

The original documents are located in Box 11, folder “Foreign Policy Speech - Materials (5)” of the Robert T. Hartmann Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

DATE: 4-15-76

TO: RTH,

FROM: GWEN ANDERSON

INFORMATION _____

ACTION _____

APPROPRIATE _____

HANDLING _____

OTHER _____

COMMENTS:

*quotes marked
regarding
Defense Statements
with pencil.*

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

These are
done

will get \$100. The brigadier general in the Air Force is the man who leads the wing attack. The most important person to lead his squadron is the brigadier, and you are proposing in your amendment to eliminate him altogether.

Mr. FORD. I can say, from personal experience in the Navy, that the man with comparable rank in the Navy did not lead the attacks in the Navy Air Corps. They were aboard ship and that is where they should have been. But still they were getting their 50 percent extra as flight pay for combat flying, which I say is wrong.

Mr. VINSON. The skipper should always be able to do that which he orders someone else to do.

Mr. FORD. But they did not do it. Mr. VINSON. Exactly. But he is qualified to do it, and under this bill under certain conditions he will do it and we compensate him for it.

Mr. FORD. I doubt if on any occasion in the last war did any admiral, vice admiral, or rear admiral ever lead any combat flight, and that is what we were paying them for in World War II. I think that is wrong. I am not familiar with the Air Force, but the rear admirals and other flag officers in the Navy put in their flight time by flying the requisite 4 hours per month in noncombat flying. I do not think they should be compensated an extra 50 percent or even an extra \$100 per month because officers of comparable rank in other branches of the service were doing equally good jobs and were flying just as many hours.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield. Mr. KILDAY. Speaking of generals who are combat aviators, can the gentleman tell me where General Tinker is at the present time?

Mr. FORD. As I said before, I am not fully informed as to the situation in the Air Force, but I can tell you that just as many people in the Ground Forces were flying from one place to another and probably being killed in an equal number of situations.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have one extra minute so I may read him a statement.

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

There was no objection. Mr. VINSON. The statement is as follows:

During World War II over 90 general officers in the Air Forces personally led their forces in combat. Ten were killed.

Mr. FORD. How many generals in the Ground Forces were there, who were flying from one place to another and who were not getting flight pay, who were also killed in flight accidents? I think that is the only way you can compare the situation.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield. Mr. POTTER. Can the gentleman tell the committee how much hazardous-

duty pay the Infantry officers received during the war from the second lieutenants on up?

Mr. FORD. I am quite sure that everyone knows that the Infantry did not receive hazardous-duty pay for their valiant services. I say we ought to compensate the people who fly in combat, but we should not give extra hazardous-duty pay to those flag officers, rear admiral and above, who are simply doing routine flying.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield. Mr. KILDAY. Of course, this bill contains a provision under which in the future all of this hazardous-duty pay can be suspended in time of war. It is discretionary with the President, but he would have the power hereafter to put all branches of the service on the same plane when it came to hazardous pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORD) there were—ayes 28, noes 71.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 40, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment which is on the desk.

The Clerk read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. FURCOLO: On page 19, line 17, after the word "of" strike out "\$100" and insert "\$50."

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take time on this, because it is exactly the same amendment that has just been defeated. The reasoning is exactly the same, the only difference being that in this case it seeks to make it \$50 a month for both officers and enlisted men. The reasoning is exactly the same with regard to both amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 43, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected. The Clerk read as follows:

SPECIAL PAY—DIVING DUTY

SEC. 205. (a) An enlisted person of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay and assigned to the duty of diving shall, in addition to basic pay, be entitled to receive special pay, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, at the rate of not less than \$5 per month and not exceeding \$30 per month.

(b) Members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay and employed as divers in actual salvage or repair operations

in depths of over 90 feet, or in depths of less than 90 feet, when the officer in charge of the salvage or repair operation shall find, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary concerned, that extraordinary hazardous conditions exist, shall, in addition to basic pay, be entitled to receive the sum of \$5 per hour for each hour or fraction thereof while so employed. The amounts authorized to be paid pursuant to this subsection shall, in the case of enlisted persons, be in addition to the amounts authorized pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

(c) No member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive the special pay authorized pursuant to this section in addition to hazardous-duty pay authorized pursuant to section 204 of this act.

(d) The President may, in time of war, suspend the payment of diving duty pay.

SPECIAL PAY—SEA AND FOREIGN DUTY

SEC. 206. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, enlisted persons of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay shall, in addition thereto, while on sea duty or while on duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, be entitled to receive pay at the following monthly rates:

Table with 2 columns: Pay grades and Monthly rates. Grades E-7 to E-1 with rates from \$22.50 to \$8.00.

SPECIAL PAY—REENLISTMENT BONUS

SEC. 207. (a) Members of the uniformed services who enlist under the conditions set forth in subsection (b) of this section within 3 months from the date of their discharge or separation, or within such lesser period of time as the Secretary concerned may determine from time to time, shall be paid a lump sum reenlistment bonus of \$40, \$30, \$160, \$250, or \$330 upon enlistment for a period of 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 years, respectively; and, upon enlistment for an unspecified period of time a lump sum reenlistment bonus of \$360 shall be paid, and, upon the completion of 6 years' enlisted service in such enlistment, for each year thereafter a lump-sum payment of \$60 shall be made, subject to the limitation that the total amount paid shall not exceed \$1,440. No reenlistment bonus shall be paid for more than four enlistments entered into after the effective date of this section: Provided, That the bonus to be paid in the case of a person reenlisting for a period which would extend the length of his active Federal service beyond 30 years shall be computed as if said reenlistment were for the minimum number of years necessary to permit such person to complete 30 years' active Federal service.

(b) For the purpose of payment of the reenlistment bonus authorized by subsection (a) of this section, enlistment in one of the Regular services following (1) compulsory or voluntary active duty in such service, or (2) extended active duty of 1 year or more in a Reserve component of such service, shall be considered a reenlistment.

(c) Enlisted persons of the uniformed services, who, prior to expiration of the period for which they have reenlisted, extend their reenlistment to any one of the longer enlistment periods mentioned in subsection (a) of this section, shall be paid the sum of \$20 for each year of such extension subject to the limitations contained in subsection (a) of this section.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, a member of the uniformed services who reenlists within 3 months after being discharged from the enlistment entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act, or who reenlists within 3 months after being relieved from active service as a commissioned officer or warrant

Copied

Branch of the Government in its report to the Congress—March 1949—between the Federal hospital construction program and Federal aid to non-Federal hospitals, under the Hill-Burton Act, may be ended.

Section 10 adds a new part E to title VI of the Public Health Service Act. Under the provisions of this new part there are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each of the five succeeding fiscal years, not to exceed \$50,000,000 for the maintenance and operation of public and other nonprofit hospitals and for the administration of State plans relating thereto. Funds appropriated pursuant thereto are to be allotted among the several States in the same manner in which funds appropriated under title VI for hospital construction are to be allotted. The States are to give special consideration to needs of hospitals serving rural communities and areas with relatively small financial resources.

The effective date of the act is July 1, 1949.

It was apparent during the hearings on the original bill that everyone agreed upon the objectives of this legislation. The bill was supported by the American Hospital Association, the Catholic Hospital Association, and the Protestant Hospital Association. It was supported by organized medicine, dentistry, and nursing, as well as by all the major farm and labor organizations. Many other groups and persons testified in favor of the bill and our record of experience throughout the Nation as a whole indicates an enthusiastic response from the people in achieving the objectives of the act. In offering amendments to the existing legislation, I am merely advocating that the program be placed on a basis where the achievement of our goal will be made possible during our lifetime. The resources of our country are not so meager that we have to do this basic program on a time schedule which will not give us the hospitals we need until we have great-great-grandchildren.

And let us bear in mind that this program is related to our national defense. If the cities where our hospitals are now concentrated are ever bombed—and I pray that we may never see such a day—we shall be glad that we built these hospitals in our rural areas and maintained them on a sound operating basis.

In summary, let me say that the amendments provide for increased Federal assistance for hospital construction, for meeting the costs of administering the State plans for hospital construction, and for the establishment and support thereafter of State plans for aiding in hospital maintenance and operation, particularly in areas of limited population and limited resources.

The United States is a member of the World Health Organization which seeks "to lift the great and unnecessary burden of human suffering throughout the world and to protect us from invasion of our shores by disease from abroad and to lift the level of world economy through the strengthening of world resources in effective manpower." Can

we do less for our own States, for our own counties, for the people of our own countryside? We all know, as Disraeli said, that "The health of the people is really the foundation upon which all their happiness and all their powers as a state depend."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, during the last month I have had a rather interesting experience because on each and every Monday during this period I have been confronted by one or more of my colleagues who have invariably said they had just returned from a very interesting week end where they enjoyed the privilege of a cruise on board one of the Navy's largest aircraft carriers. They have been rather amazed at the techniques of the Naval Air Arm, and particularly by naval air operations from our aircraft carriers. On each occasion I have listened rather carefully to my colleague's discussion of his trip, but when he was through, I could not help but say that it was my privilege to have served on a combat aircraft carrier for some 2 years in the Pacific with the Third and Fifth Fleets. The comments my colleagues made about the speed with which the Navy launches planes and lands planes interested me particularly, because I know of the far greater problems that the Navy had to face during the war when we were not operating a single carrier. In the war we operated four or five aircraft carriers in a single task group. In the whole task force we had up to 22 aircraft carriers plus supporting ships. We were not operating in broad daylight, and under favorable conditions, but in many cases we operated for 24 hours a day. I am truly sorry that more of our colleagues have not taken advantage of the opportunity to see the Navy Air Force in operation at sea.

During the experiences I had in the Navy in the last war, I had ample opportunity to view at first-hand some of the vulnerability that the Navy air arm is bound to encounter. I say vulnerability, not only from the air, but from underwater craft. It was always a great concern that any one of the ships in our task group or task force would suffer torpedo attack either from aircraft or from submarine. Fortunately those occasions were few.

