate 500 cars in peacetime and give protection in wartime to 7,000 persons. In Malmö, the country's third largest city, one of the subterranean shelters does peacetime duty as a ballroom.

THE CLASSIC CASE

So far, however, the classic among civil defense constructions, and probably unique in the world for the manner in which its designer has reconciled peacetime possibilities and wartime needs, is Västerås' Mariaberget. Begun in 1951 and finished this past spring, the granite grotto, carved out of a hill near the center of the city, is already functioning as a complete community center with a garage, workshops, adult education classrooms, a gymnasium, experimental theater, restaurant, and shooting range.

By car from Stockholm, Vasterås is a comfortable 2-hour drive west through successive tableaux of identical fir forests and slate-gray lakes just saved from monotony by the elusive northern sun which alternates the mood from gloomy to golden with each turn in the road. But by ballistic missile from the nearest conceivable enemy, the town, with its 69,000 residents, its modern city hall that stands disconsolate over red-roofed factories and homes, and its strategic electrical and metalworking industries, is only minutes, and will some day be only seconds, away.

DETAILS, DETAILS

"Again and again and again." With these words, Gösta Lundin, whose engineering firm served as architect, constructor and interior decorator, recalls early efforts to convince town fathers that attention had to be paid to every detail of the job, even if it meant going over budget. With about 1½

[1] Since 1950, a dozen spies, not all of them Swedish nationals, have been convicted. The sentences have ranged from 2 years to life imprisonment (which in Sweden cannot exceed 20 years).

million sunk in the cave, it eventually meant just that, but there haven't been any complaints, Lundin says. "When you're building for permanence underground, the materials not only have to look right, but be right, and not just when it's finished but years later."

Constructed in two below-ground stories with an average of 15 meters of solid granite overhead, the shelter can accommodate 5,500 persons under war condition, with 1½ meters of space allocated to each. Like most shelters throughout Sweden, it is designed to safeguard its inhabitants from the effects of nuclear, biological and chemical warfare for as long as is needed, providing the oxygen and food supply holds out. It can be filled in 3 or 4 minutes through three entrances—one for automobile traffic that enters the gently sloping hill at a very slight incline, a second via elevator from the top of the hill where a girl's school is located, and a third which features wide stairs whose purpose is to prevent panic by segregation.

Also, as in most other shelters, about 30 percent of the expense, and upward of 90 percent of the headaches, arose from the specifications for wartime safety. The multiple exits, widely separated, provide alternative avenues of escape so that people won't be buried alive if one is blocked. Deep baffles are sliced in the main entrance tunnel to pocket as much of the blast as possible before it reaches the 2-foot-thick, 20-ton steel doors, which at the touch of a button seal the narrow entrance in a matter of seconds.

Heating is no problem—5,500 persons crammed together in an underground cave constitute their own heating system, as it were—but ventilation and cooling plagued Lundin every step of the way. The concrete walls and roof are perforated, and there is a layer of space between them and the granite facing so that air is constantly evacuated. Filters screen out radioactive and bacteriological material. If fire rages above ground, threatening to stifle the inhabitants within, the ventilation system can be closed and the trapped air constantly revivified with built-in oxygen machines.

Cooling is guaranteed by a system large enough to provide the entire Nation with ice cream. The shelter is self-sufficient in water and electricity, with an emergency battery set-up synchronized to take over automatically if the power should falter.

"You'd only need a minute or two of complete darkness to plunge the place into panic," Lundin points out.

IF WAR COMES

Behind the peacetime planning of the shelter's layout, the blueprint for catastrophe is shrewdly stenciled. The lamplit mechanical drawing rooms, now used by the town's fledgling draftsmen, can be quickly converted into X-ray rooms, the gymnasium dressing rooms into sanitary surgeries. In the bigger rooms, vertical bars can be hastily erected and canvas tents thrown up to create smaller segments so that panic, the most contagious of psychological diseases, can be dealt with in isolation.

For Lundin, the actual construction of the shelter posed no large engineering problems which his firm had not already encountered in jobs for private mining companies.

"After all," he explains, "a shelter is a house."

Over the years, Swedish engineers, spurred mainly by the mining industry, have developed what are generally acknowledged as the world's most advanced tunnel-driving techniques. As solid granite and gneiss are the major components of the country's geological structure, the tunneling operation is the crucial step in most shelter jobs, except in less rocky southern Sweden where the bunker-type of construction predominates. As underground houses, the shelters are in essence concrete arch constructions within the blasted-out rock, offering protection against the descent of boulders torn loose by pressure waves.

CONSTRUCTION COSTS

Building in granite can sometimes be less expensive than building above it. Lundin estimates that it costs about 1,200 crown per square meter to build underground, about 800 above ground. But this is exclusive of the site cost, which in Stockholm runs about 100 crown per square meter. In the long run, maintenance underground, where there are few dust or dirt problems, is less expensive.

The history of going underground in Sweden, apart from the mines, goes back to stockpiling programs through two world wars: fuel, munitions, electrical installations, and food. The advent of the atomic bomb expanded the program to include military installations and industries of a vital nature.

For the Swedish naval fleet, which must operate in narrow waters on a hit-and-run basis and then be serviced out of sight of prying enemy eyes, Operation Granite has provided a natural, almost a self-evident, solution. The predominant feature of the Swedish coast is the multitude of shallows and islands of hard bedrock, amounting at times to no more than gigantic pillars of granite with sheer cliff faces. After the last war, an ambitious program of building underground harbors was begun. Out of camouflaged entrances to the subterranean sea pens, the largest of which can swallow a normal-sized five-story block of flats, fast destroyers can foray, then return to interior quays for repairs and stores. The Air Force's jet fighters, now built underground, are often hangared there.

INDUSTRY ENTERS

Fifteen years ago, the firm of Bolinder-Munktell, manufacturers of engines, became the first factory to go below. Current showplace of the industrial program, initiated by the Government and to some extent subsidized by it, is the AGA gas-producing plant in a Stockholm suburb. It is not underground in the strict sense of the word, but has been burrowed out of the side of a granite hill, a topographical commonplace in Sweden. Visited by CD officials from many nations, including the United States and Russia, the physical plant consists of a labyrinth of large, well-lighted rooms, soundproof, dustproof, and vibrationproof, factors which make the site ideal for the manufacture of delicate precision instruments. Free from the water hazards of most other rock formations, it guarantees a drier, warmer, more easily regulated atmosphere. The thickness of granite crust overhead varies from 10 to 30 meters, reasonable assurance that the factory is protected against nuclear explosion and radiation.

Since all firms in built-up areas are required by law to provide shelter for workers, the trend in industry is to expand downwards. Hospitals, munition and fuel dumps, and hydroelectric plants are also being lodged in the earth. Scheduled for operation late this year: the Stornorrfors power tunnel in northern Sweden, the world's largest, with a volume of about 1,600,000 cubic meters of solid rock.

"STANDARD" SAFETY

The big rock shelters are not, as commonly thought abroad, intended to house the civilian population in case of war. They will serve instead as nerve centers for a tight-knit CD cadre which will fight fires, maintain essential services and, in close cooperation with the military, police the ravaged metropolitan areas. Only about 50,000 of Stockholm's 750,000 residents will be expected to stay behind and perform these duties, for which they are now being trained. The rest—if they cannot be evacuated in time—will find protection, if only a bare minimum of it, in the so-called standard shelters underneath all apartment dwellings. While most of the private basement shelters built during the last war for nearly 2 million persons are considered obsolete, the new ones, according to technical director Smitt, can withstand atomic explosions of up to one atmosphere[2] offer considerable protection against radiation, and will even survive the destruction of the houses overhead. Since 1945, the law has required that builders of new housing units provide shelters that satisfy technical specifications worked out in CD research labs: Walls, ceiling and flooring consist of reinforced concrete, and air-purifying plants are included. New regulations soon to go into effect require collapsible pillars so that basements can be quickly compartmentalized, stipulates and filters to block radiation, absorb shock, and heat and sift nerve gases.

The shelter represents about 2 percent of the building's total cost, and is paid by the builder. He gets it back in the rent, however.

"Most Swedes have no idea," Smitt says, "that they pay a small amount each month for home protection. Nobody knows anything about it, but it's there."

The 15,000 standard shelters already built, most of them on the periphery of the big cities, will accommodate about 1 million persons, and they are being added to at the rate of 2,000 annually.

CITY TO COUNTRY

If the shelter system protects the nerve center of the Swedish CD effort, then the evacuation program may be thought of as providing the legs on which nine-tenths of the population will flee to safety from the big cities of Stockholm. Göteborg, and Malmö. In case of war, the cities will be emptied into the countryside—sometimes as far away as 400 kilometers—to be billeted, fed and, if the conflict continues, put to work. Women, children, and the ill will go first (20,000 invalids in Stockholm by special bus). Right now, says evacuation boss Ake Björkman, CD is tagging all of the capital city's 120,000 cars and 15,000 boats, will commandeer more than half of them during evacuation. For the 70 percent of the population who won't use their own cars or bicycles, railroads and buses will be provided.

Björkman is now pondering a plan which will oblige all motorists to keep their gas tanks full in peacetime so that during evacuation they can reach country service stations under their own power, there to be refueled with just the amount needed to get them to their predetermined destinations.

Even bigger than the traffic problem (complicated by the fact that the hastily mobilized army may be heading toward the cities) is the care of evacuees in the country. For some time, CD has been inventorying every rural living unit so that it can pinpoint alternative accommodations for the displaced city dweller. A special Government board is grappling with the immense problem of feeding them (complicated by the fact that the entire food supply, unless stockpiled, could be contaminated overnight by radioactive fallout).

WAR RECORD

Actually, it was out of experiences in the care and feeding of refugees that the present civilian defense administration evolved in 1944. Directed by Eije Mossberg, now almost a legend in his own lifetime after a hectic career as cabinet minister, governor, and business executive, a tiny task force settled 72,000 refugees during the war and, an even tougher tactical problem, moved in

[2] The equivalent of 10 tons of pressure per square meter.

30,000 head of cattle from northern Finland. By the end of the war, the administration was empowered to conscript all citizens from 16 to 65 for CD service of up to 60 days a year.

With only one or two exceptions, the public response has been commendable, asserts Ake Sundelin, the present CD director. One of the exceptions, a well-known woman journalist of extreme pacifist views, went to jail for a month rather than serve.

"Of course we were terribly embarrassed by the incident," Sundelin admits. "But, after all, the law is the law, and to uphold it, we had to prosecute."

The government's response to CD, expressed in appropriations, has been almost as gratifying, he says. Represented graphically, the rate of expenditures resembles a series of jagged peaks, climbing from 2,700,000 crown in 1946–47 to 25 million at the time of the Czech coup, and from there to 60 million during the Korean war. The average for the next 10 years is expected to be about 76 million, over twice what was spent this past year.[3]

MAIN MORAL

It is hard to know what lessons have been learned by the many foreign observers who have come to assess the Swedish experience. Merely technical ones will be probably wasted, since the conditions for shelter construction are peculiarly Swedish and the organizational plans for evacuation tailored to a relatively small population. Perhaps the only lesson is that the effort is being made at all.

This is a bigger lesson than might appear at first glance. For the effort is made notable, perhaps even ennobled, by the fact that the problems which remain to be tackled are so much greater than those already dealt with. Trapped on a technological treadmill which gives every advantage to the weaponmakers, CD administrators must continually alter their plans as new fashions in destruction lend an air of futility, almost of fantasy, to all pretences of keeping up appearances.

The bible for Sweden's CD research men is a 576-page paperback printed by the U.S. Government Printing Office and entitled "The Effects of Nuclear Weapons." It has it own genesis ("In general, an explosion is the release of a large amount of energy in a short interval of time") and it contains its own apocalyptic version of the Armageddon extrapolated from the experience of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, where two entirely outmoded A-bombs killed 106,000 persons and injured 110,000 more in an incredibly brief interval of time.

Its pages are profuse with prophecies and portents of disaster. How would Sweden's rock shelters stand up under an A-bomb attack? CD officials say they'd probably escape unscathed if bombs exploded in the vicinity, but concede that a direct hit at ground level would certainly demolish them. And what would happen in a hydrogen bomb holocaust? The supervisor of the Västerås shelter shrugs his shoulders and says, "Well, this whole town would be one big hole."

Even if not at war, how can Sweden immunize its 175,000 square miles against the effects of fallout if bombs are exploded on the Continent or in England? And how could the evacuation program be set in motion if the enemy turned on Sweden with complete unexpectedness?

For the moment, Director Sundelin points out, Sweden must base its plans on the premise that the nation will go to war only if sucked into the vortex of a major world conflict. If the international situation grows grave, then the plans can be put into effect.

At whose command?

Shaking his head slowly, and running his hand through a boyish mop of hair, Sundelin squints his eyes and then, almost as if to himself, says quitely: "That's a political decision. The politicians will have to decide that. Yes, in the end, that's their responsibility."

[3] In the United States this past summer, the Senate turned thumbs down to Civil Defense Chief Leo Hoegh's modest request for $13,150,000 to get a prototype shelter program started. The refusal followed a stark warning from the House Military Operations Subcommittee: "The supreme irony of civil defense in the United States is that the American people and many of their elected and appointed policy officials refuse to accept the distasteful facts of reality simply because they are distasteful."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is a beloved friend. I worked with him in the House, and now I work with him in the Senate. However, I think his motion should be defeated. It is for that reason that I have spoken in this manner.

The people of West Virginia have genuine interest in and a cooperative attitude toward the program of civil defense. We have seen its shortcomings. We understand the mistakes which have been made. We are conscious of the errors which have been committed. They are usually administrative. Still, we know that there is a very vital need for a continuance of this type of "back-home" program.

I was impressed by the cogency of the remarks made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] as he discussed this subject a few minutes ago. I think it is important for me at this time, as one of the Senators from West Virginia—and I know the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who now presides over this body, would want to join with me—to place in the RECORD communications, telegrams, and letters which have been received from the Governor of West Virginia, from county and city officials, pointing out the necessity for a restoration of the moneys deleted by the House and setting forth the reasons why civil defense should be continued in our State as well as in the Nation. The reasons are valid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of these telegrams be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *July 28, 1959.*

OCDM funds for administrative matching States and local political subdivisions come to Senate floor today. Essential that all Senators support Senator MAGNUSON's conference committee recommendation to restore the $12 million deleted by House. West Virginia counties and cities need this aid.

GOV. CECIL H. UNDERWOOD.
COL. EDGAR M. SITES.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA., *July 27, 1959.*

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Very important to Cabell County that you support Senator MAGNUSON's conference committee recommendation to restore $12 million deleted by the House.

HAROLD FRANKEL,
Chairman, Cabell County Civil Defense Advisory Committee.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA., *July 27, 1959.*

Cabell County court is very anxious that you support Senator MAGNUSON's conference committee recommendation to restore $12 million deleted by the House.

IRVIN MORRISON,
President, Cabell County Court.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA., *July 27, 1959.*

Concerning civil defense matching funds, hope you will support Senator MAGNUSON's conference committee recommendation to restore $12 million deleted by the House.

LLOYD E. WARDEN,
Director, Cabell County Civil Defense.

BUCKHANNON, W. VA., *July 28, 1959.*

Very essential you support Senator MAGNUSON's conference committee's recommendation to restore the $12 million deleted by House.

HUGH BRAKE,
President, Upshur County Court.

WHEELING, W. VA., *July 28, 1959.*

Urge your wholehearted support of Senator MAGNUSON's conference committee's recommendation to restore the $12 million deleted by House.

WILLIAM DEIFENBACH,
Deputy Director, Ohio County Civil Defense.

PARKERSBURG, W. VA., *July 28, 1959.*

Request and urge you to support Senator MAGNUSON's report conference committee's recommendation to restore the $12 million deleted by the House.

WOOD COUNTY CIVIL DEFENSE,
W. P. A. KNICELY, *Director.*
C. B. MONTGOMERY, *Secretary.*

BUCKHANNON, W. VA., *July 28, 1959.*

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Very essential you support Senator MAGNUSON's conference committee's recommendation to restore the $12 million deleted by House.

J. D. HINKLE,
Mayor, City of Buckhannon.

BUCKHANNON, W. VA., *July 28, 1959.*

Very essential you support Senator MAGNUSON's conference committee's recommendation to restore the $12 million deleted by House.

MRS. PEARL NUTTER,
Director, Upshur County Civil Defense.

CHARLESTON, W. VA., *July 27, 1959.*

We hereby request your supporting vote tomorrow for MAGNUSON's conference committee report to restore $12 million to OCDM State matching fund deleted by House of Representatives.

W. L. PENCE,
Director, Kanawha County Civil Defense.

LOGAN, W. VA., *July 30, 1959.*

U.S. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge passage of legislation for matching funds to county courts for civil defense.

IRA. J. COOK,
President, Logan County Court.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I express the hope that the motion of the Senator from Ohio will be rejected.

RECIPROCAL OPERATION OF RADIO BROADCASTING STATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, various suggestions have been made as a result of the visit to the Soviet Union by Vice President NIXON.

Today I made a statement in the form of a press release suggesting that the Soviet Union be permitted to own and operate radio broadcasting stations in the United States, provided we were permitted to do the same thing in Russia. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, July 30.—U.S. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH proposed today that the United States permit the Soviet Union to own and operate radio and television broadcasting stations in this country if we may do the same in Russia.

"Vice President NIXON put his finger on what is perhaps the most important difference between American truth and Russian Pravda yesterday when he criticized the Kremlin for its practice of jamming U.S. broadcasts," Senator BUSH said in a statement issued from his office.

"The Vice President was suggesting that freedom of speech could, better than anything else, lead to understanding between people. Mr. Khrushchev himself, in his telecast repartee with the Vice President, best demonstrated the need for such understanding when he expressed fear that his remarks might not be given a full and honest translation into English when broadcast in this country, which of course they were.

"These expressions by the visiting Vice President and his Kremlin host lead me to suggest a simple exchange of facilities which could open new doors of free speech and mutual respect and understanding between our two nations. I believe this is a fruitful time for us to make available to the U.S.S.R. important television and radio facilities in our country, fully owned and operated by Soviet personnel, if the United States is given similar facilities, under our full control, in Russia.

"Stations operated in the English language by Russians could bring to Americans the full picture of Soviet progress, information and ideas. Our American stations, in Russia, could present, in their language, the full and true story of our American culture, prosperity, and philosophy.

"With the Russians claiming the same dedication to peace that motivates our American diplomacy, this audio-visual exchanging of viewpoints and environments would inspire a truly wholesome competitive race for an increasingly better way of life for people everywhere. It should lead to an Olympics in ideology rivaling in friendly competitive atmosphere the great sports events between nations, with the world as a stadium.

"How much better and more effective this would be than the current arms race."

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in an attempt to accommodate all Members of the Senate, since we will have several rollcalls this afternoon, it appears that at this point it might be desirable to have the conference report on military construction authorization called up, and after it is called up the Senator from Mississippi informs me that he will make a very brief statement on it, and then we can have the yeas and nays ordered on it.

We would then like to call up the Health, Education, and Welfare conference report and have the yeas and nays ordered on it.

Then if there is further discussion in connection with the motion affecting the independent offices motion appropriation bill, or the military construction bill conference report or the HEW conference report, it could take place prior to the consecutive votes.

When we start to have the yeas and nays, we could have the votes follow each other so that Senators will not have to come to the Chamber and then return to their offices.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi be recognized to submit the conference report on the military construction authorization, report No. 729.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not rise to object, and I shall not object, but it seems to me that since we have completed the argument on the pending measure, the Senator from Texas might include in the unanimous-consent agreement that no further debate will take place.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Illinois would like to have 3 minutes on it, and I do not want to deprive him of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Excepting that it seems to me there would be no use in getting all the Senators here and then having the same debate all over again.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Illinois says he will take only 3 minutes, and the Senator from Mississippi says he will take only 1 minute.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL, 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 29, 1959, pp. 13342–13351, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to make on certain major points involved in the conference report.

The report was signed by all the conferees on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate, and has been agreed to by the House. With respect to the net money figures in the bill, there was only about a $14 million increase over the amount in the bill as passed by the Senate. This increase was primarily the result of reinserting in the bill a provision for six hospitals, which had been deleted by the Senate committee because it was felt the cost estimates were too high and unrealistic. It will be recalled that in the Senate committee's report it was pointed out that the committee did not question the need for the hospitals, but only questioned the cost estimates. The Department of Defense did subsequently submit revised figures in a lesser amount, and these were reduced still further by the conferees. It is believed much more realistic figures have now been arrived at, resulting in a substantial savings to the Government.

There are two or three language provisions which I should like to highlight. The first is section 412 of the bill. As the bill passed the Senate, this section would have prevented the appropriation of any funds after December 31, 1959, to or for the use of any armed forces for the design, development, or procurement of aircraft or missiles, unless the appropriation of such funds had been specifically authorized by legislation enacted after that date. It was agreed by the conferees that the words "design" and "development" should be stricken from the language, and that it be directed solely to the procurement of aircraft and missiles, and to include a similar requirement with respect to naval vessels. The conferees also agreed that the date after which authorization legislation would be necessary should be changed from December 31, 1959, to December 31, 1960. The conferees are in agreement that proper discharge of the legislative responsibilities of the Armed Services Committees required a review of these procurement programs, and that a thorough examination into these areas might serve to reduce the enormous cost of defense and be of assistance to the Committees on Appropriations in their consideration of the defense budget. The new section agreed to by the conferees will give the two committees a year to study the field of aircraft, missiles, and naval-vessel procurement, after which the committees will be ready to function in the legislative area and will be prepared to submit to their respective Houses soundly conceived and clearly presented programs for legislative consideration.