My comments today are predicated on some of those experiences which I went through for some 2 years at sea with the Navy. With this background I must agree with the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I think he is wholeheartedly in favor of a balanced armed service, and I gather the impression from what he has said that he is in favor of a military program that accentuates air power without discrimination against Navy air power. If that is what he meant, I am in full agreement with him.

Once again may I say for the record that we should and must have a balanced program. If I am wrong, I would like to be corrected, but it appears to me that the Air Force is benefiting to the

extent of approximately \$800,000,000 more than that which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

At the same time it appears, from the comments made here today, that the Navy Air Force has received less consideration to the extent of \$573,000,000. If those facts are true, I am not in thorough agreement with the recommendations of the committee, because I believe in a truly balanced program, a balanced program that accentuates air power without undue or unfair discrimination against Navy air power. While favoring air power, I am not one of those who are swayed by statements made on many occasions during the last war, when the Air Force people, Navy and otherwise, said they won the war, for I can tell you from personal experience that some of the records claimed were not quite as good as they would like to have our people believe. I can tell you of several examples in the various battles of the Philippine Sea when the number of hits we actually got were very, very small, percentage-wise, in relation to the number of planes that we sent out in those two particular instances. I have no sympathy for that kind of performance, none whatsoever; I condemned it then and I will continue to condemn it.

I wish to make a few comments on what I think is a very favorable program of this committee. I wholeheartedly favor the apparent consideration given to the Reserve components of the armed forces. I notice that in the Navy's budget there is a rather substantial sum allocated for the Reserve program. That brings to mind one further question. In my estimation all the services have been somewhat neglectful of the Reserve program in its actual operation. This Congress authorized a program a year ago which implemented the Reserve program, but the services, all three services, have not done a 100-percent job in putting that program into operation. Many of the members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Reserves have not been able, and will not be able, to take full advantage of the opportunities the Eightieth Congress desired. Some weeks ago I introduced a bill which would have set back the anniversary date until July 1, 1949, to give our Reserves an opportunity to take full advantage of the retirement provisions. If we do not change that date we will discriminate unfairly toward a great many of our Reserves who want to get in and make a substantial contribution to our national defense program.

In conclusion, I reemphasize my support of a well-balanced military program, but I wish to accentuate the need for air power. We should not, however, discriminate against the Navy Air Force. Let me remind you again we must give due consideration not only this year but in the future, to an adequate Reserve program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House on Monday for 30 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to vacate the special order granted him for today and to address the House on Tuesday for 10 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6042) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6042, with Mr. KROCH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday it was agreed that further general debate on the bill continue not to exceed 3 hours, 1 hour to be allotted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and 2 hours to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation at the outset to the chairman of our Army panel, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. He has been extremely fair and most constructive during the consideration of this bill in the past 3 months. Also, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] have been most helpful in the consideration of this legislation. We in the minority are grateful. I would be remiss if I failed to praise my competent and conscientious colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

I also feel it essential to say that, in my opinion, the Department of the Army for the past several years has been in good hands. The Secretary of the Army and his civilian associates have done a fine job in the management of that great Department. General Ridgway as Chief of Staff of the Army has been an outstanding leader of men and as a result, in my opinion, the Army is as strong as it has ever been in a peacetime era. Likewise, the Army budget officials, under General Lawton, have been most

helpful and constructive in the manner in which they presented their budget justifications.

As was pointed out yesterday, the Army part of the budget as requested by the President totals \$7,573,930,000 for the fiscal year 1956, which begins July 1, 1955. Our committee, after considerable consideration of this vast amount, decided that the figure for the fiscal year 1956 should be \$7,329,818,000. This would appear to be a reduction of \$244,162,000 in new obligational authority. This figure is somewhat misleading. In reality there is a bookkeeping transaction which involves \$224,626,000.

Our committee for the past 2 years, and again this year, has not gone along with the Bureau of the Budget recommendation in reference to the use of deutschemark equivalents. The Bureau of the Budget has repeatedly recommended that the Congress appropriate certain sums which were to be deposited with the Treasury so that the Treasury in turn could buy deutschemarks for the operation of our Army and other military services in Europe. Our committee has disapproved of that approach. In contrast we have given the military the authority to use the deutschemark equivalent without a comparable deposit of cash in the Federal Treasury.

In reality, therefore, the only reduction in the Army budget is \$20,594,000, a rather small cutback in a budget which totals seven billion and some five hundred millions of dollars. I support the budget as recommended by this committee.

I think we ought to be cognizant of one point that is quite important. It would appear that the Army budget for fiscal year 1956 is slightly over \$7 billion. That is true, as far as new obligational authority is concerned. The Army expenditure figure is more important. Army expenditures for last year, this year, and the forecast for next year are anywhere from \$8.5 billion to \$11 billion. When you compare Army expenditures to new obligational authority, this means that the Army for the last several years, and again for the coming year, will be living off of previously made available obligational authority. The expenditure figure is a more accurate reflection of what the Army is procuring and what the Army will procure in the future.

During the Korean war the Congress made available to the Army huge sums of money for procurement and production of heavy military equipment. This was necessary and desirable. With the termination of the Korean emergency the Army canceled certain contracts and did not let others. The net result is that a substantial amount of unused obligational authority was available to the Army. In fiscal years 1954-55 the Army has been using up this obligational authority for procurement of heavy military equipment.

It is forecast in the President's budget that at the end of fiscal 1956 there will be \$1,658,000,000 still available in this particular appropriation item. The President's budget proposed that the Congress rescind \$500 million of this obligational authority and make it avail-

able to the Department of Defense for other purposes. The President's budget said that we ought to leave \$353 million worth of this obligational authority available for fiscal 1957. It was the consensus of our committee that we should leave a total of \$1,658,000,000 available to the Army in the production and procurement item for fiscal 1957. Therefore, on this item we have gone contrary to the President's budget recommendation. However, I should point out that in the committee report we have informed the Department of the Army officials that unless there is an emergency, which is not foreseen at the present time, that \$1,658,000,000 for production and procurement should not be used during fiscal 1956, but should be reserved for fiscal 1957. I have confidence that the Department of the Army will respect our committee's recommendations. I repeat, however, that the present budget or obligational authority request is not a true reflection of the amount of hardware, military equipment that is being procured for the Army during fiscal 1955 and prospectively for fiscal 1956.

It may be well to point out at this point the unexpended balances which have been in existence and which have been forecast for the Department of the Army.

On June 30, 1954, the Department of the Army had unexpended \$10.6 billion.

On June 30, 1955, 1 year later, it is forecast there will be an unexpended balance of \$12 billion.

On June 30, 1956, it is estimated there will be an unexpended balance of \$9.1 billion.

It might be in order to set forth for the record the unobligated balances which the Army has had and will have on various dates.

On June 30, 1954, the Army had unobligated 7.7 billion.

On June 30, 1955, it is forecast the Army will have unobligated 3.8 billion.

And a year hence, June 30, 1956, the unobligated balance forecast will be 1.7 billion.

I give you these figures to show that the unexpended balances for the Department of the Army for the last 3 years are going down. The unobligated balances are likewise being reduced. This is a creditable reflection on the management of the Department of the Army.

It has been stated in the papers on numerous occasions that because of atomic warfare techniques, the size of the Army must of necessity be increased. Various experts have stated that in this new type of warfare the size of ground forces must of necessity be expanded. I was most anxious to find out the answer to that as best I could during the hearings on this bill. I was particularly interested to find out whether the Army budget as presented for fiscal '56 was based on any strength change resulting from tests conducted on atomic warfare.

On page 107 of the Army hearings, I asked General Ridgway this question:

It is my recollection from the testimony that the Army is now in the process of making certain tests to determine whether that argument is sound or whether no changes are in order.

This referred to changes in ground forces, based on atomic warfare.

Then I continued:

I gather that the argument in favor of more rather than less has not been resolved; is that correct?

And General Ridgway replied as follows:

That is right, sir.

Later on, on the same page, I asked General Ridgway this question:

The net result being that none of that thinking is reflected in any of the figures which have been submitted for fiscal year 1956?

And General Ridgway answered:

That is correct, sir.

Either dollarwise or manpowerwise.

General RIDGWAY. That is correct, sir.

It might well be that, at the conclusion of the various tests and exercises which are now going on, we may have to change the structure of our Army. It may well be that these tests and exercises will show we will have to expand the size of our Army, but as of now and as of the date that this budget was prepared, none of the thinking of the Army in that regard has been firmed up and consequently the problem is not reflected dollarwise or manpowerwise in this Army budget for fiscal '56.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I know the gentleman was a great help on this committee, and he has been most helpful during the consideration of this bill, but on page 107, in the very next sentence of General Ridgway's testimony which the gentleman read, there is also this:

Both are substantially smaller than our present counterparts, and we propose to reach our conclusions sometime this summer or early fall.

So, while what the gentleman said was true, the experiments are going on, and the fact is that it will be this summer or this fall that the conclusion will be reached.

Mr. FORD. I might say to the gentleman that we further explored this problem when the Army training people under General Adams were before us. It is in the record, I do not have the precise citation, that the Army will not conclude any of its exercises, nor will it make its final recommendation until January or possibly until after the first of the year 1956. That is on the record and is part of the hearings.

If you will refer to one other statement on page 108, you will see there that I asked General Ridgway this question:

Mr. FORD. Until we get the results of these field tests, which I presume are now being conducted by the Army, which you expect to finalize sometime in the fall of 1955, it is not fair to relate the arguments pro and con to the fiscal year 1956 budget?

I also quote General Ridgway's answer:

I think that is right, sir.

So, as far as this budget that we are now considering is concerned, it has no relationship to any field test or exercise

the Army is now conducting; in reference to future atomic warfare.

I would like to bring up at this point some of the problems which we today will have to face if the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) offers one of his amendments. I understand he intends to offer an amendment to the Department of the Army budget which would call for an increase of \$249,574,000. It is my further understanding that he is predicating this increase of approximately \$250 million on an increase of about 89,000 in Army ground strength.

I think we ought to know that all through the hearings the Army repeatedly stated that it costs \$5,500 to maintain a single soldier for a year. Three thousand two hundred dollars are required for the military pay part of this annual cost and \$2,300 for what we call maintenance and operation, making a total of \$5,500. If this figure is accurate, and that is the figure you can find in numerous places in the hearings, I think we ought to understand the mathematics of the gentleman's proposed amendment.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has indicated that he intends to make available to the Army 89,000 more men in the fiscal year 1956. If you will multiply 89,000 by \$5,500, if my figuring is correct, the total amount is \$489,500,000, rather than the figure of \$249,574,000.

Also, if my mathematics are correct, dividing \$5,500 into \$249 million means that what the gentleman from Pennsylvania intends is to increase the size of the Army by 45,000-plus individuals in the year 1956 rather than the budget strength figure as proposed by General Ridgway.

There is one other matter that I think deserves consideration. It was stated in the newspapers earlier in the calendar year 1955 on numerous occasions that the Soviet military budget had been increased, I believe, by some 12 percent. I have in my hand a copy of the Washington Star for Sunday, February 13, 1955, and I ask you to look at the headlines. It reads: "Red Budget Is Deceptive—A 12-Percent Rise Is Not Necessarily So."

And let me point out, if I may, some of the statements which are made in the article to substantiate the headlines. The author of the article is Mr. Richard Fryklund, who writes:

The 12-percent increase in the Soviet military budget reported when the early figures became available, probably is only a change in bookkeeping.

He goes on to say, and I quote again:

The secret category, however, was significantly smaller; the unaccounted for expenditures had dropped 22 billion rubles, and the cuts came in the portion that was military in nature.

In other words, we do not know whether the Soviet has increased their military budget. At least, some analysts say that is not so. I have just illustrated that there are those who have studied Soviet military budgets in the past are convinced, as I read this article, that the Soviet military budget has not been increased for the current fiscal year.

There has been some comment from time to time in the press that General Ridgway had no opportunity to express

his views to the President, the National Security Council, and others in authority. I refer to General Ridgway's views about the reduction of some 77,000 in the Army strength for fiscal 1956. This disturbed me. Consequently I was most anxious to find out whether General Ridgway's views were indicated to the proper authorities, including the President. On page 111 of the hearings you will find several questions by me trying to pinpoint whether or not General Ridgway's views were made known to proper authorities at the proper time. General Ridgway said:

My clear impression is, sir, that my views as Chief of Staff were known both before and after.

I had previously asked him whether his views had been known before the decision and whether his views had been known subsequent to the decision to make this reduction in the Department of the Army.

If I may, I would like to point out some things that may or may not in the mind of each of you justify the change in the size of the Army for fiscal 1956. It is a very serious decision for each Member to determine whether we should or should not decrease the size of the Army. During the long and comprehensive hearings I tried to approach the problem with an open mind and sought on every occasion to get the facts to justify or not justify the reduction in strength.

It seems to me we ought to realize these facts at the outset: As of July 1, 1955, it was originally forecast that the size of the Army would be 1,100,000. That figure has been revised so that the Army now has 2 more months in fiscal 1956 to get down to that figure. It was forecast in the President's budget for fiscal 1956 that the Army end strength for fiscal 1956 would be 1,025,000 plus 2,400 cadets at West Point. In other words, a year from now, if this budget is approved, the Army will have on July 1, 1956, 1,025,000 on active duty. Compare that, if you will, with the figure of 590,000 which the Army had on active duty as of a date just prior to the Korean war. In other words, the Army on June 30, 1956, will be almost twice as large as it was just prior to the Korean conflict.

There are 4 or 5 important facts that should be set forth so that all of us may honestly make up our own minds on what we should do on this important question. The proper utilization of manpower in the military is vital. Has the Army utilized its manpower effectively? The answer, frankly, is in the record. In the last year or so the Army has done a very commendable job in the effective use of its manpower. Certainly the situation has improved.

In 1952 a very competent and highly thought of committee of the other body prepared a report under the chairmanship of the now distinguished majority leader in that body. I have in my hands a copy of a report on the utilization of manpower by the Armed Forces. The chairman of the committee which issued the report on July 7, 1952, is the distinguished majority leader in the other body. This committee consisted of a

very outstanding group of Members, Senators from the States of Tennessee, Wyoming, Mississippi, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Oregon. It was a very competent group. I would like to read to you what they said in this report. What they said then about efficient military manpower utilization is applicable today. On page 2 the report says:

It has been demonstrated time and again throughout history that sheer numbers are no index of either efficiency or effectiveness.

Then this report also says on page 3:

In the field of manpower, however, our studies have produced a totally different result. Here we have found a high degree of waste—inexcusable waste—and an unconscionable amount of inefficiency. There is no reason why this waste cannot be removed to the benefit both of our defenses and our economic health.

Then it goes on to say, and this is quite interesting, on page 7:

The old Army game of using 5 men to do the work of 1 does not appear to have been discarded when the Air Force divorced the Army.

This was a good report and was very applicable and apropos in 1952. I am proud to say that I think our Army in the past 2 years has followed the advice in this report. I commend the authors of the report and the Army for taking advantage of their recommendations.

What has the Army done about efficient manpower use? The answer is on the record and it is a good record. If you will turn to page 240 of the hearings, you will find a series of questions by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] wanted information about the ratio of combat personnel to total personnel. If you will look at these figures, they are most enlightening. That table submitted by the Army shows that in 1953 the Army had 1,533,815 men on active duty. They had, out of that number, about one-third of their personnel in combat status, our total of 567,343. There noncombat personnel was as follows: 966,472. In other words, they had almost two men who were noncombat for every man that was in a combat status.

Now look at the improvement, and this is significant. In 1956, out of a total strength of 1,025,000, they will have in the combat forces 501,792. They expect to have in the noncombat forces of the Army 523,208. Just about even; almost 1 for 1. That is excellent progress. The Army has followed the suggestions of this distinguished group of men from the other body, and I commend them for it.

The actual change in 3 years is as follows: In noncombat forces the Army has gone from 966,472 to 523,208, a reduction of 443,000 plus. In the combat forces the reduction in 3 years has been 65,551. I remind you that the combat figure of 567,343 was at the height of the Korean war. Since the height of the Korean war we will have only gone down 65,551 in Army combat forces in a 3-year period. During that period the United States went from war to peace. Yes, the Army has done a good job, and

I commend them for it. What they have done is cut away the fat and beefed up, in effect, their relationship of combat forces to total forces.

Let us turn to another problem that is set out on page 250 of the hearings. All during the hearings we heard repeated statements by responsible authorities in the Department of the Army that they were weeding out administrative and like jobs. If the Members will turn to page 260, they will see questions recorded there by me that I asked General Young, who is head of military personnel for the Army. I asked him to pinpoint some of these reductions. In the questions and answers on page 260 you will find that in the fiscal year 1954 and I think fiscal 1955 the Army in two areas reduced 36,000 noncombat jobs. That is a commendable record. After getting these questions and answers on the record, I asked General Young this:

During this period there has been no adverse reflection whatever on the military or combat efficiency of the Army?

The question was asked because he had said they had reduced the need for 36,000 soldiers in the Army. General Young replied:

That is right. I might add that in these manpower surveys, and the study of tables of distribution, we have made considerable progress.

In another part of his testimony, General Young, in reference to a personnel problem, had some comments on reenlistment rates. This Congress in the last session passed legislation to increase reenlistment bonuses. The Congress thought if we could keep career people in the service, the Army would have a lesser training load, and consequently a more effective combat army. During the past several years, the Army was taking in anywhere from 400,000 to 600,000 raw recruits each year. And let me assure you that is expensive in dollars and manpower. It is an expensive luxury, because every time you take in four men as raw recruits, you have to assign, to train them, an average of one experienced soldier. If we can cut down this burdensome training load, we can cut our costs and get a more effective combat army. This reenlistment bonus is aimed at that objective. We have had surprising results in that regard.

On page 256 of the hearings we see this situation. I asked this question:

In other words, by the upsurge in your reenlistments, at least during fiscal year 1955, on the basis of those figures you will save \$75 million approximately?

General Young. That would be one way of expressing it. In addition, Mr. Ford, we feel our combat effectiveness has been greatly improved.

Let us turn to the testimony as shown on page 257. General Young is still the witness. He says:

That is right; yes, sir. You might almost put it this way, Mr. Ford, that because of this favorable trend—which we cannot say for sure will continue but we certainly hope it will—we possibly have achieved almost the equal of the strength of another division which we would not otherwise have accomplished.

By the simple process of paying career people more to stay in the service, in a 6-month period we had 25,000 more men stay on, which, according to General Young's testimony, is equivalent to another Army division.

Yes, I emphasize the Army has done a good job. They have cut down the fat, they have beefed up the relative position of the combat forces. We are now having a lesser training load, which means more soldiers can be in combat status.

There is another factor that ought to be considered here. What is the effect of new and better equipment? It does have a relationship to the size of your Army.

During the hearings, the chairman had before us probably one of the foremost authorities in the Department of Defense on the problem of Army planning. I refer to Major General Gavin, Assistant Chief of Staff for G-3. If you will turn to General Gavin's testimony on page 718, you will find what factors, equipmentwise, he considers to be important. The testimony indicates that in his opinion equipmentwise there are three important factors. One is firepower, the second is mobility, and the third is communications.

What does he say about our position on each score? If you will turn to page 720, you will find questions by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] and answers by General Gavin.

Mr. RILEY. General, could you give me an estimate percentagewise of the increase in firepower in the Infantry in the last 10 years?

General GAVIN. I would say in the last 10 years, about 80 percent.

Mr. RILEY. Would the same thing apply to the mobility, or would that not be quite as great?