The next section I desire to mention is section 415. This section, as it passed the Senate, prohibits the use of mortgage proceeds for the purchase of title insurance and title search in connection with the construction of Capehart housing projects. The section provides that the Attorney General will furnish an opinion as to the sufficiency of title, and the Secretary of Defense will guarantee against any and all losses arising

against adverse claims to title. There is good authority, including the Comptroller General of the United States, to support the belief that this type of title search and title insurance by the Government is adequate, and should be acceptable to prospective mortgagees. A measure of uneasiness developed, however, in the minds of some of the Members of the Senate and the conferees, who feared that all prospective mortgagees might not readily distinguish between mortgages on Government property under full and complete guarantee by the United States, and private mortgages where commercial insurance may be a reasonable requirement. For this reason, the conferees added to the section a proviso allowing the Secretary of Defense to purchase commercial title search and insurance if he finds it impossible to secure the mortgages under the new policy established by section 415. However, any cost involved in the purchase of such insurance will be paid from appropriated funds already authorized for use by the Secretary of Defense, and not from mortgage proceeds upon which interest must be paid for a period of 25 years. A provision is made for surveillance by the Armed Services Committees.

Finally, I should like to call attention briefly to section 414 which extends the Capehart housing provisions of the National Housing Act to September 30, 1960, and limits to 20,000 units the number of Capehart units that may be contracted for until that time. Although there were substantial differences in the number of such units authorized in the House and Senate versions of the bill, many of them reflected plans of the Air Force that were not complete at the time when the House was considering the bill. The differences contained in the Senate bill were substantially agreed to, as well as the limitation on the number of units to be contracted for during the next 15 months.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the principal items in controversy were the ones the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has mentioned.

With respect to them, I should like to say that considerable concern was expressed by various Members about the provision on title insurance contained in the bill, as passed by the Senate. When the bill was before the Senate, I was among the Members who expressed the view that perhaps there should be some modification, so as to assure, on the one hand, that housing projects would be permitted to proceed, and, on the other hand, that if a title examination were necessary, there would be some method of paying for it without throwing the burden upon the insurance of the Capehart housing.

I think that double goal was reached by the language now in the conference report, although I should add that experience with the provision probably will be necessary before we know fully how it will affect the military housing program.

The second item I wish to mention is the provision for a review of the military program by the Secretary of Defense. As the military construction bill passed the Senate, it provided that there should be a review by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and that it should be made known to both the House Armed Services Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee. The resolving of the so-called controversy between the Nike-Hercules and the Bomarc programs resulted in a revision of the construction program and a provision for the submission by the Secretary of what was called a master plan.

Again, until that has been actually reviewed in the light of the experience in connection with the appropriations made available by the appropriations bill for the military construction program, there will not be the firm decisions which we have a right to expect.

The language contained in the conference report is not nearly so strong as I would have preferred to see used. It provides for a review by the Secretary of Defense, but there is not full assurance that that review will be participated in by the military chiefs.

Personally, I think Congress should have the assurance of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the program is adequate to meet the defense posture which the country should have at this time.

I hope that when the review is provided by the Secretary of Defense, it will be consistent with the hopes expressed by various Members when the bill was under consideration.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has referred to the so-called Russell amendment—that is to say, the language which brings under review by the Congress the procurement programs for naval vessels, missiles, and aircraft. This is a big departure from anything we have had in our military procurement for many years.

The first review of this authorization will be somewhat experimental; but the Congress should obtain from it better control over the several programs involving missiles, naval vessels, and aircraft. It should result in the saving of money. It should result in better coordination of our military armaments and vessels and aircraft. I hope it will be successful. I believe it was an epochal step, insofar as military procurement is concerned.

The language used in the conference report was the subject of a considerable amount of discussion by the conferees. Several sessions were required in order to reach agreement on it. I believe it will be a useful instrument for the Congress in getting greater defense for the dollars we spend.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report; and I yield the floor.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the motion of Mr. YOUNG, of Ohio, that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1 to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished minority leader may now proceed for 3 minutes, and that then the Senate proceed to vote on the motion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] that the Senate recede from its position on the amendment No. 1, which is in disagreement.

I express the hope that the Senate by decisive vote will reject that motion, in which case of course the Senate will insist on its action to provide the extra funds necessary, in my opinion, in order to carry on the civil defense program.

One hundred and thirty-one million dollars of grant funds to the States has been invested for the purpose of setting up the civil-defense program, for which there is joint responsibility.

One year ago this month, as I recall, we had before us a $7 million item; and, before we adjourned, we scolded the civil-defense officials, on the ground that they had no well-worked-out program, no standards, and no merit system.

So now they have produced a merit system and a national plan and criteria for State plans—all of which have been submitted.

So today we have a national plan and State plans which have been submitted and approved; and they require the necessary funds, in order to articulate and carry out the program.

Are we now going to vote to waste the $131 million; or shall we provide sufficient funds to staff the program with the number of personnel and the kind of personnel needed?

I have given a good deal of attention to this matter. I believe I have stated the basic issue involved.

Therefore, Mr. President, I trust that the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] to have the Senate recede from its position on amendment No. 1 will be rejected by the Senate.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS, 1960 — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] may call up the conference report on the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and may make a brief statement regarding it, and that thereafter we may request that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of agreeing to the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

with the OAS Council when the membership of the Council and that of the Institute's Board of Directors are no longer the same.

Two other changes in the convention should be mentioned. The first paragraph of article I of the convention is amended to clarify the fact that the Institute is established as an international organization, in place of the present ambiguous statement that the contracting states recognize the permanent status of the Institute incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1942. Secondly, the provision in article IV of the convention that the Director of the Institute may be reelected one or more times is amended to permit his reelection only once.

The purpose of the protocol is to strengthen the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences so that it may serve more adequately as the arm of the OAS for the improvement of agriculture in the Americas. It is to be hoped that all the OAS member states will take prompt action toward ratifying this instrument and bringing it into force, thus enabling the Institute, with an expanded membership, to carry out an effive hemispherewide program of technical cooperation in agriculture of benefit to all the American Republics.

Article X of the protocol provides that the protocol shall come into force 1 month after the date on which all the states parties to the convention have deposited their respective instruments of ratification of or adherence to the protocol. Any instrument of ratification or adherence deposited by a nonmember state after the date on which the protocal comes into force shall take effect 1 month after the date of its deposit.

Respectfully submitted.

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Acting Secretary.

(Enclosure: Protocol of amendment to the Convention on the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays on resolution of ratification of the protocol be ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the protocol will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to the point of the consideration of the resolution of ratification, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive C, 86th Congress, 1st session, a protocol of amendment to the Convention on the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, which protocol was opened for signature in the Spanish, English, Portuguese, and French languages at the Pan American Union in Washington on December 1, 1958. The protocol was signed in behalf of the United States of America on January 7, 1959.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that discussion on the protocol be concluded.

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

DUTIES AND RIGHTS OF STATES IN EVENT OF CIVIL STRIFE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive F, 86th Congress, 1st session.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in committee of the whole, proceeded to consider the protocol (Executive F, 86th Cong., 1st sess.) to the Convention of February 20, 1928, on the duties and rights of states in the event of civil strife, signed in behalf of the United States on July 15, 1957, which was read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL TO THE CONVENTION ON DUTIES AND RIGHTS OF STATES IN THE EVENT OF CIVIL STRIFE

The High Contracting Parties, desirous of clarifying, supplementing, and strengthening the principles and rules stipulated in the Convention on Duties and Rights of States in the Event of Civil Strife, signed at Havana on February 20, 1928,

Have resolved, in order to carry out those purposes, to conclude the following Protocol:

ARTICLE 1

Each Contracting State shall, in areas subject to its jurisdiction:

(a) Keep under surveillance the traffic in arms and war material that it has reason to believe is intended for starting, promoting, or supporting civil strife in another American State;

(b) Suspend the exportation or importation of any shipment of arms and war material during the period of its investigation of the circumstances relating to the shipment, when it has reason to believe that such arms and war material may be intended for starting, promoting, or supporting civil strife in another American State; and

(c) Prohibit the exportation or importation of any shipment of arms and war material intended for starting, promoting, or supporting civil strife in another American State.

ARTICLE 2

The provisions of Article 1 shall cease to be applicable for a Contracting State only when it has recognized the belligerency of the rebels, in which event the rules of neutrality shall be applied.

ARTICLE 3

The term "traffic in arms and war material", which appears in the third paragraph of Article 1 of the Convention on Duties and Rights of States in the Event of Civil Strife as well as in this Protocol, includes land vehicles, vessels, and aircraft of all types, whether civil or military.

ARTICLE 4

The provisions of the Convention on Duties and Rights of States in the Event of Civil Strife with respect to "vessels" are equally applicable to aircraft of all types, whether civil or military.

ARTICLE 5

Each Contracting State shall, in areas subject to its jurisdiction and within the powers granted by its Constitution, use all appropriate means to prevent any person, national or alien, from deliberately participating in the preparation, organization, or carrying out of a military enterprise that has as its purpose the starting, promoting or supporting of civil strife in another Contracting State, whether or not the government of the latter has been recognized.

For the purposes of this article, participation in the preparation, organization, or carrying out of a military enterprise includes, among other acts:

(a) The contribution, supply or provision of arms and war material;

(b) The equipment, training, collection, or transportation of members of a military expedition; or

(c) The provision or receipt of money, by any method, intended for the military enterprise.

ARTICLE 6

The present Protocol does not affect obligations previously undertaken by the Contracting State through international agreements.

ARTICLE 7

This Protocol shall remain open in the Pan American Union for signature by the American States, and shall be ratified in conformity with their respective constitutional procedures.

ARTICLE 8

This Protocol may be ratified only by the States that have ratified or ratify the Convention on the Duties and Rights of States in the Event of Civil Strife. This Protocol shall enter into force between the States that ratify it, in the order in which they deposit their respective instruments of ratification.

ARTICLE 9

The original instrument of this Protocol, the English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish texts of which are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Pan American Union, which shall transmit certified copies thereof to the Governments for purposes of ratification.

The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Pan American Union, which shall notify the signatory States of such deposit. A certified copy of this Protocol shall be transmitted by the Pan American Union to the General Secretariat of the United Nations for registration.

ARTICLE 10

This Protocol shall remain in force indefinitely between the Contracting States. It may be denounced by any of them upon one year's notice. Such denunciation shall be addressed to the Pan American Union, which shall notify the other signatory States thereof.

ARTICLE 11

Each Contracting State shall refrain from denouncing the Convention on Duties and Rights of States in the Event of Civil Strife while this Protocol remains in force for that State.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, whose full powers have been presented and found to be in good and due form, sign this Protocol on the dates that appear opposite their respective signatures.

I hereby certify that the foregoing document is a true and faithful copy of the authentic texts in English, French, Portuguese and Spanish, of the Protocol to the 1928 Havana Convention on the Duties and Rights of States in the Event of Civil Strife, opened for signature by the American States at the Pan American Union on May 1, 1957, and that these texts have been duly examined for purposes of coordination by the Special Committee appointed to that end by the Council of the Organization of American States.

WASHINGTON, D.C., *May 1, 1957.*
(Signed) William Manger,
(Typed) WILLIAM MANGER,
Secretary of the Council of the Organization of American States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the main purpose of the protocol, which also was unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, is to clarify, supplement, and strengthen the principles and rules stipulated in the Convention on Duties and Rights of States in the Event of Civil Strife, which was signed at Havana February 20, 1928. This convention obligates its parties, among other things, to prevent the use

of their territory for fomenting civil strife in the territory of another party.

The 1928 Havana convention was one of the acts of the Sixth Inter-American Conference, and was ratified by the United States in 1930 with an understanding that certain provisions relating to insurgent vessels should not apply during a recognized state of belligerency. It is now in force for all of the American Republics except Chile, Guatemala, and Venezuela.

The convention lays down certain rules of conduct for the contracting parties in the event of civil strife in one of of them. It binds the parties "to use all means at their disposal to prevent the inhabitants of their territory, nationals or aliens, from participating in, gathering elements, crossing the boundary or sailing from their territory for the purpose of starting or promoting civil strife."

States are also to disarm and intern rebel forces crossing their boundaries; to forbid the traffic in arms and war material, except when intended for the government; and to prevent, within their jurisdiction, the equipping, arming, or adapting for warlike purposes of any vessel intended for the rebellion. Insurgent vessels arriving in a country are to be returned to the government of the state in civil strike and members of the crew are to be considered political refugees. Finally, the convention sets forth the rights of states injured by depredations or other actions of insurgent vessels.

In 1950 an Investigating Committee appointed by the Council of the Organization of American States in connection with a series of Caribbean revolutions recommended, and the OAS Council agreed, that the 1928 convention be broadened to cover additional aspects of revolutionary activity. Negotiations extended over several years, and it was not until February 20, 1957, that the protocol to the convention was approved by the Council. It was opened for signature May 1, 1957, and was signed by the United States July 15 of that year. It has also been signed by nine other American States—Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, and Peru—and has been ratified by five states—Argentina, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti.

Following consultation on June 2, 1959, between the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, the President sent the protocol to the Senate on June 18 with a request for advice and consent to ratification. The committee held a hearing on the matter July 27, at which time Assistant Secretary Roy R. Rubottom presented the Department of State's views favoring ratification. Subsequently, the committee voted in executive session to report the protocol favorably.

The protocol has four substantive provisions:

First, it obligates each contracting state to "keep under surveillance the traffic in arms and war material that it has reason to believe is intended for starting, promoting, or supporting civil strife in another American State," to suspend the shipment of any such material during its investigation of the circumstances, and to prohibit the export or import of any such material which is in fact intended for such purposes. These provisions do not apply when the belligerency of the rebels has been recognized, in which case the rules of neutrality come into play.

Second, the definition of "traffic in arms and war material" in the basic convention is broadened to include "land vehicles, vessels, and aircraft of all types, whether civil or military."

Third, the provisions of the basic convention with respect to vessels are made equally applicable to aircraft.

Fourth, the protocol obligates each contracting state, in areas subject to its jurisdiction and within the powers granted by its constitution, to "use all appropriate means to prevent any person, national or alien, from deliberately participating in the preparation, organization, or carrying out of a military enterprise that has as its purpose the starting, promoting, or supporting of civil strife in another contracting state, whether or not the government of the latter has been recognized." This prohibition extends to the contribution, supply, or provision of arms and war material; the equipment, training, collection, or transportation of members of a military expedition; and the provision or receipt of money, by any method, intended for the military enterprise.

The protocol is not self-executing; but most of the necessary implementing legislation, so far as the United States is concerned, has already been enacted, especially in title 18, United States Code, sections 958–962, and title 50, United States Code, appendix, section 2021, et seq.

These sections generally prohibit the enlistment or recruitment for foreign military service in the United States, the preparation of foreign military expeditions in the United States, and the outfitting of foreign naval vessels for service against friendly powers. They also provide statutory authority for the control of exports.

Attention should be called to the fact that section 960 of title 18, which prohibits, among other things, furnishing money for military enterprises against foreign states, is limited to expeditions carried on from the United States. This is not so broad as article 5 of the protocol which would prohibit the furnishing of money for a military expedition to be launched from the territory of a third country. If this sort of activity is to be prohibited in the United States, additional legislation will be required.

The protocol imposes no substantial obligations on the United States beyond those which have long been self-imposed as a matter of the well-established U.S. policy of nonintervention in the internal affairs of other states. This principle is one of the bedrocks of the inter-American system.

The protocol should serve, however, to define the obligations of all American states more precisely and clearly. As a consequence, it will make it easier for states which want to live up to their obligations to do so; and, by the same token, it will make it more difficult for irresponsible states to default on their obligations.

To the extent that this end is accomplished, it should exert a salutary influence on the present troubled situation in the Caribbean area.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further discussion of this protocol be concluded.

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

If there be no objection, the protocol will be considered as having been passed through its various parliamentary stages up to the point of the consideration of the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive F, 86th Congress 1st session, a protocol to the Convention of February 20, 1928 on the duties and rights of States in the event of civil strife, signed in behalf of the United States on July 15, 1957.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1 to the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, at the conclusion of which the Senate will proceed to vote on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] that the Senate recede from its position on amendment No. 1 to the independent offices appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Chair please state the question upon which the Senate is about to vote? The yeas and nays have been ordered on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. Will the Chair state what that motion is, so all Members of the

Senate will understand what they are being asked to vote on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Ohio is that the Senate recede from its position on amendment No. 1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well. There will be at least 4 rollcalls, following this one, so I hope Members of the Senate will remain in the Chamber, and we shall conclude as quickly as we can.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. For the benefit of those who came to the Chamber late, would the Chair have the clerk state the amendment? It is a little difficult for us to know what we are being asked to vote on simply by a statement that it is a motion that the Senate recede.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk state the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the clerk will state the motion.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Amendment No. 1: On page 3, line 5, strike out "$10 million" and insert in lieu thereof "$25 million."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] that the Senate recede from its position on Senate amendment No. 1. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 71, as follows:

YEAS—12

Clark	Lausche	Neuberger
Douglas	Long	Russell
Gruening	McClellan	Yarborough
Hartke	Moss	Young, Ohio

NAYS—71

Allott	Hart	Monroney
Anderson	Hayden	Morse
Beall	Hennings	Morton
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bible	Hill	Muskie
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Prouty
Butler	Humphrey	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Robertson
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Jordan	Scott
Carroll	Keating	Smathers
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Smith
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Sparkman
Church	Kuchel	Stennis
Cooper	Langer	Symington
Cotton	McCarthy	Talmadge
Curtis	McGee	Thurmond
Dirksen	McNamara	Wiley
Dworshak	Magnuson	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Martin	

NOT VOTING—15

Aiken	Engle	Green
Bartlett	Frear	Kerr
Chavez	Fulbright	Murray
Dodd	Goldwater	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Gore	Williams, N.J.

So the motion of Mr. YOUNG of Ohio was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment No. 1 and request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference; and I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS—76

Allott	Hartke	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Morton
Beall	Hennings	Mundt
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Hruska	Prouty
Butler	Humphrey	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Robertson
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Jordan	Scott
Carroll	Keating	Smathers
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Smith
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Sparkman
Chavez	Kuchel	Stennis
Church	Langer	Symington
Cooper	Lausche	Talmadge
Cotton	McCarthy	Thurmond
Curtis	McGee	Wiley
Dirksen	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Magnuson	Yarborough
Ellender	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Martin	
Hart	Monroney	

NAYS—8

Clark	Long	Russell
Douglas	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Moss	

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken	Frear	Kerr
Bartlett	Fulbright	Murray
Dodd	Goldwater	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Gore	Williams, N.J
Engle	Green	

So Mr. MAGNUSON's motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

CONSTRUCTION AT CERTAIN MILITARY INSTALLATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5674) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report on the military construction authorization bill, report No. 729, H.R. 5674.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of the conference report on the military construction authorization bill. The adoption of the report is recommended by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. The report is unanimous. The debate has been concluded, and the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report on this question. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—85

Allott	Dirksen	Kefauver
Anderson	Douglas	Kennedy
Beall	Dworshak	Kuchel
Bennett	Ellender	Langer
Bible	Engle	Lausche
Bridges	Ervin	Long
Bush	Gruening	McCarthy
Butler	Hart	McClellan
Byrd, Va.	Hartke	McGee
Byrd, W. Va.	Hayden	McNamara
Cannon	Hennings	Magnuson
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Mansfield
Carlson	Hill	Martin
Carroll	Holland	Monroney
Case, N.J.	Hruska	Morse
Case, S. Dak.	Humphrey	Morton
Chavez	Jackson	Moss
Church	Javits	Mundt
Clark	Johnson, Tex.	Muskie
Cooper	Johnston, S.C.	Neuberger
Cotton	Jordan	Pastore
Curtis	Keating	Prouty
Proxmire	Smathers	Wiley
Randolph	Smith	Williams, De.
Robertson	Sparkman	Yarborough
Russell	Stennis	Young, N. Dak.
Saltonstall	Symington	Young, Ohio
Schoeppel	Talmadge	
Scott	Thurmond	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—13

Aiken	Fulbright	Murray
Bartlett	Goldwater	O'Mahoney
Dodd	Gore	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	Green	
Frear	Kerr	

So the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR LABOR DEPARTMENT AND DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I rise to a point of information. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to the conference report on the appropriation bill (H.R. 6769) for the Departments of Labor, and of Health, Education, and Welfare, as presented by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Will the Senator from Alabama state by how much the appropriation is over the amount asked for in the budget?

Mr. HILL. It is $259 million over the budget estimate.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—69

Allott	Hill	Moss
Anderson	Holland	Mundt
Beall	Humphrey	Muskie
Bennett	Jackson	Neuberger
Bible	Javits	Pastore
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston, S.C.	Proxmire
Cannon	Jordan	Randolph
Carlson	Keating	Robertson
Carroll	Kefauver	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Church	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Clark	Langer	Scott
Cooper	Long	Smathers
Douglas	McCarthy	Smith
Dworshak	McClellan	Sparkman
Ellender	McGee	Stennis
Engle	McNamara	Symington
Ervin	Magnuson	Talmadge
Gruening	Mansfield	Wiley
Hartke	Martin	Yarborough
Hayden	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hennings	Morse	Young, Ohio

NAYS—14

Bush	Cotton	Lausche
Butler	Curtis	Morton
Byrd, Va.	Dirksen	Thurmond
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Williams, Del.
Case, N.J.	Hruska	

NOT VOTING—15

Aiken	Frear	Hart
Bartlett	Fulbright	Kerr
Chavez	Goldwater	Murray
Dodd	Gore	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Green	Williams, N.J.

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

(The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6769, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.

July 30, 1959.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 21, 40, 42, 43, and 44 to the bill (H.R. 6769) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "continuation" in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "expansion and improvement."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert the following:

Aug 12, 1959

12. BUDGET; INFLATION. Sen. Moss charged that the Administration was trying to convince the public that inflation "is almost entirely caused by excessive Government spending" and that "Democrats in Congress are solely responsible for that unbalanced budget," and inserted tables on wholesale price indexes and consumer price indexes to show "that there is little or no direct year-to-year relationship between periods of particularly great price rises and periods of budget surpluses and deficit." pp. 14313-7

13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson announced that S. 812, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps, would be debated today, Aug. 13, under a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate on the bill. pp. 14299-300, 14312-3

HOUSE

14. WHEAT; FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment H. R. 8409, to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the authority contained in that Act until July 31, 1962. p. 14400 (H. Report 883).

15. ELECTRIFICATION; BUDGETING; RECLAMATION. Received from this Department a proposed bill "to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide a revolving fund for certain loans by the Secretary of Agriculture for improved budget and accounting procedures"; to the Agriculture Committee. p. 14400

The "Daily Digest" states that the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee tabled, instead of voting to recommend the tabling of (as reported in yesterday's Digest), H. R. 5499 and 5521, to provide for the joint development of the waterpower resources of the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, Calif., by the U. S. and the Pacific Gas and Electric Co. p. D754

16. INDUSTRIAL-USES RESEARCH. The Research and Extension Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendment H. R. 7576, "to create an Agricultural Research Commission." p. D753

17. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1960. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7509 (H. Rept. 888). This bill includes funds for the Corps of Engineers (Army), certain agencies in Interior, and TVA. In an amendment relating to the Bonneville Power Administration, the conferees stated that none of the $1,055,000 provided for Harney Electric Cooperative Services shall be obligated until this cooperative has met the conditions of REA in the Loan Document of June 29, 1959. pp. 14319-26, 14401

18. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1960. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7040 (H. Rept. 887). The conferees again reported amendment No. 1 in disagreement (relating to an increase in financial contributions to States for civil defense) (pp. 14395, 14401). (See Digests 129 and 124 for a summary of this amendment and of the items of interest to this Department respectively.) Earlier in the day conferees had been appointed (p. 14319).

19. ACCOUNTING; APPROPRIATIONS. Received from this Department "a report on a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, involving an overobligation of an allotment of funds as of June 30, 1958"; to the Appropriations Committee. p. 14400

20. ADMINISTRATIVE LAW. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7559, to provide for a reasonable notice of applications to the U. S. courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against the orders of certain administrative agencies (H. Rept. 878). p. 14400

21. VIRGIN ISLANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7870, to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, as amended (H. Rept. 877). p. 14400

22. PURCHASING. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 1341, to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards. p. 14401

23. PERSONNEL; VEHICLES. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment H. R. 766, to amend section 5 of the act of July 16, 1914, relating to penalties for the use of Government-owned vehicles for other than official purposes (H. Rept. 889). pp. 14399, 14401

24. SURPLUS PROPERTY. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment H. R. 3722, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations (H. Rept. 891). p. 14401

25. HOUSING. Rep. McDonough stated that in the light of the Senate vote sustaining the President's veto of S. 57, the housing bill, he hoped that the Congress would write a bill "which will meet the requirements of adequate housing," and he inserted a statement on the subject. pp. 14395-6

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

26. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Sen. Johnson inserting an article and stating that "it gives an excellent account of the value and importance of the typical farmer in America." p. A6943

27. ECONOMIC POLICY. Rep. Rhodes inserted an address by Don Paarlberg, "Republican View of the National Economic Policy." pp. A6945-7

28. WHEAT. Extension of remarks of Rep. McGinley inserting an article discussing the results of an intensive study by the Nebraska College of Agriculture on the merits of raising only wheat compared to planting some other crops. pp. A6958-60

29. CIVIL DEFENSE. Sen. Young inserted an article, "Is Civil Defense Possible?" pp. A6961-2

30. COTTON; TEXTILES. Extension of remarks of Sen. Thurmond inserting an article, "A Magnanimous Foreign Policy Backfires On U. S. Workers," discussing problems of the textile industry. pp. A6963-4

31. MILK. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley inserting an article, "Fluid Milk Pricing Formula Is Outdated," and stating that it "constructively points out definite factors to illustrate that the present milk pricing formula definitely needs an overhauling." p. A6966

32. RESEARCH; PRICES. Rep. Hoeven inserted an article describing the benefits to consumers as a result of the new technology in agriculture. pp. A6972-3

33. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Fulton commended and inserted Francis O. Wilcox's, Asst. Secy. of State, speech, "Answers to the Challenge: Assistance Through International Organizations." pp. A6985-7

86TH CONGRESS 1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT No. 887

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

AUGUST 12, 1959.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. THOMAS, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 7040]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

The committee of conference reports in disagreement amendment numbered 1.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
GORDON ALLOTT,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON YOUNG,
By L. S.
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Amendment No. 1: Reported in disagreement.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

O

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

II Corinthians 3: 5: *Not that we are sufficient of ourselves but our sufficiency is from God.*

Most merciful and gracious God, grant that during this day we may achieve a greater gain in helpful things and experience a more blessed joy in higher things.

We earnestly beseech Thee that the Members of this legislative body may be directed by Thy divine counsel for without Thy guidance their wisdom is folly and they labor in vain.

May their constituents daily commend them to Thy all-sufficient grace that in their deliberations and decisions they may be endowed with clear vision and right judgment.

Inspire the nations and their leaders to pursue the ways of peace and good will and seek to extend and enlarge the boundaries of the kingdom of righteousness.

Here us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and request a further conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, YATES, CANNON, OSTERTAG, and TABER.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 7509, the public-works appropriation bill.

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

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 888)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7509) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4 and 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 14, 16, and 17, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$678,314,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$117,882,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$70,839,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,788,710"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,838,710"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$135,862,739"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 5, 10, 13, and 15.

CLARENCE CANNON,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ROBERT S. KERR,
HENRY C. DWORSHAK,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7509) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Rivers and harbors and flood control

General Investigations

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $10,750,000 instead of $9,518,400 as proposed by the House and $11,938,200 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided are to be distributed as follows:

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960	Conference allowance
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
Examinations and surveys:		
Navigation studies	$600,000	$1,050,000
Flood control studies	2,100,000	3,101,000
Beach erosion cooperative studies	75,000	75,000
Special studies:		
San Francisco Bay survey	400,000	500,000
Ohio River Basin review	400,000	400,000
Great Lakes Harbor survey	260,000	260,000
Coordination studies with other agencies	150,000	110,000
Delaware River comprehensive survey	330,000	330,000
Hurricane studies	950,000	950,000
Hudson River (siltation) studies		114,000
Potomac River review	500,000	400,000
Colorado River, Tex	75,000	75,000
Trinity River	200,000	250,000
Rampart Canyon, Alaska		50,000
Subtotal, examinations and surveys	6,040,000	7,665,000
Collection and study of basic data:		
Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)	$225,000	$225,000
Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau)	330,000	330,000
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)		50,000
International water studies	50,000	50,000
Subtotal collection and study of basic data	605,000	655,000
Research and development:		
Beach erosion development studies	200,000	200,000
Hydrologic studies	150,000	150,000
Civil works investigations	1,200,000	1,200,000
Mississippi Basin model:		
Construction	700,000	700,000
Mississippi River comprehensive study	105,000	105,000
Subtotal, research and development	2,355,000	2,355,000
Arkansas-Red River pollution		75,000
Total, general investigations	9,000,000	10,750,000

Funds proposed by the Senate for the Lake Champlain Waterway, and the Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek have been disallowed. The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the funds provided for the Potomac River review shall be used to finance the study of water supply and pollution abatement as authorized by the Senate Public Works Committee resolution adopted on July 6, 1959, rather than for the comprehensive study previously authorized.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Construction, General

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $678,314,100 instead of $658,800,100 as proposed by the House and $710,034,100 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that funds appropriated under this item should be allocated as set forth in the following tabulation:

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1960		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Alabama:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	$1,000,000		$1,000,000	
Holt lock and dam				$150,000
Jackson lock and dam	8,150,000		8,000,000	
Montgomery		$63,000		63,000
Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	14,900,000		14,900,000	
Alaska:				
Dillingham Harbor			406,000	
Naknek River			[1](21,000)	
Seldovia Harbor: Channel work			[1](245,000)	
Arizona:				
Alamo Reservoir		65,000		65,000
Gila River		30,000		50,000
Painted Rock Reservoir	5,171,000		5,171,000	
Whitlow Ranch Reservoir	1,903,000			
Arkansas:				
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma: Emergency bank stabilization	4,000,000		5,000,000	
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma (general studies)		900,000		900,000
Beaver Reservoir			1,500,000	
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (additions of units Nos. 5 and 6)	1,200,000		1,200,000	
Clarksville			[1](259,000)	
Dardanelle lock and dam	5,000,000		3,400,000	
DeGray Reservoir				150,000
Gillham Reservoir				80,000
Greers Ferry Reservoir	11,130,000		11,130,000	
McKinney Bayou and Barkman Creek, Ark. and Tex	600,000		600,000	
Millwood Reservoir		172,000		172,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	700,000		700,000	
Table Rock Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Missouri.)				
California:				
Black Butte Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
Carbon Canyon Dam and Channel	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Devil East Twin Warm and Lytle Creeks	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Eel River	508,000		508,000	
Halfmoon Bay Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Los Angeles County Drainage Area	15,500,000		15,500,000	
Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Middle Creek	650,000		650,000	
Mill Creek levees			500,000	
New Hogan Reservoir			1,500,000	
Oroville Reservoir		30,000		30,000
Pine Flat Reservoir	75,000		75,000	
Playa Del Rey Inlet and Basin	500,000		500,000	
Port Hueneme Harbor	3,000,000		3,000,000	
Redwood City Harbor: 30-foot depth San Bruno Shoal entrance and Redwood Creek channels			1,378,000	
Russian River Reservoir	250,000		250,000	
Sacramento River	2,500,000		2,500,000	
Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	1,100,000		1,100,000	
Sacramento River deepwater ship channel	7,500,000		6,500,000	
San Antonio and Chino Creeks	1,800,000		1,800,000	
San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek			225,000	
San Joaquin River-Stockton deepwater channel	250,000		250,000	
San Lorenzo Creek	1,700,000		1,700,000	
San Lorenzo River	274,000		274,000	
Santa Clara River	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Santa Maria Valley levees	2,200,000		2,200,000	
Stewart Canyon Basin		62,000		62,000
Success Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000	
Terminus Reservoir	5,500,000		5,500,000	
Truckee River and tributaries, California and Nevada. (See Nevada.)				
Tuolumne River Reservoirs (New Don Pedro)		25,000		25,000

Footnote at end of table.

who now is delaying the crucifixion to say a word or two concerning the condemned. I think there were those in the curious mob at Mount Calvary who would wish such opportunity.

In 1915, when the gentleman from Illinois had been a humble instrumentality in arousing the people of America to the pitiable wages paid to America's workers, the average yearly pay of men wage earners in the United States, boys excluded, but steelworkers and railroaders included, was $513.76—less than $1.70 for every working day, and but $1.41 for each of the 365 days in the year. Take at that time a family of seven—husband, wife, four children, and one grandparent. The children were small, the grandparent feeble, the wife had all she could do at home. The husband was the only wage earner. If he worked in a steel mill and got the average pay he had 27 cents a day for each member of his family—but 20 cents a day if he got the average pay of an average earner.

Mr. Chairman, I emphasize this was in my lifetime, in my adult lifetime; indeed at a period when I was old enough to be Lieutenant Governor of Illinois and chairman of a commission investigating the wages of American workers, a commission you will find, if you take the trouble to look into the newspaper files of the period, that aroused the conscience of America.

What, Mr. Chairman, raised America's labor from this position of ignominy, when the best paid workers in our country toiled away their youth and prime and in return had 27 cents a day to meet the food and lodging requirements of each member of their families?—not, Mr. Chairman, in a far remote era; but in the adult lifetime of the gentleman from Illinois who now addresses you. What was the God-blessed agency that rescued America's workers from this sad plight? Even the youngest of schoolchildren must know the answer. It was the drive, the determination, the dedication of organized labor.

In every advance we made in the betterment of our social fabric, organized labor led the way. Everybody benefited, since with adequate wages the workers, not only enjoyed the dignity God intended for them, but had the money to buy the things they needed and thus contributed to the buying power and the expanding economy of our Nation.

I knew and worked with Samuel Gompers. Together, Sam Gompers and I traveled to Washington to the inauguration of President Taft. I knew and worked in the Chicago area with John Fitzpatrick, Ed Nockels, Victor Olander. I know the character and the quality of the leaders, and of the rank and file, who made organized labor in our country the greatest savior of mankind in our times.

But now, Mr. Chairman, the time for the crucifixion draws near. The populace is gathered for the spectacle. Caesar has decreed, and the word of Caesar must not be questioned.

"Caesar" GOLDWATER has proclaimed that the bill carrying the names of two of our colleagues is indeed in substance his bill. What Caesar claims no one can deny. And Caesar was the only Member of the other body, the one sole Member of the other body, who voted no to the Kennedy-Ives bill to drive the crooks from labor. How can I put my faith in a measure that Caesar claims is his measure when I wish to drive out the crooks and Caesar stood out, the one sole Member of the other body, Republicans and Democrats, who voted nay.

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

The chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] to close debate.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the previous question without any further debate.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

The question was taken, and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KEARNS and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 132, noes 245.

So the substitute was rejected.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, 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. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Mr. THOMAS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for the sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 7040)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for the sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

The committee of conference reports in disagreement amendment numbered 1.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
LISTER HILL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
GORDON ALLOTT,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

TITLE 1—EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization

Amendment No. 1: Reported in disagreement.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

THE HOUSING BILL

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

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, since the Senate today sustained the President's veto of the extravagant and inflationary housing bill S. 57 by a substantial majority of 40 "no" to 55 "yes," where a two-thirds vote was necessary to override his veto, the following facts in support of the President's veto message are revealing and justify President Eisenhower's position.

This bill has had an unusual history having been considered by the Congress since January 7 in both the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees, and by lengthy debate and vote both in the Senate and in the House.

The most unusual procedure which has no precedent in the legislative history of the Congress was the last action by the Housing Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee when a hearing lasting a week was held on the President's veto message. Most of the witnesses testifying at that hearing were critical of the President's veto message, but in spite of this testimony the subcommittee voted to report a new bill to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee rather than to attempt to override the President's veto.

This recommendation was reversed by the whole Senate Banking and Currency Committee which by a vote of 7 to 8

recommended that the Senate should proceed to vote on the veto message in an attempt to override the President's veto.

The astounding results of the vote in the Senate of 40 "no" to 55 "yes," where a two-thirds vote is required to override proves that all of the parliamentary devices that have been used to defeat the President's proposals on an adequate housing bill and the attempts that have been made to pass an extravagant, inflationary housing bill have delayed action on this important legislation.

I trust that we will now proceed to write a bill which will meet the requirements of adequate housing.

For the information of the interested Members of Congress, I submit herewith a statement of facts in support of the veto message with which the vote in the Senate today indicates they agree:

HOUSING: FACTS SUPPORT VETO MESSAGE

At a July 23 hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing, a number of objections to the President's veto message on the housing bill were voiced. Here are the major objections cited, with the facts in each case:

The subcommittee: Amounts spent for public housing annual contributions should not have been included in the $2.2 billion estimate of spending authorized by S. 57 (the vetoed bill).

The facts: The veto message sought to give a full statement of costs. The contributions in question are paid to cities over a 40-year period and can only be estimated at this time, but they were conservatively estimated on the basis of 10 years' experience. Although appropriations would have to be made for these contributions, the Federal Government would have had no alternative but to appropriate the money in accordance with the commmitments authorized in S. 57.

The subcommittee: The veto message was wrong in characterizing the $900 million authorization of urban renewal grants in S. 57 as "excessive."

The facts: The Housing and Home Finance Agency believes it would be difficult to make prudent use of $900 million in a 2-year period. Approximately $1.3 billion of urban renewal grant funds has been reserved for specific cities since the program started in 1949, but almost $500 million of this sum is for projects still in the planning stage. In any case, additional authorizations of $900 million are excessive in view of all other demands on the Federal budget at this time.

The subcommittee: The veto message did not correctly represent the status of the public housing programs in stating: "Even though we have over 100,000 previously authorized public housing units as yet unbuilt, the bill would authorize 190,000 more."

The facts: 242,000 units have been built under the Housing Act of 1949. Commitments for annual contributions contracts have been entered into for another 101,000. These have not as yet been built. At present there are applications for about 57,000 units on hand, though only 30,000 to 35,000 of these are regarded as active. S. 57 would have authorized 10,000 units of carryover and an additional 35,000 units. Beyond that, it would have authorized the President, at his discretion, to make commitments for an estimated 145,000 additional units. No account was taken of the discretionary units in estimating the cost of S. 57. If these had been included, the cost of the bill would have been raised to more than $5 billion.

The subcommittee: The veto message was wrong in stating that "The way the bill is written a few large cities, by making early application, could tie up all the funds available under the urban renewal program."

The facts: Although it is true, as pointed out in the hearings, that not more than 12½ percent of the funds could go to cities in any one State, the fact remains that a few large cities could tie up the bulk, if not all, of the funds. Even though this provision of S. 57 would require the processing of the present backlog of applications first, this only means that the full effect of the discriminatory features would not be felt at once. No attempt was made in the hearings by the committee members to defend this provision of S. 57.

The subcommittee: In a prepared statement read at the start of the hearing, Senator PROXMIRE maintained that there was an urgent need for the proposed new program of direct loans for housing for elderly persos. The veto message questioned the need for this program. No opportunity was given at the time to answer Senator PROXMIRE's statement.

The facts: The Housing and Home Finance Agency finds that the largest part of the need for elderly housing lies in the field covered by the proposed new nursing home program. Surveys indicate that 88 percent of the elderly are satisfied with their present quarters.

The subcommittee: An effort was made in the hearings to establish that the administration was willing to accept "back door financing" in its housing programs, and that this was inconsistent with its opposition to such financing in other connections.

The facts: Although it is true that the administration's recommendations of last spring would have continued certain existing programs on a "back door financing" basis, it did not recommend any new programs on this basis and now opposes such financing even for existing programs in view of the increasing need for tighter budgetary controls. The new housing bills introduced by Senator BUSH (S. 2378) and by Representative MCDONOUGH (H.R. 8181) contains no "back door financing" provisions.

The subcommittee: The veto message compares the full 2-year ($900 million) urban renewal program of S. 57 with 2 years ($600 million) of the administration's 6-year program. It was maintained that the message should have included the full 6-year program proposed by the administration.

The facts: Only 2 years of the administration's program was included in order to make it comparable with the 2-year program provided for by S. 57.

The subcommittee: Lending authorizations should not have been counted as spending authorizations in estimating the cost of S. 57.

The facts: Lending operations involve budgetary expenditures, like any other disbursement, and are properly included to give a full account of cost.

The subcommittee: The veto message was incorrect in stating that "much of the spending it (S. 57) authorizes is unnecessary."

The facts: The message stated that, to the extent that spending authorized by S. 57 would merely displace private financing, it was unnecessary. This would be true particularly in the case of the direct loan program for housing for elderly persons. The FNMA par purchase requirement of S. 57 would also invite public financing where private funds would otherwise suffice.

RECENT SUPREME COURT TAX DECISION

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

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, a recent Supreme Court decision opens the gates to a flood of taxation and redtape that could ruin American business, industry, and commerce. In effect, that decision says that any State can tax a corporation doing business within its boundaries even though it has no plant, or warehouse, or office there.

This "tax on sales in the individual States" would mean that a company doing a nationwide business would have to pay 50 separate and additional taxes on top of the heavy tax burden it is carrying at the present time. With all the States looking for more money, you can be sure that they would exploit this opportunity to the fullest, unless corrective legislation is passed by the Congress.

With producing States taxing payrolls, and marketing States taxing sales, those firms doing an interstate business could be taxed up to 100 percent of net. Industry, already burdened with the wasteful paperwork forced upon it by Government, would be swamped by the necessity of filing comprehensive and detailed returns in 50 States leading to a bookkeeping nightmare.

The saying that "The power to tax is the power to destroy" would become the hideous reality that would break the back of private enterprise. In order to survive, concerns engaged in interstate business would have to limit their sales to one State, and our Federal Union would become a patchwork of 50 separate economic islands that would shrivel progress and ruin everything we have accomplished by the free marketing system within the United States.

This possibility not only threatens big business; it will affect the tens of thousands of small businesses that sell any product outside of the one in which they maintain their plant, warehouse or office. Already harried by mounting costs, this would be the "coup de grace."

Congress has been quick to note the serious implications of this Supreme Court decision. Several bills have been introduced which would limit this power to tax out-of-State business enterprises. One of these bills submitted by Representative FRANCIS WALTER of Pennsylvania, House Joint Resolution 450, would be most effective in preventing tax anarchy since it is in the nature of stopgap legislation to stay the enforceability of the Supreme Court decision for a period of 2 years, until such time as the Congress will have an opportunity to hold extensive hearings and report new legislation on this important subject matter.

The legitimate taxing powers of government for the purpose of raising essential revenues must not be permitted to run wild and turn our country into a tax jungle that would stifle initiative and progress.