General GAVIN. It has been considerable.

Then he goes on and discusses other aspects of it. Further:

Mr. RILEY. And in the next 5 years if your present plans mature, the mobility would be increased considerably over the last 10 years?

General GAVIN. Yes, sir; I would say so. We will make much more progress in the next 5 years than we made in the last 10 years.

Later Mr. RILEY got into the question of communications and asked this question:

Mr. RILEY. Would that same estimate apply in the communications field, or would it not be quite so great in that field?

General GAVIN. I had not thought of it this way, but per pound of weight carried, we can probably communicate twice as far. What I am trying to say, if you double the weight you can probably get twice the range.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a man in the Department of the Army who is better qualified to discuss these three important factors, firepower, communications, and mobility.

If you will look at his testimony, you will find we have made tremendous technical progress in the last 10 years, and you will see on the record and I can assure you off the record, that the progress we have made is small compared to what

we will make in the months and years ahead.

Let us turn to another aspect of why or why not we should reduce the Army strength figures. I believe the strength of our Reserve forces is an essential factor in this overall problem. I believe all military people, certainly in the Army, concur in that observation.

Here are some figures which are important: In the Army Reserve on June 30, 1953, we had 117,000 men. On June 30, 1956, the Army Reserve expects to have 219,000. In other words, in a 3-year period the Army Reserve strength will go up 102,000.

Let us examine the National Guard figures for the same period. The Guard is an integral and important part of our national defense picture. On June 30, 1953, which was during the Korean war, the National Guard had 265,000 men in their various units. On June 30, 1956, it is estimated the National Guard will have a total of 425,000. In other words, an increase in the 3-year period of 169,000. So in a 3-year period your Reserve forces in the Army will increase 271,000, a substantial bulwarking and bolstering of our active duty Army forces.

The question has been asked, Does this Reserve Manpower Act, which the gentleman from Georgia is bringing up next week, have any bearing on the cut in the Army budget? Frankly, at the beginning, I felt it might have a bearing. However, you will find in our committee hearings testimony to the effect that it has little, if any, effect on the fiscal 1956 manpower strength or dollar figures. So whether the Congress passes or does not pass this legislation during this session, will have little, if any, impact on the budget or the strength figures for the Department of the Army in fiscal 1956.

I call your attention to the testimony of General Ridgway in reference to the effectiveness of our Reserve forces. If you will turn to page 104 of the hearings you will see I was questioning General Ridgway about the importance of our Reserve forces and their effectiveness. Here are the answers to the questions.

General Ridgway is saying:

We think, sir, there is a steady though slow increase in the efficiency of training in the guard. I believe the same would be true, though probably to a slightly lesser degree in the Reserve due to such low strengths of the participating units.

General Milburn, who is in charge of the Reserve program, concurred on the record.

Then I asked this question:

In other words, we can assume that aside from the number increase, there is increased effectiveness of both the Guard and the Reserve?

General MILBURN. Yes, sir.

Then General Ridgway said:

I think also, sir, there has been a steady, although again modest, increase in the training level due to our continuing efforts to get quality in our officer corps in these two civilian components.

Yes, we have not only increased the number, but we have increased the efficiency of the National Guard and the Army Reserve forces, and this does help

to justify the slight reduction in active-duty forces.

We have a number of allies in this world who are as dedicated as we are to the defense of the free world against communism. I am glad we have them. Right after World War II it became our policy to help them militarily and economically. Frankly, right now we are beginning to get some results.

Let me point out that several days ago Adm. Arthur W. Radford told a committee in the other body, "The military-aid program is part and parcel of the United States defense program."

As you probably know in the foreign-aid budget for fiscal 1956, the President has requested \$1,700,000,000 to help our allies by providing equipment so that they could join us in this fight for freedom against communism. Do you realize how much we have paid in foreign military aid—not economic aid—in the past 5 years? Assistant Secretary of Defense H. Struve Hensel testified before the same committee of the other body just a couple of days ago and said that Uncle Sam has paid \$11 billion to build up the military strength of our allies.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-six Members are present; not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 61]

Anfuso	Gamble	Preston
Avery	Gordon	Reece, Tenn.
Barden	Granahan	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton,	Green, Pa.	Riehlman
Oliver P.	Gubser	Roberts
Buckley	Heslton	Roosevelt
Burdick	Hinshaw	Short
Canfield	Jackson	Sieminski
Celler	Keating	Smith, Miss.
Chatham	McConnell	Smith, Wis.
Christopher	Morrison	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	Mumma	Tumulty
Dawson, Ill.	Norblad	Wickersham
Diggs	Norrell	Young
Dingell	O'Brien, N. Y.	Zelenko
Dorn, S. C.	Pilcher	
Eberharter	Powell	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6042, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 381 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal. The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, at the time of the quorum call, I was discussing the interrelationship of the military-aid program and our own military budget. I indicated that Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, several days ago, in testifying before a committee of the other body, had said:

The military-aid program is part and parcel of the United States Defense Department program.

The headline of this newspaper article says: "Radford Says Aid Cuts Size of United States Forces."

I had just brought out at that time that Assistant Secretary of Defense H. Struve Hensel had told a committee in the other body that in the last 5 years Uncle Sam had contributed \$11 billion in military aid for our allies.

Included in the foreign-aid budget for fiscal 1956 is another \$1,700,000,000 for military aid and assistance to our allies who are joined with us in this effort to stop communism over the world.

How have we as a nation benefited from this \$11 billion expenditure? We now have in being 20 South Korean divisions, plus 1 marine regiment, and certain ROK reserve forces. The money we have spent in South Korea has been vast, but definite results have accrued. For example, General Ridgway testified in the hearings that when he was there he had only 10 South Korean divisions, and they were poorly trained and not entirely adequate. Our funds and equipment have doubled the size and effectiveness of the ROKs. In turn, we can revise our own forces.

So we spend money for our allies but we have gotten results. We have gotten good, strong foot soldiers who can do the job in the far corners of the earth better than ours, giving us as a Nation responsibility to use our talents in the air and on the sea where we are best equipped and best qualified.

We do not have them now, but we will in a relatively short time, maybe a year, a year and a half, or two years, have 12 crack German Army divisions. We expect to have in the not too far distant future a total German Army, Navy, and Air Force of some 500,000. Uncle Sam has already provided most of the equipment for this potentially powerful German military machine.

In addition, we expect to have in being, and I think the record can probably show, at least the newspapers have indicated, substantial Japanese ground forces. We expect to have between 10 and 12 divisions by taking those fine soldiers in Japan, ground soldiers, and adding them to the free world forces. It permits us as a Nation to concentrate our efforts in the air and on the sea.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. Will my friend tell us when we expect to have 10 or 12 divisions of Japanese troops? I am afraid he is going to find that is as far distant as the German forces which, by General G. Lenthers's statement, are about 4 years in the future. I said yesterday 2 to 4, putting the best figure I could on it. My dear friend knows I have the highest regard for him, and I am not trying to disrupt his statement, but I believe his statement of 10 to 12 divisions is an optimistic one, certainly if he means at any near time.

Mr. FORD. I would say to the distinguished chairman of my committee that whether we call the 110,000 Japanese police force divisions or a police force,

they are a decided improvement over the days following World War II, when the Japanese Army was completely disbanded. I am not saying that the Japanese Army has today or will have in 6 months 10 to 12 divisions, but they have around 110,000 of what they call a Japanese police force, which I think could do a pretty creditable job. They are easily transferable to strong, effective army units.

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

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I came in a little late and have not heard all of the very fine presentation the gentleman from Michigan is making. I am just wondering whether the gentleman has pointed out the fact that the completion of the Austrian Treaty will relieve 15,000 American soldiers who can be used elsewhere and brought back home.

I also wonder whether the gentleman has called to the attention of the House a statement made by General Ridgway, which will be found on the bottom of page 81 of the Department of the Army hearings, in which, discussing the increased manpower and firepower of World War II divisions, he said:

We could beef up the firepower on a percentage basis of our divisions 500 percent or maybe 10,000 percent, by putting a few of these atomic weapons in the division. They are not in the division today, as you know, sir.

Mr. FORD. I appreciate the very constructive and most helpful comments of the gentleman from Kansas. That is important information which, I think, the House should know because it does involve whether or not we should approve the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood]. I think we ought to remember that over the past 5 years, we, as a Nation, have spent over \$11 billion in foreign military aid plus sizable amounts of foreign economic aid and assistance. It was predicated and based on the theory, and I hope the practice, that as our friends and allies around the world beefed up and bolstered their military strength in areas and in fields where they can do the best job—on the ground—we, as a Nation, could concentrate our forces in the skies and on the waters. That is what this budget is based on today. It accentuates our air power. It accentuates continental defense program for protection of our own people.

Yes; I think the issues will be clearly drawn later this afternoon. The gentleman from Pennsylvania intends to offer an amendment adding \$249 million for the Army which, according to my mathematical calculations, would put on active duty approximately 44,000 or 45,000 more men in the Army. If that figure is correct the strength will not be up to what some people in the Department of the Army feel is necessary. If you put it up to the figure which General Ridgway, I believe, thinks is necessary, you will have to add to the present budget \$499 million in 1

year and not \$259 million. If you approve the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, you must realize that the draft call by the Selective Service will go up so far as the monthly requirements are concerned from 10,000 to anywhere between 15,000 and 20,000. Yes; are you going to increase the call of the draft in order to increase the size of the Army when the President of the United States, probably, the greatest military expert we have in the world today, when Admiral Arthur Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when Admiral Carney, of the Navy, when General Shepard, Commandant of the Marines, and General Twining, of the Air Force, are all on record endorsing this budget? It is a serious responsibility for each and every one of us but I say you have to weigh on the scales the extra cost of some \$250 million to \$480 million plus a doubling of your selective-service call against the military and civilian judgment of the men I have mentioned, the President, and the various members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, permit me at the outset, as a member of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], who has presided over our work and our deliberations during the past year. He has been eminently fair and he commands the deep respect of each and every member of the committee, not only for the method and manner in which he handles the affairs of this important committee, but for his many courtesies and his consideration of the other members. May I also pay tribute to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], who is the ranking Republican member with whom I have served on the Navy panel during the past 3 or 4 years. I should also like to pay tribute, Mr. Chairman, to the distinguished chairman of the Navy panel, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] has a long and distinguished career as a member of this committee, particularly his devotion, his applied knowledge, and his application to the problems dealing with our Navy. I am sure I need not tell the Members of this House of the tremendous responsibilities that go with the work of this important subcommittee. Hearings, as you well know, begin early in the year and last anywhere from 4 to 5 months, hearings dealing with the vast operations involving our Military Establishment.