WHAT POSSIBLE GOOD?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the hope expressed by the administration that a "campaign of smiles" will convert Nikita Khrushchev to reasonableness if he should visit the United States is sheer fantasy.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued August 17, 1959
For actions of August 14, 1959
86th-1st, No. 139

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....12
Appropriations.....1,2,3
Budget.....17
CCC.....9
Civil defense.....2
Cotton.....9
Farm program.....14
Foreign aid.....13
Foreign trade.....5,15
Freight forwarders.....11
Imports.....15
Insecticides.....4
Legislative program.....11
Personnel.....6
Research.....10
Science.....11
Small business.....8
Soil bank.....16
Textiles.....5,9
Vehicles.....11
Water resources.....1,7
Wheat.....11
Wildlife.....1,4,10,16

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to conference report on public works appropriation bill. House voted to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment to independent offices appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7509 (including funds for the Corps of Engineers, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and TVA), and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. 14547-52). Concurred in Senate amendments providing that $550,000 of the funds for the Corps of Engineers, and $200,000 of the funds for the Bureau of Reclamation, shall be transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service for studies to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of those agencies (p. 14552).

2. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. By a vote of 241 to 166, insisted on its disagreement to a Senate amendment to this bill, H. R. 7040, which would increase from $10 million to $25 million the amount for Federal contributions to the States for civil defense purposes on a matching basis (pp. 14541-7). This action sends the bill to the Senate for further consideration of the amendment in disagreement.

3. LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7453 (H. Rept. 905). pp. 14531-2, 14558

4. FISH AND WILDLIFE. A subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee voted to report H. R. 5813, to authorize the Department of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife. p. D769

5. TEXTILES; FOREIGN TRADE. The Ways and Means Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2886, to suspend the import duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn (H. Rept. 897). p. 14558

6. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendment H. R. 7758, to provide increased benefits to Government personnel stationed in a foreign area relative to cost of living allowances, storage and transportation expenses, sick and annual leave, and other purposes (H. Rept. 902). p. 14558

7. WATER RESOURCES. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment S. 300, to provide for the establishment of a study commission for the Guadalupe-San Antonio River Basins, Texas (H. Rept. 906). p. 14558

8. SMALL BUSINESS. A subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee voted to report H. R. 8599, to amend the Small Business Act so as to increase the revolving fund of the Small Business Administration from $900,000,000 to $1,100,000,000. p. D769

9. TEXTILES. Rep. Lane urged the enactment of legislation to permit the sale of CCC surplus cotton to textile mills at reduced prices. pp. 14555-6

10. RESEARCH; FISH AND WILDLIFE. A subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee voted to report H. R. 5814, to permit the Fish and Wildlife Service and other agencies of Interior to enter into cooperative agreements with other Federal agencies, colleges and universities, States and nonprofit organizations to conduct cooperative research on fish and wildlife. p. D769

11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced the following legislative program: Mon.: Consent Calendar; H. R. 8409, extend International Wheat Agreement; H. R. 8284, amendments to National Science Foundation Act; H. R. 6904, establish Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; and H. R. 5068, regulation of freight forwarders; Tues: Private Calendar; H. R. 1341, safety standards for Government passenger vehicles. p. 14541

12. ADJOURNED until Mon., Aug. 17. p. 14558

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. FOREIGN AID. Extension of remarks of Rep. Burke inserting two editorials opposing the withholding of information concerning the foreign aid programs and stating that "the adamant refusal of the President to allow an accounting to be had of foreign aid funds is a shocking abuse of Executive privilege." p. A7028

14. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Kee inserted her newsletter listing legislation which she believes should be enacted before adjournment. p. A7039

15. IMPORTS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Simpson discussing the impact of import competition on the Nation's economy and inserting an article on this subject. p. A7040

Halleck
Halpern
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Heriong
Hess
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holt
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Jackson
Jarman
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Md.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Judd
Keith
Kilburn
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Utah
Kitchin
Knox
Lafore
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Levering
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McGinley
McGovern
McIntire
McMillan
McSween
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin
Mason
Matthews
May
Meader
Merrow
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Mitchell
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morris, N. Mex.
Morris, Okla.
Morrison
Moulder
Mumma
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Konski
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pfost
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Preston
Quie
Quigley
Rains
Randall
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Roush
Rutherford
St. George
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Seiden
Short
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Springer
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wainwright
Walihauser
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Weis
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson
Winstead
Wolf
Wright
Young
Younger

NAYS—125

Addonizio
Anderson, Mont.
Anfuso
Bailey
Barrett
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bowles
Boyle
Brademas
Buckley
Burdick
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Celler
Cohelan
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dollinger
Donohue
Dulski
Farbstein
Feighan
Flood
Flynn
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Hagen
Hargis
Harmon
Hays
Healey
Hogan
Holifield
Holland
Holtzman
Irwin
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Karsten
Karth
Kasem
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kowalski
Lane
Libonati
McCormack
McFall
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Madden
Magnuson
Marshall
Metcalf
Meyer
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Montoya
Moorhead
Morgan
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill
Oliver
Perkins
Philbin
Porter
Powell
Price
Prokop
Pucinski
Rabaut
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Santangelo
Saund
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sisk
Staggers
Sullivan
Teller
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Udall
Ullman
Vanik
Wampler
Wier
Withrow
Yates
Zabiocki
Zelenko

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Foley
Saylor

NOT VOTING—4

Canfield
Elliott
Thompson, La.
Westland

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Westland for, with Mr. Saylor against.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." I voted "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 338, the Committee on Education and Labor is discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1555) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BARDEN moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1755, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H.R. 8342 as passed.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H.R. 8342) were laid on the table.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill and request a conference with the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint conferees later in the day.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that I am not recorded on this second rollcall. I answered on the first and second call. I ask unanimous consent to have my vote recorded as "no" on the labor bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the permanent RECORD and Journal will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader at this time if he will advise us as to the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be happy to. With the disposition of pending matters today, we will go over until Monday.

On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called, after which there are 11 suspensions, as follows:

First. H.R. 4306, educational assistance for orphans.

Second. H.R. 8409, extend Wheat Agreement Act of 1949.

Third. H.R. 8284, amending the National Science Foundation Act.

Fourth. H.R. 6904, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Fifth. H.R. 8587, equalization of allotments, Agua Caliente—Palm Springs—Reservation in California.

Sixth. H.R. 5892, Minute Man National Historical Park, Mass.

Seventh. H.R. 5068, Shipping Act, foreign freight forwarders.

Eighth. H.R. 8388, Merchant Marine Act, foreign flag affiliations.

Ninth. H.R. 8238, provides for a study of motor vehicle exhausts.

Tenth. House Joint Resolution 283, parliamentary conference with Mexico.

Eleventh. House Concurrent Resolution 369, China, sense of Congress against seating in the United Nations.

The letter is a resolution that is the sense of the Congress that Red China shall not be seated in the United Nations. On that there is likely to be a rollcall, so I advise the Members that there may be a rollcall on that resolution, as well as on others.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, after which the following bills will be called up for consideration:

H.R. 8374, Century 21 Exposition, clarify law.

H.R. 7985, Communications Act, equal time provisions.

H.R. 1341, safety standards for Government passenger-carrying motor vehicles.

There is the usual reservation that any further program will be announced later, and conference reports may be brought up at any time.

I might say that I see that none of these bills is going to help us much toward a sine die adjournment. There are several bills we have to get rid of first, but I do not see anything next week that is very consoling to a sine die adjournment. I hope that the committees that have these necessary bills under consideration will expedite action, if they are still in committee, and if they are reported out of committee try to get action from the Rules Committee to get a rule out of that committee.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bills H.R. 8035 and S. 300.

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

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards,

commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the conference report.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of August 12, 1959.)

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 3, line 5, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert $25,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain this matter to the House briefly, and then I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] to state his views; and I certainly want to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] for some observations he may wish to make.

This concerns one item in disagreement. The conference report has heretofore been adopted by both bodies. This is an item on which the House has voted before and has sustained the House conferees. I might say also that the other body sustained the position of its conferees. We met in conference again, and here we are on the floor with this question once more.

We are going to ask for a record vote and we will ask that the House sustain its conferees in the matter.

Here is the meat in the coconut: When the bill left the House it included $10 million for contributions by the Federal Government for civil defense purposes on a matching basis. The matching money was to be used in buying material to be used in the cities and towns for civil defense.

You have heretofore appropriated, in round figures, $130 million for such civil defense grants. You have also heretofore appropriated to buy medical and other supplies in round figures $235 million, and you today have that in 41 warehouses all over the country.

Let us go back to the point. The other body adds $15 million on a matching basis. To do what? To buy more materials? No, but to start a brandnew program—I repeat, a new program of paying for jobs in the city halls.

You have had civil defense for 10 years; you started in April of 1950. The proposal now is for the Federal Government to pay half of the salaries, the office rent, the telephone calls, the travel expenses, the Western Union messages, for 4,000 brandnew employees of the States and cities.

Civil defense makes no bones about it. It says that next year they will come back in here not for $12 million for this program, but for $25 million to pay the salaries and expenses of the new program.

Do we need it? You have heretofore said "No" by your votes, and we on the committee think you are right about that. We have had a civil defense, and I think it has done a good job, for 10 years. Why is it necessary now, after 10 years, to embark upon a new program?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant measures enacted by the 85th Congress was H.R. 7576, now known as Public Law 85-606, which made civil defense the joint responsibility of the Federal, State, and local governments—a partnership. This legislation, the result of years of study, and passed unanimously by both bodies of Congress, authorizes the Federal Government to assist the States and local governments with their civil defense personnel and administrative costs. The law also authorizes a maximum expenditure of $25 million each year for this purpose.

Shortly after passage of the bill in July of last year, an amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill, 1959, was added by the Senate. It called for $4 million to be used to initiate the contributions provision of the bill H.R. 7576. The amendment was not accepted by the conference because, at that time, all the States had not submitted their plans of organization. However, each State now has its plans perfected and many have appropriated funds to match the expected Federal contribution that will be made available to them.

The President has declared that civil defense is a vital part of our Nation's total defense. And everyone agrees that no civil defense program can be effective unless there is participation at the local level. The alternative to this program is a total Federal Government program with a correspondingly prohibitive cost. Here is legislation that has the wholehearted support of the Governor's Conference, the Conference of Mayors, the American Municipal Association, the National Association of County Officials, the American Legion, AFL-CIO and many other groups whose only aim is to develop coordinated civil defense organization. Contrary to statements made that it will "provide thousands of jobs at city halls and that a bureaucracy divorced from responsibility would be crated," those to be employed will be subject to a civil service or merit system—they must measure up to standards set by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and be fully competent and qualified under the same rules and regulations that exist for other Federal agencies which provide grants-in-aid. If the standards of employment and organization are not met, Federal money may then be withdrawn or not allowed. There is also no justification for remarks that it will be a wasteful program. With authorization to contribute $25 million per year to the States—only $12 million is being asked to carry out this program so vitally needed for national survival. Twelve million dollars is a small price to pay to coordinate and direct the resources of our State and local governments, their personnel, and some four million volunteers. As mentioned before, the alternative is outright Federalization at a probable cost of one half a billion dollars or more. In asking for these funds the OCDM is simply carrying out the mandate of Congress and the order of the President. The law says this money shall be contributed to the States. The States have set up their organizations in accordance with the law. How then, after they have acted on the promise of the Federal Government to assist, can we run out on them? It is as though we sent our soldiers into battle equipped with guns, but refused them ammunition.

And no matter how many worthy, dedicated, unpaid civil defense volunteers there may be—and they are in the millions—their services may not be used effectively without a strong nucleus of trained leaders—professionals—who are equipped to coordinate and guide their efforts in the event of disaster, be it natural or manmade.

Those who have studied the situation and who truly know—the Armed Services Committees of both bodies; my colleague CHET HOLIFIELD, who knows more of the problems and workings of civil defense than anyone in Congress; the Gaither report; the Rockefeller report; the Sarnoff report—all have urged approval of this proposal.

If we are to have a civil defense—and in view of the tensions existing in the world today it is imperative that we do have—there is, at present, only one way to achieve it, and that is to approve the appropriation necessary to implement the law.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I do not know what the experience in the gentleman's State was, but I know in the State of Oklahoma our Civil Defense Office had to lay off some people July 1 because of the failure to provide funds to carry on some programs that were going on down there.

Mr. DURHAM. That is true all over the country. Now, these people are not, as has been charged on the floor of this House, members of a political party seeking jobs.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I hope that the House today will not vote to sustain the position of the Committee on Appropriations, hard as it is to disagree with our distinguished, genial friend from Texas. This situation is getting more serious, not less, and for us to sit here and adamantly say that we are not going to do anything adequate about preparing our people on how to save their lives in the event of an atomic attack seems to me a good deal less than the situation demands. I hope that the House will vote "no" on the motion to insist on the House position on this item and go along with the gentleman from North Carolina who knows more about this than any of the rest of us. His counsel has proved very wise through the years, and I think we ought to follow him now.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman, and I might also say that this program has been endorsed last week and the week before at the Governors Conference by all the Governors of the States of the United States. It has also been endorsed by the Municipal Association. It has been endorsed by the National Association of County Officials and also endorsed by the American Legion and by the AFL-CIO. So, this measure does not come before you today without some thought being given to it as to what it is and how it works. It is not a wasteful program. It is not a political program. It is instructional service for your life and the individuals in your own community. That is just exactly what it is.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Minnesota said the situation is getting worse. My question is, What situation is getting worse?

Mr. JUDD. The capacity to inflict devastating blows upon the United States is increasing in the hands of those who have proclaimed that they intend to bury us. That is a serious situation.

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly, I do not like to come here and take a position against the Committee on Appropriations. I do not think these people have seen me do this many times in the 21 years that I have been a Member of this House. But, it is difficult for me to understand why this amendment is opposed. Of course, the other body has insisted on its retention, and I think they have some people of excellent judgment and sound thinking who, of course, are qualified to make a decision in this field. In all sincerity I ask this body today to insist on the Senate provisions as a sound approach to future protection, and I am going to insist on it if the chairman does not—that we vote on this measure and have a showdown. I think it is time that we decided the issue. This is the second time the conferees have come back here in disagreement on a matter which I feel is one of the most important provisions of civil defense. The requested amount of funds, approved by the Budget Bureau, will, in my opinion, do more to put back into the local communities the responsibility for survival in the atomic age than any other action we could take. I am convinced, after serving on the Atomic Energy Committee since the original act of 1946, that a danger does exist. And certainly our responsibility here is a grave one.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity—and I really wanted to insist upon taking the opportunity—of aligning myself with the views of the gentleman from North Carolina. I have watched with care the operations of the civil defense organizations in the State of Minnesota. Every county has a well organized group. They are going not only police duty, but working in many other capacities involving civic functions all through the State, in emergencies, traffic matters, and everything else.

Mr. DURHAM. I might add to the gentleman's statement that it has been amazing the cooperation we have had, without any cost to the Federal Government, all over the country, not in just one field but in all field of civil defense.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to aline myself with the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy [Mr. DURHAM], and I should like to adopt all of the arguments that he made with regard to this particular appropriation item. This amount has been adopted in the other body twice. It was cut out by the Appropriations Committee.

It is very seldom that I come to this floor in opposition to anything that the Appropriations Committee has advocated during the years I have been in this body.

I just recently served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Radiation that made a study of a hypothetical nuclear war on the United States, not a full scale nuclear war, but what we called a limited type of nuclear war, in which only 260 weapons were dropped on the United States. The report of that study will be in the hands of each Member within the next 10 days, I think. It has already been approved unanimously by the full committee and has been sent to the Printing Office.

The results of this study show that if 260 nuclear weapons are dropped on 224 targets in the United States there will be 50 million people killed and 22 million people injured. These are not figures taken out of the air. These are the result of studies made by the Pentagon, the Casualty Estimate Division of the Pentagon, using IBM machines, using specific sized weapons on specific targets, with specifically known populations.

We do not have a good civil defense. We might as well face up to it. I have been one of the critics of civil defense, but I have tried to be a constructive critic of civil defense. I say to you that this Congress has not faced up to the problem. This will not do the job, I will admit that, but this is a step in keeping together the State and local organizations, keeping them encouraged to continue to give their voluntary services. We need this money and we need it very badly.

I hope the House will support the restoration of this item which has been insisted on in the other body twice.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to disagree with my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], but I feel that we are most inconsistent when we spend billions of dollars for antimissile missile protection, and for all of our military defenses, here and abroad, and then we are so niggardly that we will not spend a drop in the bucket, comparatively speaking, for our own defenses right here at home, right in our own backyard.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. We are spending $40 billion a year for a Military Establishment that cannot defend the people of the United States against enemy attack. If we spent just a little of that $40 billion a year for the next 4 or 5 years we could—and this is the testimony of experienced scientists and engineers whom we have had before us—we could cut that 50 million casualty figure down, a casualty figure of 30 percent, to 3 percent in the event of enemy attack. And most important, this would provide us a deterrent value far in excess of the money that would be expended on it.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman in urging that this additional money be provided. The gentleman's studies have demonstrated that one of the major deterrents to a mass attack upon the United States is an effective civil defense. I think every dollar we spend to strengthen that civil defense is a dollar of insurance against the attack that we want to avoid.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman. I want again to emphasize this; if we had a good civil defense which we knew would protect our people in this country from enemy attack, we would have a deterrent factor second only to our ability to militarily strike the enemy and militarily defend ourselves.

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

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. It has been stated that the gain we hope to get from the impending visit of the ruler of Russia is that we will be able to show him that both the Government and the people of the United States are stronger, firmer, and more united than he has believed. Certainly he would be less likely to strike if he realizes that he cannot destroy us. Therefore, to have our people trained in civil defense so that they can do more to prevent being wiped out in any attack is important in preventing the attack.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we all think the former Governor of Iowa, Leo A. Hoegh, is doing a splendid job as the Director of Civil Defense, but from some of these statements that have been made here, it would appear that no funds are carried in this appropriation bill at all for civil defense education and training. The civil defense program has been carrying on an intensive and extensive educational and training program for years. People are brought in

to Washington from the various regions—civil defense workers, police officers, and others, and a very extensive training program is being carried on presently. They then go back and have a further training program in the local municipalities and cities on the local level.

In 1958, for education and training alone, we appropriated $3,442,966. For 1959, we appropriated $4,037,000 and a similar amount next year. So the amount of funds for this purpose has been going up each year. For the grants program we are appropriating millions in grants to the States for education and training alone. So there exists an intensive education and training program in civil defense. This is a question of whether you are going to embark upon a program of some 4,000 new jobs for next year when we have rather substantial employment conditions prevailing in the country. I thought also another factor is that since Mr. Khrushchev is coming to our country that tensions have lessened and, perhaps, we may not need all of this additional money for civil defense at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will sustain the position of the House on this vote, as we can soon reconsider the matter if further funds ultimately may be needed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago when this issue was first on the floor of the House, and the House took certain action, I saw a newspaper story in one of the Detroit newspapers which bewailed and bemoaned the fact that because of the House action, I believe something like 10 firemen and 10 policemen from the city of Detroit would have to be put on the local city payroll rather than on the Federal funds. It does not seem sensible to me that Congress start paying out of Federal funds for the employment of local policemen and local firemen who are employed and fired and administered under local civil service regulations. I sincerely believe that if the local communities are anxious to have these people as a part of their organization, the minimum they should pay is 50 percent of the cost of employment and not put the full burden on the Federal Treasury. We would lose control of personnel policies and we would have no control and jurisdiction over what they do or how they do it. I sincerely believe that we would be getting our foot into a most dangerous situation by permitting Federal funds to be paid exclusively for the employment of local officials. I sincerely believe the House should sustain the House conferees.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. Under the law, what the gentleman says cannot be done. I do not know where the gentleman got his information or the newspaper article, but it can only be on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. FORD. All I know is that this newspaper article stated that certain employees of the fire department and the police department of the city of Detroit were going to be fired or removed from the rolls because Uncle Sam was not going to pour the money into the city coffers of the city of Detroit.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, knowing of the intense interest of the members of this House to keep the interstate and defense highway program on schedule, I have today introduced a bill that will allow the program to continue in an orderly and progressive manner.

The bill which I have introduced, H.R. 8678, is in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 5950, which I introduced earlier in the session. H.R. 5950 was referred to the Committee on Public Works, which held public hearings and agreed to report the bill to the House, contingent on favorable action by the Committee on Ways and Means in providing the necessary financing provisions.

Such action is now completed and is incorporated as title 2 of the bill I introduced today.

Title 2 of the bill, as referred to the Committee on Public Works by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], provides a temporary increase in the Federal tax on motor fuels of 1 cent per gallon—from 3 to 4 cents—effective September 1, 1959 through June 30, 1961; a transfer to the highway trust fund of the receipts from 5 percentage points of the excise tax on passenger cars and the receipts from 5 percentage points of the excise tax on parts and accessories, effective July 1, 1961, until June 30, 1964.

I hope that H.R. 8678 can be brought to the floor quickly and voted on without delay. The measure provides for the continuation of the interstate highway program at the level of $2 billion for the fiscal year 1961 and $2.2 billion for fiscal 1962.

The legislation proposed is temporary, emergency legislation. It is anticipated that in 1961, when the results of certain comprehensive studies ordered by the Highway Act of 1956 will be placed in the hands of the Congress, we will consider a broad revision of the revenue law supporting the Highway Trust Fund, in order to insure an equitable distribution of the costs of the highway program among the various classes of highway users and nonusers who benefit from the Federal-aid highways.

Pending this long-range revision, it is essential that the highway program be continued substantially along the lines contemplated by the Highway Act of 1956. In most States, this program has been brought to a dead halt.. The Federal Highway Administrator has announced that there must be a 9 months' moratorium in the letting of new contracts unless there is remedial legislation at this session of Congress, and that, in the absence of such legislation, there will be an even more serious interruption of progress on the construction of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. It is the purpose of my bill to correct this critical situation.

The cost of such delay in the interstate program is, actually, incalculable. Unless the situation is corrected, it is estimated that a delay of 1 year would result in a loss of billions of dollars. This loss is accounted for in the delay of the economic benefits of the system and the cost of disrupting and then reorganizing the forces of trained men and equipment and the sources of materials supply which have been brought together for this great program.

Such dollar estimates, of course, cannot take into account the loss of human life which is part of the toll we pay for inadequate highways. The National Safety Council has estimated that if no interstate highways are built in 1960, thus delaying completion of the system for 1 year, about 5,700 more deaths would occur by the time the system is completed than would have occurred had the system been completed on schedule.

Nor can we estimate, in terms of dollars, the importance of completing the Interstate System to our national defense. The value of the defense aspects of the Interstate System are greater than many citizens realize, and greater than was the case when the Highway Act of 1956 was enacted, in the view of the Department of Defense.

In short, in terms of economic benefits, highway safety, and national defense the Nation cannot afford a major cutback in the rate of progress of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

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

Mr. FALLON. I am delighted to yield to our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Will my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, advise us whether or not the bill he has introduced today contains a title II dealing with the financing of the road program for the 2-year period involved?

Mr. FALLON. Yes; it does.

Mr. MILLS. The language of title II in your bill is the language which was prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means with regard to the financing?

Mr. FALLON. It is the exact language.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which should, in my opinion, be handled in one bill. However, it should be understood that this is not in any way to indicate the establishment so far as our committee is concerned of a precedent with respect to jurisdiction of the highway trust fund.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I want to ask the chairman of the committee in regard to a matter we have already passed in the conference report for the Federal Trade Commission in this bill.

Are adequate funds provided for the administration of the Textile Labeling Act?

Mr. THOMAS. The Federal Trade Commission, of course, has jurisdiction over a good many of these labeling acts. I believe the gentleman is the author of the Textile Labeling Act; is he not?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. The Commission is working on the rules and regulations now and there is money in the bill for enforcement of that act.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I can remember when I first came to Congress—that is a good while back—that the National Guard and what we had of the Army Reserves, and the Naval Reserves, were paid for out of State funds. They began to creep into the Federal Treasury a little at a time until at present the guard costs approximately $400 million and the Federal Government pays practically all the expense. The Reserves cost aproximately $300 million. The Naval Reserves also cost an enormous sum of money.

This program starts a local policing proposition similar to that which was described by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]. Frankly, if we are going into every city hall and every county courthouse and set up a new outfit to do the things the police and firemen and volunteers who take an interest in this thing should do, I do not know where we are going to get the money. Frankly, we are up against it right now. It is a tremendous job to undertake to balance the budget and to keep the United States right side up.

There is not any lack of a sense of responsibility on the part of any of the members of the Appropriations Committee; it is not a question of being hidebound or anything of that kind; it is a question of being honest with the people.

The people can operate a situation like this through the States for a great deal less than to have the Federal Government contributing. They can do it better and take care of the situation fully and completely if we do not give them this appropriation.

Frankly, I do not see how we can go along carelessly and loosely any longer. It is time we woke up and began to appreciate what kind of situation the United States of America is in. I hope the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will prevail and that the question at issue will be sent back to the Senate with instructions from the House that its conferees further insist in our disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be well for us to bring back into focus exactly what is before us at this time.

This is the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1960, and it is the second time that this report appears before the House. The managers on the part of the House returned to a second conference with the Senate maintaining the original action of the House on H.R.7040. The Senate in the meantime had acted to sustain the position of the Senate in providing $25 million appropriations for Federal contributions to the States and communities for personnel and other services. I think it well for us to bear in mind that the only item in dispute in this conference report deals with civil defense; and in that connection I might point out that in the independent offices appropriation bill as passed by the House including that of civil and defense mobilization, there are items such as salaries expenses; Federal contributions for emergency supplies and equipment; research and development and Federal grants or contributions to the States and localities for civil defense purposes.

I repeat that the Senate provided $25 million for Federal contributions, the House bill as originally passed provided $10 million for contributions, but no money for personnel—but included in the House bill was $10 million for equipment and supplies. The Senate restored $3 million additional for equipment and supplies over and above the House figure and that is likewise on a matching basis, the same as the $12 million item, which is the main item in dispute as between the House and the Senate figures.

The Durham Act, as passed a year or two ago, did authorize and provide for a $25 million a year matching fund for personnel purposes. No funds have ever been provided for this program. The Budget Bureau included the $12 million item for fiscal 1960.

I merely wanted to clarify the picture and make certain that the disagreement between the House and the other body was understood.

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

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad the gentleman explained exactly what is before the House. This is a request of the administration. Governor Hoegh has requested this amount, it is approved by the Budget Bureau, it has been approved twice by the other body. Now we have it before us to vote up or down. If we want to vote for the money, then the vote on the motion to be offered by the gentleman from Texas to insist on the House position of disagreement with Senate amendment No. 1 would be "No," if we want to vote for the providing of this money to the local people.

Mr. OSTERTAG. That is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true this is on a matching basis?

Mr. OSTERTAG. Yes. As I understand, the law authorizes a 50–50 matching basis.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Is it not, in his opinion, an obligation of the Federal Government to assist the people of any town or any city in the event of an enemy attack on that town or city? Is that not a Federal obligation rather than a local obligation?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I doubt that I have the time to give a qualified answer to that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Both sides would have to help, the local would have to help, but in all wars the Federal Government is the responsible entity to protect us against an enemy attack?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

[Mr. BOLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I will move the previous question when I get through, because we do not have much time, and I humbly apologize to the House for taking up this time. But, we have to do it, and we will have a rollcall. You have had a hard week, and you are tired.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what the situation is here. No one is falling out with Civil Defense. They have done a magnificent job. We have had three Administrators who have all done a fine job: Our former colleague, the Governor from Florida, the Governor of Nebraska, Governor Peterson, and Governor Hoegh of Iowa. He formerly was Administrator of the FCDA, but now he is head of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, which combines civil defense and defense mobilization, and it is over at the White House, and he is in a little different position than he was a few years ago.

My friend, Governor Hoegh, has not failed and refused to use his lovable personality and his ingenuity and brains, and he is smart. He has given this Congress many, many letters to write on account of the organization back home.

Now, let us see. Why is this additional $25 million a year so important now? Civil defense has been in effect for 10 years. I think they have done a pretty good job for the last 10 years.. I have heard everything when it is said that this country is dependent upon civil defense for our defense. I cannot quite agree with that. We appropriate $40 billion every year to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and maybe one or two other agencies, for the defense of this country. Certainly that is a lot of money. So, let us not cloud the issue now and say we are depending on civil defense to defend this country. Of course we are not. Civil defense has its functions, and I think it has done a good job.

But, why go in there and put 8,000 or 10,000 more people to work. Who is going to hire these people? Who is going to fire them? Will the Congress? Will my friend, Governor Hoegh? Will the President of the United States hire them or fire them? Not one syllable of authority will he have over hiring them or firing them. Who is going to be their boss? Frankly, I do not know. They may be their own bosses. What are they going to do? They do not have anything to do now except what we say in polite terms, public relations work.

They are public relations people. All they have got to do now is go out and say, "This road is going to be closed," and then 6 months from now tear down that sign and say, "No; we have to do some more planning, and we are not going to close this one, and that one we will close, and we will let you know 2 months from now," and at the same time write the Members of Congress, "Let us have this appropriation." You are putting a little fire under yourselves.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Certainly I will yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. In the first place, the gentleman, I think, changed a little bit the import of what the gentleman from Oklahoma said.

A moment ago the gentleman from Oklahoma said that the reports of the congressional committee of which the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is a leading member——

Mr. THOMAS. And a leading Member of the House.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Had indicated that a civil defense was one of the most effective and important deterrents to attack. I certainly do not think it is going to defend our country, but I think it is an effective deterrent to attack.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope so, but that is neither here nor there. If we put these people to work, we are putting that much money down a rathole, if you want my honest opinion. I hope we are never attacked. But if we are and this country is paralyzed and we are bleeding and we do not know which way to turn, are we going to call for civil defense? No. We are going to do as we would do now. Your Governor is going to call out your National Guard, and another Governor is going to do the same thing, and they are going to take charge. We all know that—the gentleman knows it and I know it. I hope that time never comes, but if it does come, he knows what is going to happen. These people are serving a useful purpose, of course. But they do not have an organization, and they never will have it. You have a military job to do and you are going to call on the military to do it.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOSMER. I think we should understand that the essence of civil defense is protection in time of attack plus, of course, a followup afterward. That means shelters. It is not enough well understood, but it was brought out in the hearings of the committee of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] that for the price of $100, a shelter can be built by any individual and they will cut the factor of danger of radioactivity by 1,000. I think everybody in this country should realize that they can write to the Civil Defense Administration and get a booklet on how to build a shelter for $100. They cannot only build them, which will offer them a great amount of protection, but, by doing so, they will be taking part in making it more difficult, if not impossible, for an enemy to reduce this country to a shambles.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, may I say in reply, I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. It just shows what time does to us all. It has a great purifying effect. If we had followed these Civil Defense Administrators before this, we would have spent 5 or 7 or 8 or maybe $10 billion on shelters. Now they are saying that we can build one for $100. I say if you vote for this $12 million for new people, new jobs, these public relations boys, if you do not open up a shelter program that will be coming in here next year for one-half billion dollars, I will come here and say to you, "Well, I am wrong."

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

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. MEYER. Is not the crux of the matter that in case of a nuclear war even though we have spent billions and billions of dolars for a civil defense system, we would not really have a civil defense system that would work anyhow?

Mr. THOMAS. I think the gentleman has put his finger right on the point.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. On the vote now about to be put in the House, as I understand it, a "yea" vote is a vote against the increase in the funds and a "nay" vote is a vote for the increase in the funds; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman is further to disagree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Will the Speaker inform me——

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not construe these motions. I think it has been made very evident by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] what it is all about.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 241, nays 166, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—241

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Albert
Alexander
Alger
Allen
Andersen, Minn.
Andrews
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Bailey
Baker
Barr
Bass, N.H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Baumhart
Becker
Beckworth
Belcher
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bosch
Bow
Boykin
Bray
Breeding
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Carnahan
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Coad
Collier
Colmer
Corbett
Cunningham
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Denton
Derounian
Devine
Dooley
Dorn, S.C.
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Frazier
Friedel
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
George
Glenn
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Gubser
Haley
Hargis
Harmon
Harris
Harrison
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hess
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Hogan
Holt
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ikard
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Keith
Kilburn
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kowalski
Lafore
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Levering
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDonough
McFall
McMillan
McSween
Machrowicz
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin
Meader
Meyer
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Mitchell
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morris, N. Mex.
Morrison
Multer
Mumma
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nelsen
Norblad
Norrell
O'Konski
Oliver
Osmers
Passman
Patman
Pfost
Pilcher
Pillion
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Preston
Quie
Rabaut
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riley
Rivers, S.C.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Rutherford
St. George
Santangelo
Saund
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Tuck
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Wampler
Watts
Weaver
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Winstead
Withrow
Wolf
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger

NAYS—166

Addonizio
Alford
Anderson, Mont.
Arends
Ayres
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bennett, Fla.
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton
Bonner
Bowles
Boyle
Brademas
Brewster
Brock
Brooks, La.
Broomfield
Brown, Mo.
Burdick
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Chiperfield
Church
Clark
Coffin
Cohelan
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dixon
Dollinger
Donohue
Dorn, N.Y.
Doyle
Durham
Dwyer
Edmondson
Farbstein
Fascell
Fenton
Flynn
Foley
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Gallagher
Giaimo
Goodell
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Pa.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagen
Hall
Halpern
Healey
Hemphill
Holifield
Holland
Holtzman
Jensen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kearns
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
Kitchin
Lane
Lankford
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
McCormack
McDowell
McGinley
McGovern
McIntire
Mack, Ill.
Matthews
May
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Montoya
Morgan
Morris, Okla.
Moss
Moulder
Nix
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill
Ostertag
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Porter
Price
Prokop
Pucinski
Quigley
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino

Rogers, Colo.	Smith, Miss.	Van Zandt
Rogers, Mass.	Spence	Vinson
Roosevelt	Springer	Wainwright
Rostenkowski	Staggers	Wallhauser
Roush	Teller	Walter
Saylor	Thompson, N.J.	Weis
Shipley	Toll	Wier
Short	Trimble	Wilson
Sisk	Udall	Zablocki
Slack	Ullman	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—27

Anfuso	Elliott	Mason
Barden	Halleck	Powell
Buckley	Hardy	Sheppard
Budge	Hébert	Sikes
Canfield	Jackson	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Johnson, Colo.	Thompson, La.
Cramer	Kasem	Westland
Davis, Ga.	Keogh	Widnall
Dingell	Macdonald	Willis

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Celler, with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Johnson of Colorado with Mr. Budge.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Widnall.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI and Mr. HALPERN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7509) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 12, 1959.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, before I move the previous question on the conference report, I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] if they prefer to discuss the conference report or if they prefer to speak on the subsequent motions?

Mr. TABER. I should prefer to speak on the conference report.

Mr. JENSEN. Are we going to have 30 minutes on each side on this?

Mr. CANNON. Under the rule, we have 1 hour.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that I was not recorded on the last rollcall. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the rollcall be corrected accordingly.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report which we submit calls for a larger amount than the similar bill called for last year. This year the amount is $1,206,728,549. Last year it was $70,245,264 less than it is this year. But, Mr. Speaker, the budget estimate received from the President is higher this year than it was last year by almost $100 million. The budget estimate received this year is $1,176,677,000. The budget estimate received last year was $1,077,356,000.

The bill as the House passed it totaled $1,177,177,000. The bill as the Senate passed it was $1,256,836,300. The conference figure is $29,571,549 above the House bill total but $50,087,751 below the Senate figure.

The Senate added 30 new construction starts with a total future commitment of $586 million. Fifteen of these were deleted in conference and the remaining 15 represent a future commitment of only $126 million.

In total, the conference bill includes 52 new construction starts and a net future commitment of $482 million or less than 10 percent above the future commitment on projects included in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 15 minutes to the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as this bill came to the House floor from the Committee for Public Works Appropriations, we were exactly on the budget figures. A small amount was added on the House floor, but it was rather inconsequential. The bill, as passed by the other body, included a number of unbudgeted items as did the House bill. The other body added almost $80 million to the House figure. The House conferees by holding out for the House figures were successful finally in reducing the Senate figures by $50,087,751. So the conference report comes back to the House today $50,087,751 below the Senate figure, and $29,571,549 above the House figure, as passed by the House of Representatives originally.

This public works bill covers all irrigation, reclamation, hydroelectric power, transmission lines, and the deepening of our harbors on the seacoast as well as the deepening and broadening of channels in the interior streams of our Nation, and for flood-control projects. We have gone hog wild in appropriating for these many projects which are so essential to the conservation of our natural resources, our soil and precious water, which in some parts of our country is known as liquid gold.

Congress has been about as conservative in appropriating money for all these public works for America as it could properly be. There are, of course, some projects I would not have included in this bill; but, generally speaking, this bill is a good bill; it is for America and America only every dime appropriated in this bill.

I have served on this committee for many years. It is an interesting committee on which to serve because one learns so much about the problems of the people in every section of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

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

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, because of the limitation of time I will say at the outset that I must respectfully decline to yield until I have concluded my statement.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly solicit the attention of Representatives of big cities in particular, of Members from Maine, Pennsylvania, Iowa, Illinois, Texas, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Louisiana, and all points in between. In fact I would like to speak to every Member of Congress except those representing 7 percent of the people of the State of California.

This conference report contains a $310 million giveaway. A giveaway of money by all taxpayers across this land to a small number of citizens in northern California. I refer to the $2½ million item calling for all Federal construction of the powerplants in the Trinity project in northern California. This $2½ million is the fingernail in the public cash register which will soon be plunged to arm's length for a giveaway of $310 million—a giveaway to 7 percent of California at the expense of your constituents.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has offered to build these powerplants with $60 million of its own funds, not public funds, and will pay $4½ million each year for use of the falling water from Trinity, and it will agree to sell it back any time the Federal Government needs the power for its own use. The Secretary of Interior has recommended this partnership as being in the best interests of the taxpayers.

I do not urge defeat of this conference report because of a philosophical opposition to Federal power. On the contrary I will support Federal power when it is in the public interest.

All Federal construction at Trinity is not in the public interest.

First of all the Central Valley project surplus will be $175 million lower if Trinity is constructed as an all-Federal project. Testimony has been presented which states that the cost of generating Federal Trinity power will be 7.2 to 8.9 mills. It is also an accepted fact that a large portion of the power generated, 81 percent if present policy is continued, would go to the Sacramento Municipal Utility District at a price of 4.5 mills. We are building a power project to sell power below cost, maybe half what it costs. The argument that Trinity losses will be absorbed by other units of the Central Valley project and still leave a surplus in the fund has no validity. Can you imagine a decision by a chain store

executive to add a new and unprofitable store to his chain on the grounds that those already in existence could absorb the loss and still leave a profit? This loss in surplus can only come from the pockets of water users in the Central Valley project area.

Secondly, all Federal construction will deny the Federal Treasury $83 million in taxes which would be paid by P.G. & E. Certainly the cost of Government is not going down in the near future and the need for Federal revenue will not decrease. This means that the $83 million loss in taxes will be borne by taxpayers all over the country.

The abovementioned losses are losses to the general public. They are losses of water users, local taxpayers, and Federal taxpayers everywhere. And who will get the benefit? For one, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District will get a handout of millions of dollars—paid for by the farmer in the Central Valley, the automobile worker in Detroit, along with the butcher, baker, and candlestick maker in every city and town across the Nation. We cannot serve the general public interest by subsidizing a very few at the expense of many.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong believer in the reclamation program. I do not take a back seat to anyone in my support of reclamation projects. I believe the spirit of the reclamation law, and probably the letter of the law, is to dedicate power revenues to repayment of the costs of reclamation projects. Its primary purpose is not to provide cheap public power to private consumers. Federal construction would take project revenues away from general public beneficiaries as the original law intended and give it to a relatively small number of private and business consumers. If the purpose of this Congress is to provide cheap Federal and subsidized power to private consumers then let us say so. Let us not engage in subterfuge. Let us have the courage to change the reclamation law and give private consumers of power higher priority than the reclaimers and irrigators of land. If this is to be a policy let us so state it.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL has said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that more than $800 million will be needed to complete presently authorized reclamation projects in California. The rest of the Nation has been good to California. In this public works appropriation bill California will receive more than $40 million, or over 30 percent of the total allocated to all reclamation States. In the face of our future needs, which are so urgent, is it right that California should ask the Nation to spend $60 million on a Trinity powerplant which it does not have to spend? In all, Federal Trinity will require more than an additional $25 million in each of the next 2 years from the rest of the Nation. Since the supply of Federal money is limited these unnecessary millions must mean one of two things: Either California must get a larger share or some of the scheduled projects must be delayed. Mr. Speaker, there is too much reclamation work that needs doing for us to spend $60 million when it is not necessary.

Some may argue that Trinity power is needed for Federal installations. This argument is not valid since the private utility company has agreed to the right of the Federal Government to recapture Trinity power facilities in the future should they ever be needed for project pumping or for any other purpose.

There is also the argument that partnership would force the Government to pay more for its own power needs. The Secretary of Interior has testified that even after this increase is taken into consideration the partnership balance sheet still shows a credit. Let us not delude ourselves into thinking we are saving money in one pocket with lower Federal power rates by taking more out of the other pocket in lowered Federal revenue. We will never find a foolproof means of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about our debt limit and the financial crisis facing us as a Nation. If we allow all Federal construction we will lose the revenues I have previously mentioned. We will increase expenditure by $60 million at a time when we are concerned with cutting expenditures. Let us not forget the Public Works projects, not only in California but in all of the other States, which must be built in the future. Let us not rob the revenues which can build those projects or spend money now which need not be spent. Let us think of the general public interest and not the interests of a few.

Trinity partnership is in the general public interest. I urge that this conference report be rejected. If we vote in the general public interest it will be.

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

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

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement. The gentleman, I think, knows that this is one item in the bill that I have opposed with all my strength, for certainly it cannot be justified by any stretch of the imagination. We could take these many millions of dollars that is proposed to spend for this Trinity powerplant and use it for many other things that we need badly for America. For instance, we need more funds for flood control in many areas of our country, but so long as we spend so recklessly for such unjustified projects as Trinity, other much needed projects will suffer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we are having a unique experience here this afternoon. For the first time within my recollection the gentleman from California objects to spending money in California.