Mr. Chairman, this is concededly a difficult period for military planning. We must have enough military might to protect ourselves against aggression, yet not so much that it will topple our economy. We must make maximum use of the terrible destructive power of nuclear weap-

ons, while conserving what is indispensable in our traditional forces and concepts. We must be ready for massive retaliation in the event of attack, while enabling a maximum number of our people to enjoy the blessings of peaceful pursuits. And always, we must bear in mind that our ultimate objective is not war but peace. Thus, it is a period of transition in military planning, and subject to all of the stresses and strains, difficulties and misunderstandings that such a period entails.

In considering the bill before us, it is imperative to bear in mind the concepts of military planning enunciated by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson. Let me repeat them here. Very briefly, he said in part:

The forces envisaged in this long-range program of the Department of Defense constitute by far the largest Military Establishment that this country has ever undertaken to maintain for an indefinite period of time. With the incorporation into our Military Establishment of the new weapons that we have developed, they constitute a force of tremendous striking power. We believe that this program developed over many months represents the general order of magnitude of the size forces that the country can effectively maintain, can improve, on a qualitative basis, and that the economy of the country can continue to support.

Mr. Chairman, within that framework, then the Committee's recommendations envision new spending authority for the coming fiscal year of \$31.4 billion. This amount, together with obligated and unobligated balances, will provide the Department with total funds available for expenditure in the coming year of \$74.6 billion.

The committee has become increasingly concerned with the size of the carryover funds, which now measurably exceed the annual appropriations. They are, in part, the result of the transitional planning to which I referred earlier, but they also reflect the tendency on the part of the Department, to ask for more than it needs, and to squirrel away what it cannot immediately use. To the extent that the carryover cover financing of long-lead items or are essential to the maintenance of industrial-type activities, they are, of course, essential. But the committee believes they have grown far beyond that point, and should be reduced.

It was brought to the committee's attention, for example, that the Department last December transferred to its stock and industrial funds over a billion dollars in unexpended moneys, although it had foreseeable need for only a limited part of that money. The committee has therefore provided that further transfers of currently available funds be made only with its approval, and that future justifications contain adequate explanation of all proposed plans and programs of stock and industrial operations. In addition, it has ordered recission of \$1,649,000,000 in working capital funds. This represents cash sequestered by the Department in excess of needs for activities operated on revolving fund principles.

It should be pointed out that the greatest opportunities for economies in

from a date earlier than the date of the approval of the report of the board in accordance with whose recommendations his running mate was so reassigned."

(c) Deleting the proviso to paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of section 311 and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That a staff officer with the same date of rank as his line running mate shall take precedence ahead of all line and staff officers junior to his line running mate: And provided further, That, except as otherwise provided herein, officers serving in the same grade and having the same date of rank in that grade shall take precedence in the following order: (a) Line officers, (b) medical officers, (c) supply officers, (d) chaplains, (e) civil engineers, (f) dental officers, (g) officers of the Medical Service Corps, and (h) officers of the Nurse Corps."

(d) Amending paragraph (5) of subsection (d) of section 311 to read as follows:

"(5) An officer of a staff corps of the Naval Reserve assigned to active duty subsequent to the date of establishment of the lineal list of line officers as prescribed by subsection 304 (a) of this title, shall, upon assignment to active duty and upon appointment to adjust his precedence as provided in subsection 304 (o) of this title, be assigned as his running mate by the Secretary of the Navy a line officer of the same grade and appropriate to this adjusted precedence."

(e) Adding to section 316 the following new subsection:

"(o) Each officer on the active list of the line of the Navy designated for engineering duty or aeronautical engineering duty who, on August 7, 1947, was serving in the grade of captain with date of rank prior to June 21, 1942, and who, subsequent to August 7, 1947, has been or may be temporarily promoted to the grade of rear admiral shall, if in the grade of rear admiral or upon promotion thereto, as the case may be, have lineal rank among all line officers of the grade of rear admiral corresponding to the relative lineal rank of all such officers while serving in the grade of captain: *Provided*, That if the assignment of such lineal rank would result in giving any such officer a lineal position senior to that of another rear admiral of the same category promoted earlier to that grade such first-mentioned officer shall have lineal position next after the junior rear admiral of the same category who attained that grade as the result of such earlier promotion: *Provided further*, That in the assignment of lineal rank as herein provided there shall be disregarded any officer who, on August 7, 1947, was serving in the grade of rear admiral or captain under a temporary appointment of limited duration."

(f) Deleting in subsection (c) of section 404 the words "service in the Navy" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "naval service, exclusive of active duty for training in a reserve component"; deleting in the first sentence of subsection (h) of the said section the words "For 2 years after the date of approval of this act" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "During the period that title III of this act remains in effect"; and deleting in the second sentence of subsection (h) of the said section the words "shall have completed service in the Navy" and substituting in lieu thereof the words "shall have been selected therefor prior to August 7, 1949, and shall have completed active naval service, exclusive of active duty for training in a Reserve component."

Sec. 2. All commissioned officers of the active list of the United States Navy on active duty on the effective date of this act, who on that date or within 1 year thereafter are designated for special duty in accordance with the provisions of section 401 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, shall be credited for purposes of adjustment of lineal position, eligibility for selection for promotion, eligibility for promotion, eligibility for continuation on the active list and

in respect to separation from the active list, pursuant to the provisions of that act but not pay or retired pay, with a period of active service equal to the time spent in attendance at a professional school, or in graduate study at a college or university, in the attainment of education which is a requirement or an alternative requirement of the United States Navy for qualification for designation for the performance of the special duty for which the officer is designated: *Provided*, That the maximum period of active service so credited shall be three calendar years, and shall not include any time spent in attendance at such professional school or in graduate study at such college or university while serving on active duty: *Provided further*, That no such period of active service shall be credited to those of such officers who, although required to hold a graduate degree, were originally and permanently appointed and commissioned in the line of the Regular Navy in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) as officers designated for special duty, pursuant to section 408 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended: *Provided further*, That no officer who attended the United States Naval Academy shall be advanced, pursuant to this act, to a lineal position senior to any member of his class who was as such senior to him and has not lost numbers or precedence.

Sec. 3. As used in this act, the term "time spent in attendance at a professional school, or in graduate study at a college or university" shall, for the purpose of establishing the active service credit authorized by this act, be computed as follows: (1) Full-time, regular-session attendance at a college, university, or professional school for one academic year, exclusive of summer or extra sessions, shall be considered one calendar year; (2) full-time, regular-session attendance at a college, university, or professional school for a fraction of an academic year, exclusive of summer or extra sessions, resulting in the completion of the units of study undertaken during that period, shall be considered to be an identical fraction of a calendar year; and (3) part-time attendance at a college, university, or professional school, or attendance at summer sessions or other extra sessions, shall first be converted into an equivalent fraction of an academic year of full-time, regular-session attendance, and shall be considered to be an identical fraction of a calendar year: *Provided*, That, subject to the limitation contained in section 2 hereof, every officer entitled to the benefits of sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act who holds a professional or graduate degree, with the exception of an honorary degree, from a professional school or a college or university, which degree is acquired through attendance at a professional school or in graduate study at a college or university for a period of at least three academic years, and which degree is a requirement or an alternative requirement of the United States Navy for qualification for service in the special-duty-only classification for which the officer is designated, shall be credited with the maximum period of three calendar years of active service without regard to the actual time elapsed between matriculation and qualification for the professional or graduate degree held.

Sec. 4. The lineal position of each officer described in section 2 of this act shall be adjusted by advancing such officer on the lineal list established pursuant to section 304 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, in accordance with his active service credit determined pursuant to sections 2 and 3 of this act. If such adjustment would advance any such officer to a grade higher than the grade in which he is serving under a permanent or temporary appointment on the effective date of this act, he shall be assigned a position on the lineal list senior to the line officer in his grade not restricted in the performance of duty who was the junior

officer in the promotion zone last established for his grade and, when selected for promotion to the next higher grade, shall upon promotion be advanced to the position on the lineal list commensurate with his active-service credit: *Provided further*, That officers described in section 2 of this act below the grade of captain whose names appear on a promotion list on the effective date of this act, if not then eligible for temporary promotion to the next higher grade under other provisions of law, shall become so eligible on that date.

Sec. 5. As soon as practicable after each officer described in section 2 of this act has been advanced on the lineal list pursuant to section 4 of this act, the Secretary of the Navy shall appoint and convene selection boards pursuant to the provisions of title III of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, to consider for temporary promotion to the next higher grade all eligible officers designated for special duty pursuant to section 401 of that act. The promotion zone for each grade shall consist of those officers who have been advanced pursuant to section 4 of this act, to a lineal position in such grade senior to the line officer of that grade not restricted in the performance of duty who was the junior officer in the promotion zone last established for that grade. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all officers recommended for temporary promotion in the approved report of a selection board, appointed and convened as herein provided, shall be eligible for temporary promotion to the next higher grade on the date of approval of such report. Upon promotion to a higher grade and advancement on the lineal list pursuant to section 4 of this act, each such officer shall be deemed to have as much service in grade as the line officer not restricted in the performance of duty who has not lost numbers or precedence and who is next junior to such officer on the lineal list.