This is an old, old fallacy that is so assiduously circulated that the Federal Government is paying for all these improvements, for all these advantages. Public power has made America great. The taxpayers, he says, are paying for it. Mr. Speaker, the taxpayer does not pay one penny. Every dollar of it is paid back with interest. I think that it speaks for itself. The only opportunity that we have of using these sites which nature has given us, of utilizing the resources which nature has provided, is through this bill. If the Federal Government does not build these plants and supply this power it will not be installed, it will not be available at a time when there is an ever-increasing demand for power for the industrial development of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee and members to the deletion by the conference committee of $200,000 which was allocated for planning of Erie Railroad Bridge No. 19 on the Cuyahoga River, which is slightly south of Cleveland Harbor. That is one of the seven bridges that have been obstructing navigation in the Cuyahoga River. Six bridges have been satisfactorily reconstructed. The city of Cleveland money and other non-Federal funds have contributed over $25 million of the total expenditure of $50 million. Now, this bridge is the last obstruction on the river. Replacement of the bridge which will remove this obstruction will enable the larger vessels that will be plying trade on the St. Lawrence Seaway to navigate the river. I hope the gentleman can assure us that there will be an effort made to restore that money next year so that planning for the bridge may be initiated and completed. This bridge will cost over $9 million. More than half of it, of course, will be paid by the city of Cleveland and other non-Federal contributors.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], who is probably as familiar with that situation as anyone in the Congress or the Nation, to answer.

Mr. KIRWAN. There was no budget estimate for this item and when the bill passed the House there was no money in the bill for the project. The other body inserted in the bill $200,000 for planning. I know that the gentleman in the well of the House as well as the other Congressmen were for this project and always have been for it. I know it is not proper to speak about a member of the other body, but when this bill was being considered in the Senate, the senior Senator from Ohio voted to recommit it. So as long as he votes to recommit the bill to cut it back to the budget figure, Cleveland is going to have difficulty getting this project without a budget estimate.

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

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I concur with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], on this plea for $200,000 for planning money. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] and I appeared before the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate urging inclusion of this planning money. The item was stricken out. It is very important to remove this bridge, which is a very dangerous impediment to navigation. I just want to say that I regret the circumstances un-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department Staff Only)

Issued Sept. 7, 1959
For actions of Sept. 4 and 5, 1959
86th-1st - Nos. 155 and 156

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....18,24
Agricultural attaché....15
Appropriations.....4,7,8
.....10,13,23,31,32
ASC committees.....30
Buildings.....15
Centennial celebration...39
Civil defense.....4
Commissions.....29
Congressional-Executive...
..Relations.....16
Dairy industry.....11
Depressed areas.....38
Disaster relief.....9
Egg prices.....34
Farm labor.....40
Farm program.....16,35
Feed.....9
Fiscal policy.....17
Food reserves.....1
Food stamps.....1
Foreign aid.....36
Foreign currencies.....13
Foreign trade.....1,21,33
Forest highways.....19
Forest Service.....7
Housing.....3,20
Interest rates....12,22,37
Livestock.....11
Minerals.....5
Monopolies.....11
Personnel.....6,14,25
Property.....27
Public debt.....17
Public Law 480 1,21
Public works.....8,10
Recreation.....26
Research.....20
River basins.....29
Roads.....19
Soil Bank.....2
Surplus commodities 1,21,36
Wheat acreage.....1,11,28

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated Public Law 480 bill. House committee reported bill to authorize sale of CCC feed in emergency areas. Senate agreed to conference report on independent offices appropriation bill. Senate concurred in House amendment to bill to provide compensation under Soil Bank to producers for actions based on incorrect information. Senate sustained President's veto of housing bill. Rep. Johnson, Colo., warned of monopoly in dairy industry. House committee reported new public works appropriation bill. Rep. Evins criticized Administration's farm policies.

SENATE - SEPT. 4

1. FOREIGN TRADE; SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Began debate on S. 1748, to extend Public Law 480 (pp. 16565-6, 16571-6, 16595-621). By a vote of 47 to 38 agreed to a committee amendment to extend titles I and II for 3 years (pp. 16596-600). Agreed to a committee amendment to increase the total authorization under title I to $4.5 billion for the 3-year period, with not to exceed $1.5 authorized to be used annually (p. 16600).

Rejected the following amendments:

A committee amendment, 39 to 48, to change the title of the "Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954" to the "Food and Fiber for Peace Act of 1959." pp. 16601-7

A committee amendment, 42 to 46, to authorize the President to grant surplus commodities to foreign countries to establish national food-reserves. pp. 16608-13

By Sen. Humphrey, 41 to 46, to authorize the enrichment and sanitary packaging of cornmeal, grits, white rice, and white flour distributed by this Department to schools and needy persons, and to authorize demonstration food

stamp programs. pp. 16614-21

2. SOIL BANK. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 2457, to authorize the Secretary to compensate producers under the Soil Bank for actions based on erroneous information furnished by authorized representatives of the Secretary. The House amendment provides that no Soil Bank contract shall be modified, invalidated, or changed because of the marriage of any two contracting parties. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 16607

3. HOUSING. By a vote of 58 to 36, sustained the President's veto of the housing bill for 1959, S. 2539 (a two-thirds majority vote being required to override the President's veto). pp. 16576-86

4. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960. Agreed to the conference report and receded from its amendment (No. 1) to this bill, H. R. 7040, which would have increased to $25 million, instead of $10 million (as proposed by the House) the amount for Federal contributions to the States for civil defense purposes on a matching basis. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp.16586-91

5. MINERALS. Conferees were appointed on S. 2181, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 so as to modify oil, gas, coal, and certain other mineral leasing requirements and conditions. House conferees have not been appointed. p. 16598

6. PERSONNEL. Sen. Johnston submitted a motion, intended to be proposed by him, "that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House, with amendments, to Senate bill 2162, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959." p. 16556

7. APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses received from the Budget Bureau a report that a Forest Service item for forest protection and utilization had been apportioned on a basis indiciating the need for a supplemental authorization for 1960. pp. 16555, 16689

8. PUBLIC WORKS. Sens. Murray and Mansfield criticized the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill for 1960. pp. 16567-8, 16569-70

HOUSE - SEPT. 4

9. FEED; DISASTER RELIEF. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment S. 2504, to authorize the Secretary to sell at market prices CCC feed for livestock in emergency areas (H. Rept. 1149). p. 16689

10. PUBLIC WORKS. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9105, the new public works appropriation bill for 1960 (H. Rept. 1152). p. 16689
Rep. Thomson, Wyo., termed the President's veto of the original public works appropriation bill "unfortunate" and "ill considered," and he and others discussed the issues and projects involved in the bill. pp. 16676-83

11. MONOPOLIES; DAIRY INDUSTRY. Rep. Johnson, Colo., warned of vertical integration in the dairy industry. He stated that such a situation already exists in the livestock industry in his district and that under vertical integration a national chain will determine what price it will pay the milk producer and if the producer asks a higher price, the chain will expand its operations to milk producing as well as distribution. Once the competition is eliminated, the chain is able to set prices at will, he stated. pp. 16683-6

12. INTEREST RATES. Passed, 378 to 7, without amendment H. R. 9035, to permit the issuance of series E and H United States savings bonds at interest rates above the existing maximum, to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to designate certain exchanges of Government securities to be made without recognition of gain or

lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing a substantial supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing. S. 2539 provides for the reduction of the gap requirement from 20 percent to 5 percent. (Sec. 503(b).)

Public housing authorization: S. 57 contained a provision specifically granting contract authority for approximately 10,000 units to be available until July 1, 1961, and 35,000 units to be available until June 30, 1963. S. 57 also granted the President discretion to authorize additional units up to the limit contained in the Housing Act of 1949, which discretion could not be exercised until July 1, 1960, and which discretion could not be used to contract for more than 35,000 units in any one year.

The veto message objected to this provision of S. 57 and the number of additional low-rent housing units authorized by S. 2539 has been cut to only 37,000. This figure was established by administration estimates that there is now a backlog of applications for 37,000 units which could be expected to be built if the authorization is provided. The bill also requires that any units under contract from prior authorizations which are recaptured by the PHA may be reallocated but will be charged against the 37,000 unit total. (Sec. 505.)

College housing loan authorization: S. 57 contained a provision increasing the college housing loan fund by $300 million, which included $37.5 million for "other educational facilities" and $37.5 million for student-nurse and intern housing. In view of the objections in the veto message, S. 2539 reduces these amounts to $250 million, $25 million, and $25 million respectively. (Sec. 601.)

College classrooms and educational buildings: S. 57 provided for a new loan program to assist colleges and universities in constructing or rehabilitating classrooms, laboratories, and related facilities, including equipment and utilities. The amount provided for these loans has been reduced from $62.5 million in S. 57 to $50 million in S. 2539. Also in view of opposition in the veto message, S. 2539 provides that this program shall be financed by appropriations rather than by borrowing from the Treasury. (Sec. 602.)

Sale of housing project: S. 57 contained general language authorizing the Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration to modify the terms of any contract under which he had sold a housing project to a cooperative. S. 2539 modifies this provision to restrict its application to the contract by which the Southmore Mutual Housing Corp. purchased a housing project from the Public Housing Administration. (Sec. 808.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask also to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table printed on page 27 of the committee report, entitled "Comparisons of Obligational Authority and Budgetary Impact in Fiscal Year 1960," modified to reflect amendments made on the floor of the Senate.

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

COMPARISONS OF OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY AND BUDGETARY IMPACT IN FISCAL YEAR 1960

Proposed housing legislation—Comparative summary of (1) new obligational authority and (2) estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1960

[In millions]

	New obligational authority			Estimated expenditures, fiscal year 1960		
	Administration (S. 65 and S. 612)	S. 57	S. 2539	Administration (S. 65 and S. 612)	S. 57	S. 2539
Grants:						
Urban renewal	[1] $1,550.0	[2] $900.0	[3] $650.0			
Urban planning (sec. 701)[4]	10.0	10.0	10.0	$1.0	$1.1	$1.1
Scholarship [4]		.3			.1	
Defense hospital [4]		15.0	15.0		2.5	2.5
Farm housing research [4]		.1	.1			
Loans:						
Elderly housing direct loans [4]		50.0	50.0		2.5	2.5
Urban renewal advances				3.6	8.0	8.0
Public housing advances					5.0	5.0
College housing loans	200.0	300.0	250.0			
College classroom loans		62.5	[4] 50.0		2.5	2.5
Mortgage purchases: FNMA special assistance for cooperative housing		37.5	25.0		6.3	6.3
Total	1,760.0	1,375.4	1,050.1	4.6	28.0	[5] 27.9

[1] Authorizations for a 6-year period.
[2] Authorizations for a 2-year period.
[3] Includes $100,000,000 for small cities, to be used at discretion of President.
[4] New obligational authority when appropriated.
[5] Does not include an estimate of possible cost attributable to provisions regarding extension of FNMA commitments.

Table prepared by staff of Senate Housing Subcommittee, Aug. 5, 1959.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we have worked long and hard trying to get a bill. We have gone more than half way to meet the administration. I do not want any misunderstanding to arise. I do not want Senators to feel that we will have a housing bill, because it is my earnest and honest belief that there will be no housing legislation this year unless we succeed in overriding the veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired. All time for debate has expired.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd, Va.	Cooper
Allott	Byrd, W. Va.	Cotton
Anderson	Cannon	Curtis
Bartlett	Capehart	Dirksen
Beall	Carlson	Dodd
Bennett	Carroll	Douglas
Bible	Case, N.J.	Dworshak
Bush	Chavez	Eastland
Butler	Clark	Ellender
Engle	Kefauver	Pastore
Ervin	Kerr	Prouty
Fong	Kuchel	Proxmire
Frear	Langer	Randolph
Fulbright	Lausche	Robertson
Gore	Long, Hawaii	Russell
Green	Long, La.	Saltonstall
Gruening	McCarthy	Schoeppel
Hart	McClellan	Scott
Hartke	McGee	Smathers
Hayden	McNamara	Smith
Hickenlooper	Magnuson	Sparkman
Hill	Mansfield	Stennis
Holland	Martin	Symington
Hruska	Monroney	Talmadge
Humphrey	Morse	Thurmond
Jackson	Morton	Wiley
Javits	Moss	Williams, N.J.
Johnson, Tex.	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Johnston, S.C.	Murray	Yarborough
Jordan	Muskie	Young, N. Dak.
Keating	Neuberger	Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? Under the Constitution, a yea-and-nay vote is mandatory. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do I correctly understand that a vote "yea" is a vote to override the veto; and a vote "nay" is a vote to sustain the veto?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is absent on official business attending the Interparliamentary Union meetings at Warsaw, Poland.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senators from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senators from Idaho and Massachusetts would each vote "yea" and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senators from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senators from Missouri and Wyoming would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business, attending the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Warsaw, Poland. On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Massachusetts would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent, and, on this vote, is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Wyoming would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—58

Anderson	Gruening	Mansfield
Bartlett	Hart	Monroney
Beall	Hartke	Morse
Bible	Hayden	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Murray
Cannon	Humphrey	Muskie
Capehart	Jackson	Neuberger
Carroll	Javits	Pastore
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Proxmire
Clark	Johnston, S.C.	Randolph
Cooper	Jordan	Robertson
Dodd	Kefauver	Scott
Douglas	Kerr	Smathers
Ellender	Langer	Sparkman
Engle	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Ervin	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Frear	McCarthy	Yarborough
Fulbright	McGee	Young, Ohio
Gore	McNamara	
Green	Magnuson	

NAYS—36

Aiken	Dworshak	Mundt
Allott	Eastland	Prouty
Bennett	Fong	Russell
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bush	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler	Hruska	Smith
Byrd, Va.	Keating	Stennis
Carlson	Kuchel	Talmadge
Case, N.J.	Lausche	Thurmond
Cotton	McClellan	Wiley
Curtis	Martin	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Morton	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—6

Case, S. Dak.	Goldwater	Kennedy
Church	Hennings	O'Mahoney

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative, the bill is not passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote be reconsidered.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1555) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

MEETINGS OF PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Public Works Committee plans to meet shortly in the office of the Secretary of the Senate; and the Finance Committee will meet in the Finance Committee hearing room.

Mr. President, at this time I move that the Senate take a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before that motion is put, I should like to have the conference report on the independent offices bill called up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Can it be disposed of in 2 or 3 minutes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I withhold my motion for a recess, and yield now to the Senator from Washington.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

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

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 12, 1959, p. 14395, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to know to what the amendments relate. Do they relate to the civil defense part of the bill?

Mr. President, for the moment, I object to the request. I should like to find out more about the conference report.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now take a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

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

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the President pro tempore.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The bill (H.R. 8678) to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958 to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes, was read twice by title.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that H.R. 8678, the roads bill, be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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

The motion was agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the President pro tempore.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. When the Senate recessed, we were discussing the possibility of bringing before the Senate the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. It had been submitted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is that in order? Has that report been submitted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been submitted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it in order to proceed to the consideration of the report at this time?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask the Senator from Washington whether it is agreeable to him to proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. I wish the RECORD to show, however, that the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] wished to make a statement on it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We have sent for the Senator from New York.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from New York is en route to the Chamber. I understand that the Senator from Washington is prepared to make a statement.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7040) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

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

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 12, 1959, p. 14395, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

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

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

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I further move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is that the amendment——

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the only amendment in dispute.

Mr. RUSSELL. May we have the amendment reported? May we know what the purpose or the scope of the amendment is?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be reported.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 5, of the Senate engrossed amendment, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as the Senate will recall, the Senate had several conferences with Members of the House on the independent offices appropriation bill, and we came to an agreement, which the Senate adopted, on all items in that very long and complex independent offices appropriation bill, except one. That item, which is termed "amendment No. 1," involved the question of whether or not we should appropriate $12 million for grants to States and local communities for salaries paid in connection with local participation in civil defense and $3 million for equipment and other matters which the local people would need in order to carry out their portion of the work of civil defense.

The Governors of many States would appoint civil defense directors. The $12 million item would give a grant-in-aid of not more than 50 percent of the cost for the operation of that office. In some cases, another subdivision of the government would be involved, a city, county, or district, but mainly it would involve the States.

There was great dispute about this matter in the House. The House conferees and the members of the House Appropriations Committee, though I do not quote their attitude verbatim, felt that this provision would establish many local patronage jobs. As they put it, it would create more jobs in the city halls of the United States.

In truth it would not, and there is ample precedent for the provision. We have a similar provision in connection with the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which provide for participation in the payment of salaries for the operation of the local units. In these departments the employees come under civil-service requirements or a merit system, and the jobs are so established.

At the last session of Congress the Senate voted the same amount of money for participation as is contained in the bill, but we found at that time that the States had not sent in their plans and had not sent in the merit system requirements.

In the meantime, all 50 States have now sent in their plans of participation in civil defense and all of them have some merit system comparable or similar to those we demand in the Department of Labor, where we participate in the operation of the State organization, and in HEW, where we participate in other functions of that Department.

The House knocked out the item completely. The Senate put it in. Then we finally went to a vote in the Senate and in the House. The House voted approximately 2 to 1 against this item, and the Senate voted 76 to 8 to keep the item in.

That led us to an impasse on amendment No. 1. All the other civil defense features were resolved in conference, and we have been waiting with the independent offices appropriation bill for almost 3 weeks, in the hope that we might be able to resolve this item. In the meantime, civil defense officials have conferred with the Members of the House. The President formally sent a letter to all members of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations on this item, suggesting they keep it in.

I have only today conferred with the chairman of the subcommittee in the House, Representative THOMAS, of Texas, and he informs me, and will inform me by letter which is on its way over here now, that the House has no intention of having any further conference on this item. Therefore, I am suggesting to the Senate, in view of the time element involved, the fact that almost 3 weeks have gone by, and the fact that salaries in all the independent agencies downtown are involved—Veterans' Administration, General Services, Housing and Home Finance Agency—that in view of this situation about all we can do is accept the House version.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I promised to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely want to ask whether it is a fact that the House voted on the issue twice and refused to accept it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The House had a voice vote on it and then the House had a rollcall vote on it.

Mr. RUSSELL. It was fully explained?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was fully explained and discussed. It is a matter we have had in the Senate for a long time. I am somewhat in agreement with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]—and I have handled this appropriation for some time—that there has been a great deal of waste. I think we can look askance on what they have been doing in the Federal civil defense picture.

It is my firm opinion that civil defense can succeed—if we want civil defense at all—only if there is local participation. Without that, we might as well consider civil defense on a national scale to be futile. Everyone knows that the local people know better what should be done, but there should be an overall plan under which they can work. I should like to see local participation bolstered. We are not going to pay too much attention to local details. If something like a fire happens in a town, and the chief of the fire department feels that he can handle it with his own local people and in cooperation with the director of civil defense, that will be done. That is the situation in which we find ourselves. Therefore, I recommend that the House version be accepted.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. In connection with the suggestion which the distinguished Senator from Washington makes, I invite his attention to the fact that the Wall Street Journal, in an editorial in the issue of September 3, 1959, supports the view the Senator takes. In addition to the editorial from the Wall Street Journal to which I have referred, the Scripps-Howard newspapers have published editorials in various newspapers of their league of newspapers, in support of the distinguished Senator's position. I read briefly a typical editorial from one of the Scripps-Howard newspapers. This editorial appeared in the Cleveland Press recently. It is captioned "Setback for a Boondoggle." It reads as follows:

SETBACK FOR A BOONDOGGLE

Give the House of Representatives credit for a stout fight against a $12 million boondoggle which may yet be avoided.

This is the proposal to finance a new army of civil defense employees, working at the State level, paid half by the States, half by the Federal Government.

The Senate has approved the project. The House turned it down recently for the third time. Something has to give. The item is part of the independent offices appropriation bill, containing money for a variety of essential Government operations.

The House should hold the line because this $12 million is only a foot in the door, opening the way for still further expansion of this futile bureaucracy.

Insistent pressure for this needless addition to the public payroll is best explained in terms of the law expounded by C. Northcote Parkinson, professor of history at the University of Malaya, in Singapore, as follows:

"In any public administration or organization, the number of new subordinates increases at a predictable rate, irrespective of any variation in the amount of work (if any) to be done."

After all this time, and the overwhelming votes in the other body something must give. The Senator is in agreement with that statement, is he not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not agree with the editorial, because I believe this item would pave the way to local participation in the proper degree. Governor Hoegh is doing an excellent job. It was my hope that the situation could be handled in this way, and that we could take away from some of the amounts of money at the Federal level.

This is an intangible matter. If nothing should happen, someone might say in the future that we wasted a great deal of money. If something should happen, and we did not have an adequate civil defense program, we would be sorry. I believe that in the past the Federal or-

ganization has been loose. Some of the criticism of the Senator from Ohio has been well founded. I was hoping that we could switch into local participation, which would result in building up local enthusiasm and local interests in matters of civil defense. That is the only reason the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and I, and some of the rest of us insisted on this item, not because we wanted wasteful expenditures, but because we thought we would get more out of civil defense with this sort of program, rather than what has been happening.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Does not the distinguished Senator from Washington know, from the fact that he is a student of history, and also from the fact that he served in the Armed Forces in World War II, that the defense of civilians in this country is a part of the total defense of our country, and that in the event of any sudden atomic attack on any part of the Nation, whether by accident or intent, the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, would immediately declare martial law, and the military would be in charge? No civilian agency would have anything to do with it.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Ohio is correct in at least one thing he said, and that is that if there were an atomic attack all the military forces would be active—that is, those that were left—and military law would prevail.

However, I think he is just as wrong as it is possible for a person to be in assuming that the military forces would have trained men and women to take care of the situation, or that they would know what to do, or could in any way substitute for or serve as a duplicate of the availability of thousands of trained men and women in various civil defense units.

Having served during World War II as Governor of my own State, when the emergency could not possibly be as great as it would be now in the event of a catastrophe of the kind I have mentioned, I know that we had to rely on the presence, availability, and immediate services of thousands of trained citizens.

I have already said in earlier arguments on this question that we had 338,000 trained Florida citizens in civil defense.

I think it would be a tragic mistake to postpone doing the thing which would carry out in good faith what the Federal Government committed itself to the States to do by legislative action only a few months ago.

I cannot express too strongly my regret and disappointment. However, the Senator from Washington has done everything he possibly could, and his associates as conferees have done the same. I was privileged to serve as one of them.

I think there is nothing to do but to move ahead and accept the bill without that item. But I will not pretend that I am at all satisfied with the result, because I think it is a mistake from the standpoint of best serving the people of our country. I want the RECORD to show that that is my opinion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I concur wholeheartedly in the motion to recede which the Senator from Washington has made. The Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the Committee on Appropriations considered the subject. The House originally left all this amount out. The Senate restored the full amount of $12 million as the Federal contribution to the State offices for assistance and $3 million for equipment, as the Senator from Washington has said. This was our effort to comply with the act which was passed last year, authorizing the Federal Government to assist in certain ways in building up civil defense.

The Senate conferees had two or three conferences with the House conferees on the subject. The House was unyielding. The House passed this item, as the Senator from Washington has said, on two votes, one a voice vote, and one a yea-and-nay vote, with quite a substantial number of negative votes.

The Senate, on July 30, insisted on its position by a vote of 76 yeas to 8 nays. Since that time we have held one more conference, with no results.

Last week, under date of August 25, 1959, President Eisenhower sent a message to the President of the Senate. I read two pertinent paragraphs:

> For fiscal year 1960, my budget for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization included $12 million to be allocated among 9 departments and agencies needed to finance civil defense and defense mobilization programs. The $3 million provided does not enable the Federal Government to carry out the responsibilities contained in the National Security Act, the Defense Production Act, and the Federal Civil Defense Act.

That matter is now before the committee, Senate Committee on Appropriations again, in relation to the Federal Government.

The President continued:

> It would be unwise to neglect our civil defense mission because our total defense is incomplete and meaningless without reliable and responsible home defense. Survival cannot be guaranteed merely with a capacity for reprisal. Equally important is our ability to recover. This means staying power and endurance beyond that ever before required of this Nation or any nation.
>
> I recommend that the Congress appropriate the funds outlined above to carry out these programs which are so vital to the national security. The details of this proposed appropriation are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

That applies to the work of the Federal Government and the agencies of the Federal Government, but it alone is not enough. The provision which the House will not allow, and from which the Senate will recede today, would carry out the responsibility of the Federal Government to the States and municipalities.

I agree with the statement of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] that we should stimulate greater civil defense activity. I agree with what the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has said.

It is with great reluctance that I join in the motion of the Senator from Washington, but I feel that the conferees have done everything they can, and that if we are to have an independent offices appropriation bill—and we know we must have one—then we at this time will have to recede from this item, hoping that the President may submit it to Congress again.

I am certain that the President feels very strongly that civil defense, when we are spending so many millions of dollars on our national defense, is an integral part of the whole defense security program.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am not quite prepared to throw in the sponge on this proposition. I think we have reached a point where the toughest fellow has got to win. I cannot conceive of the House of Representatives, any more than I can conceive of the Senate, jeopardizing the independent offices appropriation bill because of this item. The matter has come down to the interesting stage which legislators reach when the fellow who holds out the hardest and the longest may win. Now we must decide whether we will do that in respect to this bill.

I have little doubt that if we want to sit here and wait out the House, the House will not let the independent offices appropriation bill go for a matter of $15 million any more than it is proposed we should. The question is, How serious is this issue, and how much longer are we ready to fight it out?

This kind of action has happened before in legislatures. If the Senate or the House really wants $15 million, it can get it. The Senate can get it by including the funds in a bill which the House wants urgently, if we assume we have to yield on this bill. If we really want to do it, we can find a way to do it.

What I should like to ascertain from the distinguished Senator from Washington, the chairman of this particular subcommittee, and also from the chairman of the primary Committee on Appropriations, is, Are we trying, in a supplemental appropriation bill, or in some other way, to get this money?

I should like to explain my position. First, I could not agree more than I do with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] that the idea that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force will take over the civil defense of the United States is completely impractical. I should like to see the faces of the people who make such a recommendation when the Army, the Navy, and Air Force come before the committee with their estimates of appropriations for what is needed, if they were given that responsibility. We would not have a budget of $40 billion for them; they would have a budget of $50 billion or $60 billion. We all know that in our hearts.

So, in my opinion, there is no real substance to this argument. If we are going to give the Defense Establishment the responsibility for civil defense, is it planned to give it to them the day after an atomic attack, or now? If it is intended that we give it to them now, we

can count on not less than a $10 billion increase in the appropriations for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want the Senator from New York to understand that some members of the conference—I believe every Senate conferee—felt about this matter exactly as the Senator from New York and I feel. There were, however, various items in dispute. Some of them were of very great importance to the ability of various important and functioning agencies to continue to operate. One of the items involved the $280 million necessary to start the operations of the Inter-American Bank.

Having served a good many times and for a long period of time on conference committees, I may say to the distinguished Senator from New York that I think the conferees of the Senate gave in only where they had to, and they gave in only on items which they regarded as, while important, not so overwhelmingly important as some upon which they prevailed.

I hope the reluctance of the Senator from New York to accept the result of the conference, a reluctance which can be no greater than that of the Senator from Florida, will not prevent him from realizing the great difficulties experienced in a situation which involves in one bill, as in this, hundreds of items, and in the group of bills which involve the same conferees, meeting from day to day on different bills, many more items than that. In the last analysis, there has to be some give and some take. But I assure the Senate that no one could have fought harder for this item than did the chairman of the Senate subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who are both on the floor at the moment. The Senator from Massachusetts is a former Governor of his State, and had somewhat the same experience in this matter as did the senior Senator from Florida, during World War II. The same is true of other Senators to whom I could refer. I do not know how we could go further without jeopardizing the enactment of the independent offices appropriation bill, which embraces appropriations totaling several billion dollars.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is close to $6 billion.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New York must realize, I am sure, that not only was that amendment applicable to many different agencies involved in the one bill, but that the same conferees, in large part, were sitting in conference on other bills, so we simply had to have some give and take. The items for veterans were contained in this particular bill, and every member of the conference happened to be a veteran. A considerable number of the conferees happened to be men who had had the responsibility of serving as governors during World War II.

So I am sure the Senator from New York will recognize, as I know he does recognize, because I know he has a generous nature, that this matter was not given up without a determined fight; on the contrary, we simply came finally to the end of the road. It is simply a question of making this concession, or making much greater ones in other fields, or of losing the bill as a whole.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I know of the deep interest which the Senator from New York has. His thoughts are the same as mine. But we should not overlook the fact that there is a big sum in the bill for civil defense. The only dispute was over this one particular item, which covers a new phase of the program, namely, grants in aid to establish units, which I agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. And all this is money on which we had passed legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and the States went ahead.

The House receded on amendments involving millions of dollars for civil defense; and we did not have much trouble getting what we think is a really adequate amount for the program, except for this particular grant to the States.

Mr. JAVITS. Let me ask the Senator from Washington a specific question; but first I wish to say that my reasons for speaking are, first, to make a personal protest; second, to urge the country to protest to those in the House of Representatives who, it seems to me, have not dealt wisely with the country's interests; and, third, to ascertain from the Appropriations Committee whether, if in January the administration requests a supplemental appropriation for this same item, in order to implement this legislation, it will be regarded sympathetically, and whether these members of the Appropriations Committee will feel prepared to make another fight for it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have for many years looked at the civil defense expenditures, and they have bothered me because sometimes it seems as if there has been a great deal of waste, although not intentional waste, because I think Governor Hoegh has been one of the best I have seen.

But this item to transfer more interest to the local communities, such as New York has done, seemed to me to be a good way to get something worthwhile out of the civil defense and to build it up in the local communities; and the Director felt that way, too.

So, insofar as I am concerned, I would say it would be a must, because if civil defense is to be successful at all, even in its peacetime job, there must be this shift to the local communities. So to me it is a must.

I cannot speak for the administration; but in view of the President's letter and the testimony and the personal talks I have had on this matter, I am quite sure there would be an item for it; and then I think we can meet this matter squarely; we can say, "What kind of civil defense are we going to have for the country? Are we going to have a big, sprawling agency in Washington?"

Of course it is always difficult to do a good job with a large, sprawling agency. Are we to have such an agency in Washington, or are we to handle the work in the local communities?

Mr. JAVITS. Then does the Senator from Washington agree that we would sympathetically invite the administration to take that action in January, rather than to say, "Sorry, but we cannot do anything about it, anymore?"

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that is what we should do, because this is not just a dollars and cents matter. This matter involves a policy. I believe we should meet the problem head on.

It is true that in connection with this bill, under the resolution the agencies can pay one-twelfth of what their last year's appropriations were. But the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I have seen many new agencies included—for instance, the Federal Aviation Agency, with appropriations of millions of dollars; and the Veterans' Administration, with appropriations of more than $5 billion; and other additions, because of new laws which have been passed, including the one for new pension systems.

It is very difficult for those in charge of the agencies to know how to administer them properly when they do not have the necessary funds for each branch of the work, and must use one-twelfth of what they had the year before, in order to provide properly for so many agencies, including the new ones, such as the Space Agency and the other agencies. But after watching the civil defense expenditures on the Federal level, I am convinced that what is proposed is the only answer to the problem, if we are to have civil defense.

I believe that Governor Hoegh is convinced of that, too.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Louisiana in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. JAVITS. Of course, Mr. President.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with everything the Senator from Washington has said. I can add that, from personal conversations and observations, I am confident that the President feels very, very strongly that civil defense is a very important part of our whole security program; and I am confident that he will send down a supplemental request, when he believes the proper time has come.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; and I gather that these Senators who have spoken will give it their full support.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course we will.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Furthermore, many of the ex-Governors who served in this connection knew this problem.

Of course, I think New York has done an excellent job in creating public in-

terest in this matter. But many other States have not done so. So I think what is suggested is the only way we can get the local people alerted to the problem. They are doing good work in many other respects at the local level. The new arrangement will enable those in the local groups to feel that they are doing something worthwhile, and they will proceed to do it.

Certainly it is most difficult to handle this matter from Washington. There must be overall supervision; but the local interests must act in the local communities.

I appreciate the attitude of the State of New York in connection with this matter, because I believe that in this particular field, New York has led the other States; and I compliment New York on doing so.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the rest of us have a deep interest in this matter. But in view of the problem and the circumstances, and in view of the passage of so much time, we felt that what has been agreed to was the best way we could handle the matter.

The Senator from New York realizes full well, I know, that we have held it up for almost 3½ weeks.

Mr. JAVITS. That is true. Indeed, I requested the Senator to hold it up, so we could try to make some progress with it.

I feel, Mr. President, that a real contribution is being made by the chairman of the committee and its ranking minority member, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], in giving assurances that they will do all they can to encourage the administration to seek relief by means of a supplemental bill.

Another matter of importance is that of aid to the communications media of the country, which will alert our people to what has occurred here, and will inform them why it has occurred. In my opinion they can be most helpful in correcting what I believe is now a matter of very grave disadvantage to the Nation.

In order to provide some documentary background for that position, in case any of those who shape public opinion should wish to have it, I shall call attention to some matters other than those alluded to by the Senator from Massachusetts.

For instance, I refer to the resolution on civil defense which was unanimously adopted at the 51st Governors' Conference at San Juan, P.R., on August 5, 1959. In the resolution the Governors backed up the importance of civil defense preparations, both on the national level and on the State and community levels; and they made the following significant statement, which I believe should be written on the wall of the municipal building of every town and city in the Nation:

> Without protection against fallout, we are vulnerable to nuclear blackmail.

Mr. President, I repeat that statement:

> Without protection against fallout, we are vulnerable to nuclear blackmail.

Therefore, Mr. President, this matter goes to the very elemental question of the survival of our country, because the Governors themselves have highlighted the need for civil defense protection; they have pointed out that it is organic to the whole posture on which we have built—namely, the posture of the power to retaliate—in other words, the mutuality of terror, as it is called—as being our most effective defense; and in this case they point out that without a civil defense establishment, we may be subject to nuclear blackmail.

Mr. President, another matter which has not been alluded to—or, at least, not since I have been on the floor—is the report of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy issued August 30, 1959—only a few days ago—in which they comment on a situation which they developed scientifically, and which they considered to be a reasonable facsimile of what we might very well face in the event of an atomic attack. They list as the likely targets of such an attack the following cities: New York City, Chicago, Boston, Detroit, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, San Francisco, St. Louis, Washington, Atlanta, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Dallas, Houston, Kansas City, Milwaukee, New Orleans, and Denver.

Mr. President, what do they anticipate would happen in the event of such an atomic attack? They refer to the possibility of sudden death for 50 million Americans, and serious injury to approximately 20 million Americans, and the destruction of approximately 50 percent of American dwellings; they believe they would either be destroyed or would be made unusable for months, because of the atomic fallout. All this was stated in the New York Times, in connection with the report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. President, if we needed any other certification as to the validity of civil defense, the same report finds, and it is labeled as probably the most significant finding, that civil defense preparedness would reduce radiation casualties from approximately 25 percent to about 3 percent.

Mr. President, are we blind, are we insensitive? Are we so hardened that we cannot understand the realities of our own survival? Yet that is what one would think when he faces this kind of situation of obdurateness pictured to us by the conferees.

The money involved, some $6 million, to help the States to obtain technically skilled and professional personnel for civil defense, is not going to be spent to maintain a bureaucracy. We have been over that and over that and over that, time and time again. It is to maintain those inexpensive, relatively few personnel necessary to marshal civil defense programs in which hundreds of thousands in my State of New York are patriotically engaged without hope of compensation. This is how we shall recognize them for their patriotism.

In the State of New York the total number of civil defense personnel is 305,167. The total number of personnel paid from civil defense funds is only 800, leaving 304,367 dedicated individuals who are serving in this field. And this is how we recognize and thank them.

In the State of my friend from Ohio, who has rather different ideas from those of some of us, there are 137,652 civil defense personnel, of whom only 76 are professional and technical personnel paid from civil defense funds.

It seems to me that these facts and this evidence just cry out to high heaven.

Though we are frustrated and blocked now, my own opinion, even at this stage, is that if we felt deeply enough about it, we could get our way. But the realities of the situation, with the subcommittee pretty well united as such, are that we shall probably have to—in fact, we are compelled—to go along with them now.

But this is a matter which deserves the utmost protest and the deepest concern on the part of the people of the country who are really taken up with the issue of survival and national defense in their truest sense.

I hope very much the good conscience and the good sense of the United States will in the next few months assert themselves. Knowing the operations of the administration, I am very glad it has been made clear that a supplemental appropriation application by those concerned will be sympathetically considered. There is always the danger that unless that statement is made on the floor of the Senate, they may do nothing about it at all. I hope they will bring in such a supplemental request in January, and at that time I hope very much the members of the Appropriations Committee will put us in a posture of being very much better able to overcome what I consider the obdurate and very unwise blocking of this matter by the House of Representatives which we have seen up to now.

Mr. President, I have just one further observation. I had had in mind the idea of getting a rollcall, if I could get one, on this particular proposition, but I look very much with dismay upon the Senate, which voted 76 to 8 on this proposition, allowing itself to be bested on a matter of such critical importance to the security of the country and the safety of the people that I do not wish, as a Senator, to stultify the Senate by asking it to vote on a rollcall on this issue, unless the leadership desires it.

I wish to record my own protest. I shall vote "no" on this proposition. I assure any of those who are interested as much as I am on this question that I shall continue to fight for this item.

I deeply feel, I may say, with all due respect to the conferees, that if we really have our teeth in this thing we can find a way to prevail. I cannot conceive that the Senate of the United States cannot get the House to yield on a $15 million item if we really have our teeth in it.

In view of the frustration and dismay with which the people should regard this matter, I hope we shall really have our teeth in it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the State of New York, as the distinguished Senator from Washington has said has taken the lead in an effort to come to grips with this civil defense problem. I commend my colleague for what he has said. It seems strange to me, as I am

sure it must to the country, that after such an overwhelming vote we in this body should recede from our position.

I shall vote "no." I should like to see this matter put to a vote again.

The distinguished Senator from Florida has said here on the floor that every one of these conferees is a veteran. Mr. President, they are fighting men. I know my distinguished friend from Florida, and my distinguished friend from Massachusetts. They are fighters. My distinguished friend from Washington, the chairman, is a fighter. Every one of them is a fighting man. I feel sure they would be ready to go back to this conference and fight again. They will not give up. That is their reputation. I commend them for it. I would like to see this matter sent back so that it again may be taken up with the House conferees. However, I share my colleague's view that unless we have some support from the leadership on one side or the other, there is little chance that the Senate would reverse itself on a roll-call.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have said before that it was with the greatest reluctance that I came to the conclusion I reached, but there are between $6 billion and $7 billion involved, items concerning many other departments, and we have had at least four meetings on this subject, with no change whatsoever. It is only because of those facts that I accepted the position we have taken.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that, and I appreciate that every member of the conference on our side has fought, and fought hard. I say go back and fight again.

I yield to my friend from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had not asked my distinguished friend to yield. I was interested in his impassioned eloquence.

Mr. KEATING. Particularly about the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may disclose to him that no less eloquence was used in the conference, and there were items involved which were of great importance. I recall one that was involved as to which a group of Senators refused to sign the conference report and got up and left. I see my two friends, the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from North Dakota, smiling, because they remember the incident.

We have to decide where to make our supreme fight when we are dealing, as we were in this case, with a bill that involves $6 billion, and I do not remember how many agencies, and hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of items, and when we were dealing with other bills, with largely the same group of conferees, on alternate days. We cannot run at full speed all the time.

All I can say is that we have every reason to believe that when the matter comes up after the first of the year we will be successful in our efforts to obtain this appropriation. Further than that I cannot say. I wish I could say we had won 100 percent of the controversies but in the very nature of things that rarely happens in conferences.

Mr. KEATING. I realize that. I know how hard the Senators have fought.

In other words the position of my friend from Florida is that sometimes one has to yield a tactical position in order to gain a strategic objective. I am sympathetic with the conferees.

I am not happy about the situation in which we find ourselves. I cannot observe any assurance that when the matter again comes back to us in a supplemental next year, we will not be faced with exactly the same situation, but perhaps the Senate conferees, having been refreshed in the meantime, will be able to make an even greater and more herculean effort in their controversy on this matter with the other body.

I understand some of the House conferees were with us, but that there simply were not enough of them. I am told that my distinguished colleague from my neighborhood, Representative OSTERTAG, was back of this move, and I commend him for it.

Mr. President, I shall vote "no," but I shall not ask for a yea and nay vote, under the circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] that the Senate recede on amendment No. 1 to the independent offices appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8575) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

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

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of September 3, 1959, p. 16442, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

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

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the conference report on H.R. 8575, the military construction appropriation bill for 1960, contains $1,363,961,200. This is an amount $78,958,500 over the House recommendation and $64,217,500 under the Senate recommendation. It is an amount $199,238,800 under the budget.

For the Department of the Army, the appropriation is $263,632,300.

For the Department of the Navy, the appropriation is $204,112,400.

For the Department of the Air Force, the appropriation is $776,832,500.

In addition, it includes smaller amounts for the Department of Defense and the Reserve components of the three services, which I shall discuss later.

As is true of most conference reports, the position of the Senate conferees was not upheld in all instances, and there have been items deleted from the bill which we would have preferred to have included. On the other hand, I believe that the bill which is now before the Senate is a good measure, and will provide the necessary military construction to strengthen our defenses in the coming year.

On pages 3 and 5 of the conference report, Senators will find a list of the items and amounts which the conference has included in addition to those provided in the House report on this bill. I shall describe certain highlights included among these changes. On such items as I do not cover, I shall be glad to answer any questions which are propounded.

The conference committee considered and approved, with one minor exception, the amounts as recommended by the Senate for all hospital construction in the three services. In this connection, the conference report specifically directs the Secretary of Defense to apply the funds provided on a utilitarian basis to meet essential needs and maximum utilization of existing private and governmental medical facilities in the area. The conference committee is also directed that available equipment be utilized to equip these hospital prior to initiation of new procurement, including fixed equipment and other equipment not normally financed from construction funds. Certification of compliance with these conditions is directed.

I believe one item, location 12, Japan, deserves specific reference. In providing $1,700,000 for this project, the conferees are in agreement that these funds are available only for the purchase of local currencies available through the U.S. Treasury and to be used only for the construction of facilities, other than housing and community facilities, at this location. It was the unanimous opinion of the conferees that the greatest use possible should be made of the Commodity Credit accounts in foreign countries.

For the Department of the Navy, the conference action added $24,064,400 to the amount provided in the House bill. The conference committee deleted $7 million for North Island, San Diego, Calif., and $1,271,000 for Ford Island, Hawaii, which were included in the Senate bill. These funds would have provided berthing wharves for the large *Forrestal*-type carriers. The Senate conferees strongly urged the inclusion of this construction. However, the House conferees were adamant in their belief that existing facilities were adequate to

meet operating requirements in the immediate future.

For the Department of the Air Force, the conference action added $20,215,900 to the amounts provided in the House bill. For aircraft engines inspection and repair shops and aircraft maintenance field shops, the conference provided a lump sum of $2,650,000. The conferees agreed that these funds should be allocated to specific locations upon a priority to be determined by the Department of Defense, with the understanding that maximum utilization will be made of existing facilities and that funds will be allocated only for the construction of complete shops. For ground powered equipment shops, the conference committee agreed to a lump sum of $750,000 to be allocated on the same basis.