Sec. 6. The Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe all necessary and proper regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of this act, for the computation and crediting of the active-service credit provided by this act to the officers entitled thereto, and for their appropriate advancement on the lineal list of officers established pursuant to section 304 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 21, strike out "a" and insert "the next".

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 1452 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1639) to amend section 1452, Revised Statutes, relating to Presidential action on the proceedings and decisions of Navy retiring boards.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1452 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows: "A record of the proceedings and decision of the board in each case shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Navy for his approval or disapproval, or orders in the case."

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

AMENDING RESERVE RETIREMENT PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAW 810, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5508) to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I find that this report does not comply with the Ramseyer rule. Will a member of the committee explain this?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this is most important legislation and it should be passed as quickly as possible. It is legislation that is vitally important for the benefit of the Reserve military program and if objection can be waived I hope it will be. Early this year I introduced H. R. 3039 which is practically identical with the bill under consideration. The Military Establishment has recommended H. R. 3039 with minor amendments. The Clemente bill takes H. R. 3039 with the amendments. Because we are all only interested in making the Military Establishment the very best it is immaterial to me whether I am known as the author of this important legislation. Any delay, for purely technical reasons, would be ill-advised. The reservists need this legislation. The country needs this legislation. I hope favorable action will be taken.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I ask the chairman of the committee if he can assure us there will be an amended report complying with the Ramseyer rule?

Mr. VINSON. We will file a report to comply with the Ramseyer rule, but if it is waived I cannot see any need for it except merely to have a record of it. A similar bill was introduced by the distinguished gentleman to your right and this is, as he says, a very important bill. I hope the gentleman will not insist on his objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is this identical with the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford]?

Mr. VINSON. It is.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Why did not the committee report the bill out under his name?

Mr. VINSON. A member of the committee some time later on introduced a bill, and in deference and courtesy to the member of the committee we reported the committee member's bill.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF A BRIDGE ACROSS THE RIO GRANDE AT OR NEAR RIO GRANDE CITY, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4022) to extend the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., to July 31, 1950.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for commencing the construction of a toll bridge

across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex., authorized to be built by Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives and assigns, by an act of Congress, approved July 31, 1948, is hereby extended until July 31, 1950. Construction of such bridge shall be commenced on or before such date and shall be prosecuted with reasonable diligence until same is completed.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby reserved.

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.

ADJUSTMENT OF IRRIGATION CHARGES ON THE FLATHEAD INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4986) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1948.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the adjustment of irrigation charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1948, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Unpaid charges for operation and maintenance of the irrigation system which were assessed prior to May 10, 1926, against any lands within the project, amounting to a sum not exceeding \$40,549.89, together with all unpaid interest and penalties on such charges, and unpaid charges due from consumers for electric energy sold through the power system between July 1, 1931, and June 30, 1942, amounting to a sum not exceeding \$2,195.16, are hereby canceled."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 6, insert "together with interest thereon."

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, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COURTS TO REMIT OR MITIGATE FORFEITURES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4762) to amend title 25, section 247, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America, to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 25, section 247, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America (39 Stat. 970, sec. 1, March 2, 1917), is amended by striking out therefrom the final period and substituting therefor a colon and adding immediately thereafter the following words: "Provided, however, That the court shall have jurisdiction to remit or mitigate the forfeiture of any such automobiles, vehicles, or conveyances, if decreed, in favor of any claimant, if it finds that such forfeiture was incurred without willful negligence or without any intention on the part of such claimant to violate the law, or finds the existence of such mitigating circumstances as to justify the remission or mitigation of such forfeiture, upon such terms and conditions as the court deems reasonable and just. The court shall order delivery of any such automobiles, vehicles, or

conveyances to any claimant who shall establish his right to the immediate possession thereof, and shall execute, with one or more sureties approved by the court, and deliver to the court, a bond to the United States for the payment of a sum equal to the appraised value of any such automobiles, vehicles, or conveyances. Such bond shall be conditioned to return any such automobiles, vehicles, or conveyances at the time of the trial and to pay the difference between the appraised value of any such automobiles, vehicles, or conveyances as of the time they shall have been so released on bond and the appraised value thereof as of the time of trial; and conditioned further that, if any such automobiles, vehicles, or conveyances be not returned at the time of trial, the bond shall stand in lieu of, and be forfeited in the same manner as, any such automobiles, vehicles, or conveyances."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "25" and insert "18."

Page 1, line 3, strike out "247" and insert "3618."

Page 1, line 4, strike out "(39 Stat. 970, sec. 1, March 2, 1917)."

The committee amendments were 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 title 18, section 3618, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America, to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFERRING CONTROL OVER INDIAN TRIBAL FUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4025) to transfer control over Indian tribal funds to the Indian tribes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

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

There was no objection.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR TUNG NUTS AND HONEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 29) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide parity for tung nuts, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the author of the bill if he can give us any information relative to it. There is no report from the Department of Agriculture nor from the Bureau of the Budget, and I feel that an explanation is in order so that the Members may know how much money this will cost, and whether or not it is a step toward the adoption of the Brannan plan. It seems to me this bill is too involved to be considered on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I may say to the distinguished gentleman that this bill was reported out by the Committee on Agriculture. I understand there was a unanimous report filed. As to why there

I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that I am not arguing against a unification of the armed services as directed to savings, but I am attempting to show that the present Unification Act provides the necessary means to accomplish this economy. At the same time, I wish to caution against the dangers of the determined philosophy of this long-range program to strip down and eventually destroy the Navy and Marine Corps aviation, and to protest against a program that would reduce those proud services below an executive department to mere agencies in one big military bureau, and which would leave them in a status somewhat similar to the prewar Army Transport Service.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] is one of the strongest and most able chairmen in Congress and is to be congratulated for his successful efforts in conference in retaining some of the important safeguards of the House bill. During the many years he served as chairman of the old Naval Affairs Committee, and since, he has devoted his life toward building a strong Navy and Marine Corps, and to him must be given much of the credit for the glorious achievements and outstanding record made by these services during the recent war. He and his committee exercised close congressional contact which contributed to the efficiency of the Navy and which helped to keep it free from any corruption or suspicion in the vast expenditure of public funds during the period of the prewar and war years.

A one-man rule is answerable to no one, and it is important that Congress keep alert in an effort to eradicate the philosophy that would, if continued, submerge any one of the armed services.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of misgiving expressed in the course of the debate regarding this bill. To my mind there are entirely too many "doubting Thomases" in our midst. I think this is a good bill. It is a bill which has received much care, study, and attention during the last year or year and a half. It is a bill which comes to us with the recommendation of a non-partisan commission, the Hoover Commission. This Commission is supporting this bill 100 percent. This is a bill which is supported by the testimony of outstanding witnesses, in whose judgment I have complete confidence. These witnesses told our committee this would save the United States a minimum of a billion dollars. Some witnesses said that it would save over a billion, and perhaps better than \$2,000,000,000. I am perfectly willing to rely on the judgment of those distinguished Americans who testified before our committee and give this plan a reasonable opportunity to be tried. I believe the bill will accomplish just that thing. It will give our Government a well-ordered defense establishment. It will take the sprawling defense department, which now runs all through our Government, and unify it in a single Department of Defense. It will give the

head of that Department the opportunity to work out efficient reforms and organize a businesslike administration of the Department of Defense. While it does that, it does not, Mr. Speaker, take from the several departments, including the Army, Navy, and Air Departments, the full protection which those departments ought to have in maintaining their separate identities and organization in the defense establishment. It has been said that no one gave us minute information as to where a dollar would be saved and where it might not be saved by this unification bill.

It has not been told you, but it is true that the Secretary of Defense offered to tell the committee in executive session just where he intended to make changes and just how he intended to save money.

He told the committee that by virtue of eliminating overlapping, duplication, and inefficiencies the sum of \$750,000,000 would be saved our people.

That is all in the testimony. When they talk about doubting the effectiveness of this bill, I say I believe proper efficiency in this department of Government will bring about economies and savings and improvements which will effect reductions of tremendous amounts.

During the course of the war, Mr. Speaker, we were forced under stress of the emergency to work out a hurried unification. We unified our command in Europe and in the Pacific. Much to the surprise of many "doubting Thomases," this unification worked nicely and ran smoothly. It speeded up the prosecution of the war and brought victory with less expense and with less loss of life. It was hailed as a great victory asset. Now, with peaceful times returned to our land, some arise who doubt that the unification which worked in the armed forces so well in the times of emergency would work at present in our armed forces. I think it is entitled to a trial; and I believe the witnesses are correct who feel that an untold amount of money may be saved to our taxpayers by the passage of this measure giving reasonable unification of our armed forces.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the subject of unification of the armed services is one which has been very close to my heart for as many years as the problem has existed. I have had, since its inception, a great many misgivings. Some of them have been dispelled partly because those who were ambitious to gain tremendous personal power have relinquished their ambitions for one reason or another.

Quite frankly, the statements just made by the very able chairman of the Armed Services Committee have relieved me. He is an old friend, and our offices are just across the hall from each other. We frequently exchange views, and I

have noted each of his reluctant steps toward this so-called unification.

In a few minutes, I am going to vote with him, very much against my own desires, and moved by the feelings that the measure must inevitably be passed; and that it has now been protected by the best safeguards that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] can provide. I cast my vote, knowing full well that the extravagant claims of money saving are misleading the general public and that it is very likely that someone will ultimately take a tremendous blame for the failure of at least this part of the unification scheme.

It is known to all who care to interest themselves that I am a United States marine of some 30 years of service either on active duty in two wars or as a Reservist—a militiaman. However, my interest in the armed services always included the other branches: Army, Navy, and Air, and I believe that I can understand the proper and essential functioning of each in its relationship to the other. Much has been said about the plan in the mind of the Secretary of Defense to do away with the Marine Corps. This, he has denied. There is no choice but to accept his denial and to assume that anyone who may have gathered from conversations with him that he planned the effective disposal of the Marine Corps as a vital fighting unit, evidently misunderstood him.