No funds have been provided for Mace facilities overseas. The conferees agreed that since the Secretary of Defense has not as yet made a determination as to the procurement and deployment of the Mace missile, no funds should be provided for the construction of facilities in support of this missile. However, if a determination is made, the Secretary of Defense, after notifying the Congress, is directed to use available funds within this appropriation including funds from prior years for the construction of the necessary facilities.

For the Department of Defense, $23,200,000 is included for the loran stations, and $23,545,000 is included for the Advance Research Projects Agency construction.

For the Reserve components, the conference committee approved $20 million for the Army Reserve, $8,980,000 for the Navy Reserve, $4 million for the Air Force Reserve, and $16,440,000 for the Air National Guard.

For the Army National Guard, $23,219,000 was approved, an increase of $12,219,000 over the House. The increase referred to provides for 86 authorized National Guard armories in 30 States for which local funds are immediately available. The action was based on the belief that State and local cooperation should not be discouraged and that the growing backlog of National Guard Armory construction projects should be reduced. A list of projects added by the Senate is found beginning on page 37 of Senate Report 752.

Before I close, I wish to thank sincerely all the members of the House and Senate conference committee for the part they played in providing what I believe to be an excellent report. For an entire week these members labored diligently in a spirit of cooperative understanding, considering each item on its individual merits. I trust that the conference report will be approved quickly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation showing congressional action on the military construction appropriation bill be included at this point in the RECORD.

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

Congressional action on H.R. 8575, the military construction appropriation bill for fiscal year 1960

Title (1)	Appropriations, 1959 (2)	Budget estimate, 1960 (3)	House action (4)	Senate action (5)	Conference action (6)
Department of Defense:					
Loran stations	$20,000,000	$23,200,000	$23,200,000	$23,200,000	$23,200,000
Advanced Research Projects Agency	50,000,000	(1)	23,545,000	23,545,000	23,545,000
Regular Forces:					
Army	230,000,000	341,000,000	241,564,100	278,773,700	263,632,300
Navy	295,000,000	244,000,000	180,048,000	225,785,400	204,112,400
Air Force	785,000,000	[1] 894,000,000	756,616,600	803,495,600	776,832,500
Reserve components:					
Army Reserve	[2] 6,250,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,160,000	20,000,000
Navy Reserve	8,000,000	9,000,000	8,589,000	9,000,000	8,980,000
Air Force Reserve	(3)	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Army National Guard	(4)	11,000,000	11,000,000	23,219,000	23,219,000
Air National Guard	9,600,000	17,000,000	16,440,000	17,000,000	16,440,000
Total	1,403,850,000	1,563,200,000	1,285,002,700	1,428,178,700	1,363,961,200

[1] Budget estimate for Sentry and Midas programs totaling $23,545,000 contained in Air Force request.
[2] Includes funds for Army Reserve and Army National Guard.
[3] Included in "Military construction, Air Force."
[4] Included in "Army Reserve Forces."

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to add to what the Senator from Mississippi has said that the Senate conferees felt very strongly on these subjects, but had to yield because of items felt to be even more important. The berthing of the carrier of the *Forrestal* class at San Diego is important, and even more important is the facility at Pearl Harbor, where there is involved the loading of ammunition aboard the ship.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senate conferees also felt that the powerplant at Guam was very important.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. That item was deferred.

All of these items are part of the Pacific complex or the Pacific pattern of our national defense. We think they are items which should be started as soon as reasonably possible. The House conferees agreed this action was not a rejection of these items, but that the items would be approved at the proper time.

I wish to invite particular attention to the item in the bill, Mr. President, providing an additional $12.2 million for the Federal part of the construction of the additional National Guard armories throughout the Nation, including 86 armories scattered through many States. Those are the ones for which the local funds are already available. The priority ratings are based upon the availability of the local funds. We did not set the priority ratings. That was done by the State authorities, and it was approved by the National Guard Bureau.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts again.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I recognize that we had no authorization for the Jacksonville National Guard Armory and nothing could be done in that regard, but I appreciate the interest of the Senator and of the other conferees.

Will the Senator advise me what happened to the item for the Marine Reserve building in Tampa, which the Senate added to the House-passed bill?

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will wait just a minute I will check. That was one of the last items. I know we insisted quite strongly on that item.

I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that I am glad to report that the Marine Reserve building for Tampa, Fla., is in the bil.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate that action on the part of the conferees, and I particularly thank my friend, the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if there are no other comments or questions, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

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

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on the military construction appropriation bill, H.R. 8575.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 8575, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
September 4, 1959.

Resolved, That the House agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8575) entitled "An Act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes";

Public Law 86-255
86th Congress, H. R. 7040
September 14, 1959

AN ACT

73 STAT. 500.

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offi es, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, namely:

Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1960.

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; not to exceed $8,500 for the purchase of newspapers, periodicals and teletype news services; not to exceed $1,000,000 for expenses of travel; and not to exceed $6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive: $23,285,000, of which $185,000 shall be available for the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee: *Provided*, That contracts for not to exceed eight persons under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annually.

60 Stat. 810.

Federal Contributions

For financial contributions to the States for civil defense purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to be equally matched with State funds, $10,000,000.

64 Stat. 1246.
50 USC app. 2251 note.

Emergency Supplies and Equipment

For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing, distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, $6,950,000.

50 USC app. 2281.

Research and Development

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for evacuation, shelter, and the protection of life and property, as authorized by section 201(d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

50 USC app. 2281.
60 Stat. 810.

46285 O - 59

No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including contract stenographic reporting services; employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; not to exceed $1,000 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals (excluding scientific, technical, trade or traffic periodicals, for official use); hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed $50 per diem; $6,925,000.

60 Stat. 810.

Payments to Air Carriers

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 763–765), as is payable by the Board, $58,500,000, to remain available until expended.

49 USC 1376.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $22,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed $10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals (excluding scientific, technical, trade or traffic periodicals, for official use); payment in advance for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed $77,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; not to exceed $472,000 for expenses of travel; and not to exceed $5,000 for actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; $19,120,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the Career Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended.

60 Stat. 810.

5 USC 118i, 118k-118n.

41 USC 5.

5 USC 631 note.

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

3 CFR, 1943-1948 Comp., p. 256.

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $400,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive order: *Provided further*, That members of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business away from their homes or regular places of business, including periods while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of appointment for part-time or intermittent service as a member of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Commission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated January 9, 1953, as amended.

22 USC 287 note.
60 Stat. 810.
63 Stat. 166.
5 USC 835 note.
62 Stat. 697.

ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771–775), $2,450,000.

58 Stat. 258.
64 Stat. 465.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES' LIFE INSURANCE FUND

Not to exceed $249,000 of the funds in the "Employees' Life Insurance Fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091–2103): *Provided*, That this limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 85–377 (5 U.S.C. 2094(c)).

68 Stat. 736.
5 USC 2099.
72 Stat. 87.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; not to exceed $5,000 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals (excluding scientific, technical, trade or traffic periodicals, for official use only); purchase of one passenger motor vehicle at not to exceed $4,500; not to exceed $13,500,000 for expenses of travel; and purchase and repair

60 Stat. 170.
49 USC 1101 note.

of skis and snowshoes; $301,700,000: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

For an additional amount for the aquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of air navigation facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at remote localities not on foreign soil where such accommodations are not available (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed $50,000 per housing unit in Alaska); purchase of one aircraft; and the initial flight checking of air navigation facilities and the transportation by air to and from and within Alaska and the Territories of the United States of materials and equipment secured under this appropriation; $135,200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air navigation facilities.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

49 USC 1101-1105, 1108, 1111, 1104 note.

For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to enter into contracts, $47,500,000, to remain available until expended.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for research, development, and service testing, including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; and purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles; $48,725,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Washington National Airport, including purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; $2,400,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

63 Stat. 707.

68 Stat. 1114.

During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 596a), to the extent and in the manner prescribed by said Act; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including newspapers (not to exceed $200), land and structures (not to exceed $81,800), special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed $13,900), services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $10,550,000. 60 Stat. 810.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including not to exceed $375,000 for expenses of travel; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $500 for newspapers; $7,218,000, of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for special counsel and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not exceeding $50 per diem for individuals: *Provided*, That not to exceed $354,200 shall be available for investigations relating to Federal river development projects. 60 Stat. 810.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), not to exceed $700 for newspapers, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed $285,000 for expenses of travel, $6,840,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation. 68 Stat. 1114. 60 Stat. 810.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding $500); rental or lease of office space in foreign countries without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529); and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $41,800,000. 60 Stat. 810.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Operating Expenses, Public Building Service

For necessary expenses of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests

therein; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of August
69 Stat. 722. 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); $151,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available, without regard to section 322 of the Act of
47 Stat. 1517. June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to buildings, or parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appropriation for "Emergency operating expenses".

REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT, FEDERALLY OWNED BUILDINGS

For expenses necessary for the repair, alteration, preservation, renovation, improvement, extension, equipment, and demolition of federally owned buildings and buildings occupied pursuant to the
68 Stat. 518. Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356),
40 USC 356,357. not otherwise provided for, including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto; acquisition of land as authorized by title III of the
63 Stat. 198. Act of June 16, 1949 (40 U.S.C. 297); and care and safeguarding
40 USC 297,297a. of sites acquired for Federal buildings; $60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the Public Buildings Pur-
68 Stat. 518. chase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), $1,675,000: *Provided*,
40 USC 356,357. That authority heretofore granted under this head for the Administrator of General Services to enter into a 10-year contract for the project at Sacramento, California, for which the annual payment for amortization of principal and interest thereon shall not exceed $1,250,600, is hereby extended to December 31, 1959.

SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropri-
72 Stat. 1066. ation Act, 1959, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended, and this amount shall be expended for projects at such additional locations as may be selected by the Administrator of General Services and in amounts he deems necessary.

OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

For necessary expenses of personal property management and related activities as authorized by law and not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $300 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals, $3,770,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,230,000 of any funds received during the current or preceding fiscal year for deposit
63 Stat. 388. under section 204(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative
40 USC 485. Services Act of 1949, as amended, and not otherwise disposed of by law, shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and shall be available for necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the General Services Administration under the said Act, with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus personal property.

EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for operation of the stores depot system and other procurement services, including contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items; and not to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals; $21,450,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law, including contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, $9,176,800.

OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC UTILITIES SERVICE

For necessary expenses of transportation and public utilities management and related activities, as provided by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals, $2,000,000. 60 Stat. 810.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Funds available for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98b), during the current fiscal year, shall be available for transportation and handling, within the United States (including charges at United States ports), storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and critical materials acquired for or transferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), and for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462), relating to machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the General Services Administration is responsible, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed $3,230,000 for operating expenses, but total obligations of funds available for carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act during the current fiscal year shall not exceed $50,000,000: *Provided*, That to the extent materials sold under section 3(d) of said Act to prevent deterioration are excess to stockpile needs the replacement provisions of said section 3(d) shall not be mandatory: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be transferred to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Provided further*, That no part of funds available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage facilities: *Provided further*, That unobligated balances of funds in excess of $50,000,000 as of July 1, 1959, together with any receipts from sales or otherwise, during the fiscal year 1960, are hereby rescinded and shall be promptly deposited into the Treasury.

60 Stat. 596.
50 USC 98 note.
68 Stat. 456.
62 Stat. 1225.
60 Stat. 810.
50 USC 98b.
60 Stat. 598.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For expenses of executive direction for activities under the control of the General Services Administration, including not to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals, $225,000.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), $200,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

3 USC 102 note.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Funds available to General Services Administration for administrative operations, in support of program activities, shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That costs and obligations for such administrative operations for the respective program activities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems approved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount deposited into said account for the fiscal year 1960 from funds made available to General Services Administration in this Act shall not exceed $12,750,000, of which not to exceed $400 may be used for purchase of newspapers and periodicals: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited into said account for administrative operations for each program shall not exceed the amounts included in the respective program appropriations for such purposes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the General Services Administration shall be credited with (1) cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair, and improvement, included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129); (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the General Services Administration, in connection with property transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, be so transferred.

61 Stat. 584.

62 Stat. 1225.
50 USC 451 note.

Not to exceed $2,000,000 granted in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the appropriation for "Construction, Federal Office Building Numbered Six, Washington, District of Columbia", may be transferred to "Construction, Public Buildings projects": *Provided*, That the latter appropriation shall be available for acquisition of buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation or otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts: *Provided further*, That the limits of cost applicable to projects authorized under said appropriation may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected on other projects.

72 Stat. 1067.

Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines except in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

63 Stat. 377.
40 USC 471 note.

Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be thereby increased more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of $2,000,000.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Office of the Administrator

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed $3,000); and purchase of two passenger motor vehicles (including one in the District of Columbia, to remain under the control of the Agency, at a purchase price of not to exceed $3,500) of which one shall be for replacement only; $9,052,000: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of inspections and of providing representatives at the site of projects being planned or undertaken by local public agencies pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and projects and facilities financed by loans to public agencies pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be compensated by such agencies or institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative; and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such institutions, or the Administrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such charges have been made, but such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed $2,900,000.

60 Stat. 810.
63 Stat. 414.
42 USC 1451-1460, 1462.
64 Stat. 77.
12 USC 1749-1749c.
69 Stat. 642.
42 USC 1491-1496.

Urban Planning Grants

For grants in accordance with the provisions of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, $975,000.

68 Stat. 640.
40 USC 461.

Capital Grants for Slum Clearance and Urban Renewal

For an additional amount for payment of capital grants as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), $90,000,000.

63 Stat. 416, 417.

Reserve of Planned Public Works (Payment to Revolving Fund)

For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 462), $6,000,000.

68 Stat. 641.

Public Housing Administration

Annual Contributions

For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410), $120,000,000.

50 Stat. 891.

Administrative Expenses

For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, $12,830,000, to be expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this Act.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including not to exceed $5,000 for the employment of special counsel; services as 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; newspapers (not to exceed $300); and purchase of not to exceed thirty-five passenger motor vehicles of which nineteen shall be for replacement only; $19,650,000, of which not less than $1,529,650 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than $1,054,550 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

60 Stat. 810.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Operation and Maintenance of Properties

For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, $40,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not be effective.

48 Stat. 930.
D.C. Code 5-111.
64 Stat. 81.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as 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; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $350 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $152,773,000, to remain available until expended, of which $1,890,000 shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, for an additional amount to complete the construction of a secondary road to the Optical Astronomy Observatory on Kitt Peak in Arizona: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than $30,250,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers.

64 Stat. 149.
60 Stat. 810.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as 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, $2,850,000.

60 Stat. 810.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $1,125 for the purchase of newspapers; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $8,100,000. 68 Stat. 1114. 60 Stat. 810.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase of ten passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals; not to exceed $61,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and $19,000 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; $29,278,400: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense. 65 Stat. 75. 50 USC app. 451-454, 455-471. 60 Stat. 810. 31 USC 665.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

General Operating Expenses

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; not to exceed $3,500 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed $67,000 for preparation, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures, and other visual education information and descriptive material, including purchase or rental of equipment; $163,373,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of $1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

Medical Administration and Miscellaneous Operating Expenses

For expenses necessary for administration of the medical, hospital, domiciliary, special service, construction and supply, research, and employee education and training activities; expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical research, as authorized by law; not to exceed $1,136,600 for expenses of travel of employees paid from this appropriation, and those engaged in training programs; and not to exceed $2,700 for newspapers and periodicals; $29,349,000, of which $17,344,000 shall be available for medical research: *Provided*, That $1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriations shall remain available until expended for prosthetic testing and development.

INPATIENT CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration as authorized by law, including the furnishing of recreational articles and facilities; maintenance and operation of farms; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; purchase of fifty-two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State or Territorial homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38, United States Code, for the support of veterans eligible for admission to Veterans Administration facilities for hospital or domiciliary care; $792,079,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That $8,400,000 of such sum shall be for deferred maintenance: *Provided further*, That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments, for disbursement by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration: *Provided further*, That the foregoing appropriation is predicated on furnishing inpatient care and treatment to an average of 140,846 beneficiaries during the fiscal year 1960 including members in State or Territorial homes, and if a lesser number is experienced such appropriation shall be expended only in proportion to the average number of beneficiaries furnished such care and treatment.

68 Stat. 1114.

72 Stat. 1146.

OUTPATIENT CARE

For expenses necessary for furnishing outpatient care to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, as authorized by law; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $83,866,000.

68 Stat. 1114.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF SUPPLY DEPOTS

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of supply depots, including purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), $2,218,000.

68 Stat. 1114.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended, $3,300,000,000, to remain available until expended.

72 Stat. 1169.

43 Stat. 125, 128; 72 Stat. 1264, 1271.
38 USC note prec. pt. 1.

Readjustment Benefits

For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, $585,000,000, to remain available until expended.

58 Stat. 284; 72 Stat. 1264, 1271. 38 USC note prec. pt. 1. 72 Stat. 1167, 1174, 1192, 1203, 1215, 1170.

Veterans Insurance and Indemnities

For military and naval insurance, for national service life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-disabled veterans insurance, $53,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That certain premiums provided by law to be credited to the "Military and naval insurance" or "National service life insurance" appropriations shall be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be subject to the same statutory provisions and shall be available for the same purpose as formerly applied to the appropriations for "Military and naval insurance", "National service life insurance", and "Servicemen's indemnities".

Grants to the Republic of the Philippines

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans, $2,000,000.

72 Stat. 1145.

Construction of Hospital and Domiciliary Facilities

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001 and 5002, title 38, United States Code, $31,659,000, to remain available until expended.

72 Stat. 1251, 1252.

Administrative Provisions

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations so augmented, and not to exceed $500,000 of the appropriation "Veterans insurance and indemnities" for the current year may be transferred to "Service-disabled veterans insurance fund".

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

60 Stat. 810.

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for "Inpatient care" and "Outpatient care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under such appropriations.

72 Stat. 1169.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veterans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Travel expenses.

SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System, or to travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Newspaper and periodical purchases.

SEC. 103. Where appropriations in this title are expendable for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed the amount of $50: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of the authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are herein provided, nor to the purchase of newspapers and periodicals necessary for the care and welfare of patients and members in Veterans Administration hospitals and domiciliary facilities.

Positions formerly held by persons entering Armed Forces.

SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service and has within ninety days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

Real estate sales, etc.

SEC. 105. No part of any appropriation made available by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have been approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

Personnel work, restriction.

SEC. 106. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1960 for each such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

61 Stat. 584.
31 USC 849.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Limitation on Administrative and Examination Expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Not to exceed a total of $1,800,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and shall be derived from funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home Loan Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (including payment for office space): *Provided*, That all necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That members and alternates of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421–1449): *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses for the examination of Federal and State chartered institutions (other than special examinations determined by the Board to be necessary) shall not exceed $7,700,000.

68 Stat. 634;
64 Stat. 259.
12 USC 1464, 1730.
47 Stat. 725.
12 USC 1421.
47 Stat. 725.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed $775,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 407 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724–1730).

64 Stat. 259.
12 USC 1730.

48 Stat. 1255.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, ABACA FIBER PROGRAM

Not to exceed $47,000 of funds available to the General Services Administration for the abaca fiber program shall be available for administrative expenses incident to the abaca fiber program, to be computed on an accrual basis, and to be exclusive of the interest paid, depreciation, capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property relating to the abaca fiber program, and expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal services.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION

Not to exceed $20,000 shall be available during the fiscal year 1960 for all administrative expenses of the Corporation (including use of the services and facilities of Federal Reserve banks), to be computed on an accrual basis, and to be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND

Not to exceed $40,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the liquidation of said functions: *Provided*, That as used

71 Stat. 647.
5 USC 133z-15 note.

herein the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to include all salaries and wages, services performed on a contract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the termination of contracts or in the performance of legal services: *Provided further*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the account shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Office of the Administrator, College Housing Loans

Not to exceed $1,723,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis, of carrying out the functions of the Administrator under the program of housing loans to educational institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749–1749d), but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the United States.

64 Stat. 77.

64 Stat. 873.
12 USC 1811 note

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Office of the Administrator, Public Facility Loans

Not to exceed $525,000 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the United States.

69 Stat. 642.
42 USC 1491-1496.

64 Stat. 873.
12 USC 1811 note

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Office of the Administrator, Revolving Fund (Liquidating Programs)

During the current fiscal year not to exceed $653,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government and legal services on a contract or fee basis and of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the United States.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Not to exceed $6,050,000 shall be available for administrative expenses which shall be on an accrual basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said Association or in which it has an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside of the continental United States, expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

For administrative expenses in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed $8,100,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall be available, in accordance with
48 Stat. 1246. the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of Septem-
68 Stat. 1114. ber 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided*, That, except as herein otherwise provided, all expenses and obligations of said Administration shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said Act: *Provided further*, That funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed $1,500); and purchase of periodicals and newspapers (not to exceed $750): *Provided further*, That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of
63 Stat. 905. Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed
12 USC 1702. $48,000,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such expenses by title I of this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the
50 Stat. 888. United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401–1433); purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by
68 Stat. 1114. the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative

expenses, and funds received from such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed $1,500,000.

CORPORATIONS—GENERAL PROVISION

Personnel work, restriction.

SEC. 202. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by, any corporation or agency included in this title shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

Short title.

This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1960".

Approved September 14, 1959.

468-A
37

3

3540E

U.S.D.A.
SEA/TIS
LAW LIBRARY
ROOM 1406 SOUTH
WASHINGTON D.C. 20250