In his explanation a few moments ago, the gentleman from Georgia reassured me somewhat. I still wonder if in the back of some people's minds there is not the idea that the mission of the corps may be gradually restricted until it becomes merely the force to guard the navy yards and other naval establishments and to man the marine detachments on board ship. It will be interesting to watch from the side lines for this development.

I have no desire to further delay the inevitable. We will, of course, pass this unification measure on the part of a great many of us who have followed national defense very closely there will be tongues in cheeks. We hate to put this awful power in the hands of one man. We distrust a measure which must be sold to the public in the guise of fantastic claims of money-savings. Perhaps we should find comfort in the idea that the final passage of the bill and its enactment into law will do something for the morale of the armed services. Judging from members of the various branches with whom I have had contacts in recent months, the morale is presently at a serious low.

Anyhow, let us try it and hope for the best.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, many of my Armed Services Committee colleagues have expressed doubt about the effectiveness of this bill, as agreed to by the conferees. They seem to be afraid that we have granted too much power in the Secretary of Defense.

I want to express my wholehearted support of this bill as it comes from the conference. It does give the Secretary much power. But it also hedges that power in rather strictly. It is a long

step toward unification over the original unification bill. It does point in the direction of clothing the Secretary with power to at least partly match his responsibility. If we are going to have unification we must face the fact that the Secretary must be clothed with sufficient power to carry out his duties, or he may become merely the presiding head of warring factions in our defense organization.

Many of the powers he now has are phrased in such general terms that every step the Secretary may take toward unification can be challenged by someone on the ground that the language on which the Secretary relies to support his action can be interpreted more strictly and as not being specific enough to permit the action of the Secretary.

Why do I believe that we should clothe the Secretary with more power? Because I think we should make unification more realistic and more workable. Think of this: In the great war when our national safety and national life was at stake we had unification in every theater of combat. The stark necessity of protecting ourselves and doing every thing possible to insure success brought that about. Pearl Harbor dramatized the futility of dual control. Every great leader during the war supported unification publicly and openly. They knew it was the only way to get the maximum protection and results with our men and equipment.

That being so, why should we not learn from that lesson. What are our armed services for, but to give us a maximum of protection in times of strife and war. We cannot expect effective unification in war unless we perfect it in peace. Next time we may not have allies holding the enemy back and time in which to build the unification that we need for certain victory.

I do not believe that the economy talked about so much is the major or principal object of this legislation. The major objective, in my book, of this legislation is to get the best possible defense system to stop aggression and to win a war if it should come. I cannot make myself believe that welding our defense forces more closely together so they will make a more perfect team will result in a dangerous centralization of power. The President is essentially a civil officer. Not a day passes but he is impressed with the fact that he represents a great population of civilians. Going through the ordeal of a national campaign makes him feel the influence of the people—the civilian voters—very vividly. He will be a check on any Secretary who grabs for too much power, either by law or through administration. Congress will keep an eagle and a suspicious eye on any Secretary who acts like he wants to be or is a military dictator and curb him very quickly. The House is very close to the people and they certainly by nature and the force of election circumstances are daily impressed with the primacy of the civil over the military. We would never let any Secretary get very far on the road to military dictatorship without finding a way to place road blocks in his way and curb his power and his efforts.

But giving him power, by statute, to weld our defense elements into a strong cable of national defense through an effective fighting team is not moving in the direction of military dictatorship.

If we are ever going to curb some of the duplications, the abuses, and the tendency to build and overemphasize small "defense empires" I believe logic drives us to the view that we must give the Secretary more power than he has now. He must be given sufficient tools to develop the fighting team to the highest degree of effectiveness during peace so it will be a winning team when it goes into action.

This bill as agreed to by the conferees is a step in that direction. Of course, the Secretary is going to do many things that those who have the fears they have expressed today will not approve. On the other hand, those who believe in more effective unification will probably applaud his conduct, but think it does not go far enough.

I have no criticism of anyone and their views on this problem. The results of this bill are problematical. But I think it is moving toward more security for our people and its institutions. To me, this step is merely a part of the evolution toward more effective unification and better national security. The better it is; the more efficient and effective it is, the less likely we are to have to use it. Barring unnecessary provocation—and we must be very careful not to give provocation—a well-knit fighting force, well trained and well equipped with the most modern weapons is the best antidote to aggression.

Those are some of the thoughts that pass through my mind as I look on this bill with favor.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill has many fundamental faults, and as a result I must make several comments. I was in favor of the bill that originally passed the House several weeks ago, but at the same time I must admit I have always disapproved of S. 1269, better known as the Tydings bill. As was inevitable, the House and Senate conferees compromised the differences between the two proposals and as a result, we now have a bill before us containing some of the undesirable features in the original Tydings proposal.

I fully concur with the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] who stated that the word "unification" is beginning to have a holy meaning, just like the word "mother." In other words, anyone who speaks out against unification of the armed forces is committing an unforgivable sin. Further, the American press has seized upon, magnified, and made capital of many of the superficial antagonisms and manifestations of disagreement between the armed services of the United States without presenting to the American people the true and basic reason for interservice differences. I submit that the real basis for this bickering is a deep-seated conflict between those, both in the military and in civilian life, who favor a republican form of government and those who apparently believe in an extreme concentration of authority and power of decision in a very

small and carefully selected cadre of officers known as the general staff. Apparently, we are being committed slowly but surely to the general-staff point of view, but I wish to go on record in opposition to those who believe in a general-staff theory and demand that those who favor that policy should be held accountable for any irresponsible or unfortunate results that may accrue. The general staff in Germany prior to the last war made a good impression in an unsavory political atmosphere. But when war and the true test came, the general-staff concept fell by the wayside. It would be most unfortunate if we should have a similar experience in the United States, and those who are driving us toward that end should be fully cognizant of the dangers that are ahead.

The idea of the Army General Staff Corps evidently germinated at about the same time as that for the establishment of the Army War College, which was founded under Secretary of War Elihu Root, by General Order No. 155 of November 17, 1901. However, little was done until the first War College Board met on July 10, 1902, under the supervision of Maj. Gen. S. B. M. Young, United States Army. One of the most important duties of the War College Board and General Young was planning the organization of the General Staff Corps. The General Staff of the United States Army began to function on August 15, 1903, and on November 1, 1903, the Army War College, immediately merged with this corps, began its first year of systematic operation under the general staff. This organization, neither American nor democratic in its scope or intent, was originally quite similar to and patterned after the Prussian General Staff. However, with the perfection attained by years of operation and by the distortion and perversion of opportunists it now assumes a role approaching that of military autocracy.

The official reorganization of the General Staff by General Order No. 14 on February 9, 1918, is a good illustration of how power has been continuously concentrated in the General Staff. In this shake-up the War Plans Division formerly associated with the War College at Fort McNair was established in the War Department with particular duties as follows:

First. Plan for organization of the Army.

Second. Study and determine types and quantities of equipment.

Third. Consider projects for national defense.

Fourth. Provide for training of the Army.

Fifth. Translate and compile foreign documents relating to military affairs.

Sixth. Compile, collect, and maintain complete military records.

Seventh. Propose military legislation for the Military Establishment.

Note particularly paragraph 7. There is reason to believe that most of this legislation in the past few years has emanated from certain groups within the Military Establishment. In my estimation the military should restrict themselves to proposing military legislation

1950 July 25

than the budget has recommended. As a result of going on behalf of the Armed Services Committee to the Appropriations Committee in 1949, the budget was increased \$800,000,000 specifically for the Air Force.

I do not want anybody to think I am criticizing the Appropriations Committee, because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and his committee, particularly Mr. SIKES, Mr. PLUMLEY, and Mr. SHEPPARD in the forefront, were trying to write into the appropriation bill the items the Joint Chiefs of Staff had in their minds, which were oftentimes curtailed by the budget.

Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side. If there are no requests for time on the other side, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in a syndicated article published July 21, 1950, in the Grand Rapids Press, and other newspapers throughout the United States, the prominent columnist, Mr. David Lawrence, had the following to say:

Out in Korea the American boys are fighting bravely and many are dying, but inside Washington there is a bitter feeling of criticism concerning certain decisions of the top command—General Collins of the Army and General Vandenberg of the Air Force—who are charged with having combined to squelch the opportunity of the United States Marine aviation units to fight in the Far East.

From other sources similar information has also been received. In addition, an interesting letter was recently forwarded to me by a constituent and for the information of the Members of the House the pertinent portions are as follows:

I am a naval reservist and expect to be called back to active duty at any time. My first gripe is aimed at the high brass at that huge office building, the Pentagon. We've enjoyed the benefits of unification since 1948, and I think it stinks. What kind of unification is it that calls the Marine Reserve ground forces to active duty and leaves Marine Reserve air units at home? What's the matter with Naval Air Reserve units? This war is supposed to be an air war, let's use all our air forces. * * * If it isn't going to be an air war, this country has been sold a bill of goods. Our Marine Corps, the best fighting group we have had in any war, has been rendered virtually useless as a result of unification. A marine by virtue of his training is imbued with that elusive esprit de corps, morale, or plain guts to fight and win. In World War II no other branch of the service could show the same qualities to any marked degree. I'm sure any military critic will say our last war in the Pacific was a Marine victory—with a slight assist by the Army and Navy. Let's give the marines in this fight the support of their own air units. Also, let's get the Marine Corps back up to somewhere near their wartime strength and keep it up there through the years ahead. It would be as good insurance as a 70-group air force. I'm like all sailors: I have a dislike for marines along with a hearty respect for their ability.

In the city of Grand Rapids, Mich., a Marine Reserve unit has been faithfully training for the past few years. It is D Company of the Fifth Infantry, Battalion. This unit either has or is sched-

uled for a call to active duty. In my estimation it would be tragic for this unit of the Marines or any other fighting Marine outfit to be sent into the front in Korea or elsewhere without the benefit of trained Marine air group tactical support. I strongly urge that any plan be abandoned for the splitting up of Marine ground units from Marine air groups.

This rumored plan to break up the long-established and highly effective Marine air-ground coordination has been in the minds of some of our Army and Air Force leaders for a number of years, but despite this pressure the integrity of the entire Marine program has been maintained except for slashes in numbers all along the line. However, the present Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson, seems to have been victimized by this unsound thinking, for he is quoted as having said:

We cannot afford to have three separate air forces—Navy, Marine, and Air Force.

It is obvious that the rumors mentioned in Mr. Lawrence's column are in line with Mr. Johnson's basic thinking.

It is important to understand a few basic and fundamental facts in discussing this problem. In the first place, marine aviation is not separate; it is a legal and administrative fact that marine aviation is administratively and technically a part of naval aviation under the applicable statutes. Marine aviation organizations are like the rest of the marines—part of the Naval Establishment. All procurement of the matériel and training of any pilots for marine aviation is included in the naval air program.

During World War II Admiral King, in an effort to determine any possible savings in the Naval Establishment, convened a board within the Navy Department to determine what would be the effect from the economy standpoint of abolishing marine aviation in toto. After exhaustive inquiries this board concluded and actually placed upon record certain important conclusions. It was the board's decision that, because of the very close integration of marine air training and operations into the naval air program, there would be, in fact, no savings resulting from the elimination of the marine air program. The assignment of strictly naval air units for the performance of functions previously handled by marine air groups was not recommended. It was found there would be no economies and the effectiveness of this vital military weapon would be abolished by such a plan.

Anyone who is at all familiar with marine air group operations knows that marine air units are trained to operate off either Navy carriers or advanced land bases. Marine air units exist for one primary reason, and one reason alone: The support, very close support, of the ground troops. In this connection it should be recalled that it was marine preoccupation with the amphibious specialty that resulted in the marine employment of our present-day close air support doctrine which, as it is used in the Marine Corps, is the most effective

close air-support program possessed by any armed forces in the world. Marine close air support not only includes isolation of the battle field, but such support is predicated upon the actual assistance of ground units by attacking specific targets opposing marine ground effort. As a result, the marine system of close air support is designed to bring down on an enemy an air strike whenever required by the front-line ground commander. This is in contrast to the theory of saturation of area targets and the control of supporting aircraft by the top echelon of ground commanders away from the fighting front.

Unlike other United States air-support doctrine, marines have carried air-ground integration to such a point that in every front-line battalion and in other specially designated units there is a marine air-control officer. This officer is trained in both air and ground techniques. He is a marine aviator, but basically, as are all marines, a marine first, last, and always. Marine air, rather than being separated from the ground effort, as has been the case of the technical support of Army units resulting from the creation of a separate air force is based upon the air-ground team concept.

Some people may well ask this question: How does this powerful close air support conception fit into the otherwise completely unique Marine Corps idea? The answer is simple and understandable. The Marine Corps usefulness as a military outfit lies largely in its adherence to the team idea. The Marine Corps feels it is their mandate to be ready with a team—not a very big one perhaps—but still a complete team to answer the call at any time.

Since in operations across the water such as we are now fighting in Korea, the Marine Corps cannot always have the tanks and artillery they need right at the moment of landing, the Marine Corps must rely more extensively on this extremely flexible weapon, namely, close support planes. Without them the marines are only a partial team and cannot be expected to be completely effective in all the complex operations assigned them. However, with their own close support planes the marines have the necessary balance and the striking power and the readiness to move into action which gives modern significance to the old marine saying "first to fight."

To give this teamwork real effect, the Marine Corps puts specially trained air personnel directly with the front line troops to observe closely the progress of the battle and to call for and direct these vital close support air attacks. The Marine Corps is the only military organization in the world that does this with such thoroughgoing detail, and needless to say it has paid tremendous dividends in the past. Consequently, it would be most unwise to change this method at this crucial hour when the marines are again going to be called upon to do their job in a new Pacific war.

Marines had to develop a close air support doctrine simply because the nature of amphibious operations was such that there had to be an effective type of

immediate, front-line controlled, air support in order to cover the ground attacks in an amphibious operation prior to the landing of heavier items of artillery and other supporting weapons. It should not be forgotten that marines pioneered dive bombing and logistical support of ground troops by air. In passing, it might be worth noting that in 1933, when Major Udet of the German Luftwaffe was watching a marine aviation squadron put on a demonstration at the Cleveland air races that he was so impressed by marine dive bombing that he stated he was going to recommend the German Air Force adopt a similar technique.

The record of marine aviation in World War II was outstanding in the annals of close air-support history. Carrier- or land-based marine close air-support aviation was able to deliver battalion-controlled air strikes with but a few minutes notice and it was very normal to deliver strafing, bombing, and rocket attacks against enemy positions as close as 100 yards to our own front lines. It is reported that on at least one occasion on Iwo Jima a close air support attack was launched within 50 yards of our own troops.

Another point that should be considered is the fact that there is no real duplication or competition between the Air Force generally and marine and naval close air-support programs. For example, the Air Force is today preoccupied with long-range strategic bombing and jet interceptor planes. It is no secret that everything else is secondary as far as operations within the Air Force are concerned. Accordingly, and quite properly, the Air Force has today developed, due to its preoccupation and emphasis on long-range bombing, the finest long-range bomber in the world, namely, the B-36. On the other hand, it must be remembered that while making this great advance in strategic air, no basic improvement has been made by the Air Force in close air support doctrine or matériel. This is best evidenced by the immediate calling up of P-51 conventional type aircraft for the Air Force's operations in Korea.

Fortunately the marine and naval aviation experts have not been preoccupied with long-range strategic bombing, but in contrast have emphasized and focused their attention on naval air operations involving close air support of ground troops in amphibious and related operations. As a result of this activity which is so important to expeditionary troops of the fleet marine forces there has been continued perfection of our close air-support doctrines and techniques. For example, we are now reported to have the finest kind of support aircraft in the new Martin Mauler. The point should carefully be noted that this aircraft was conceived and produced not by the Air Force, to which close air support is of secondary importance, but rather by naval aviation and marines whose specialty is close air-support activity. The different interests of the Air Force and marine-naval aviation has given our Nation comple-

mentary—not conflicting—types of air power. To now withhold marine aviation units from active participation with marine ground units in Korea would be disastrous, to say the least.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize again the absolute need and necessity for maintaining the close cooperation and integrity of marine ground and marine air units. I trust that the decisions in the Korean operation are unfounded, for history shows that in Pacific warfare a full marine team—ground and air—is essential in the jobs assigned to the Corps.

Mr. SHORT. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That until July 9, 1951, the President shall be authorized to extend all enlistments in any component of the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, and the United States Marine Corps, including the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve, and in any component of the Air Force of the United States for a period of not to exceed 12 months: *Provided,* That all persons whose terms of enlistments are extended in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall continue during such extensions to be subject in all respects to the laws and regulations for the government of their respective service.

SEC. 2. Personnel of the uniformed services entitled to benefits under section 515 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 831) shall not suffer any reduction in total compensation by reason of any extended service performed under the terms of this act.

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

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of raising two or three questions. They may not be answered; it may be impossible to answer them. In doing this, I realize that war is the most expensive game that man ever played or ever will play, not only in materials but in so-called finance as well as in human blood and suffering. Wars have to be financed either by compulsion or by voluntary service and voluntary contributions in the way of purchase of Treasury issues and in the payment of taxes which after all is somewhat voluntary because in this country you do not have to work and earn income which can be taxed—you can just lie down and quit and the welfare agencies will feed your wife and children. So paying taxes is more or less a voluntary proposition.

The great chairman of the committee that has brought this bill to the floor has discussed the question of dollars—and I am not up here to put dollars against human bodies now or at any other time, but the people in my district are very much concerned about the mental attitude of those in the defense arms of Government who disburse the dollars which are provided by the taxpayers and the bond buyers and therefore they have not had answered to them in a satisfactory manner, to say the least, what the administrators of the defense program have done with between sixty and ninety billion dollars which has been provided for defense during the past few years.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman to give us any comfort on that that he may.

Mr. VINSON. I will state to the distinguished gentleman that I do not know that I can answer his question, but I am trying to find information to answer it.

But I can say this: Out of every dollar appropriated for national defense, 60 cents goes to what is called housekeeping in the Defense Department. Now, the gentleman is absolutely correct and the country does want to know what is the character of our defense; what kind of tank program we have; how much artillery we have; how many men we have; how many airplanes we have. The Committee on Armed Services started yesterday on a hearing to find out what the situation is. Just as soon as we get the information, I propose to bring it to the floor of the House and tell the country how much defense we have.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the chairman for that information. I did not have it before and I do not know how many other Members of the House had it, either. The people did not have it and that is exactly what I think should be done—we should proceed just along that line.

Just one other thought. So many billions of dollars have been thrown at the feet of the administrators of national defense during the past 15 years that it is only human that those administrators have become ruthless in the expenditure of those funds. The situation now is that we are starting out with a \$260,000,000,000 debt. We started out on the last war with about a \$49,000,000,000 debt and by the time we wind up after a 2-, 3-, 4-, 5- or 10-year war, we may have six or eight trillion dollars in the national debt, unless we do get better sense in the operation of the administration of these funds.

I hope that the Committee on Armed Services will do the necessary things to put the throttle on those who are to administer these funds so that they will have a little respect for the use of material and the burdens that are placed on the citizens insofar as dollars are concerned. Dollars just represent material. And if we win any wars or keep a little peace in the world we will still need a few pieces of material for those who are at peace to use after the wars have finished.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman any idea how much we have in stockpiles? I understand that Members are having great difficulty in finding how much we have in our stockpiles.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have been reading stockpile hearings all day. I started early this morning. I have a bunch of them here. I think our stockpile situation will prove to be even more distressing and more disappointing than the situation with reference to equipment.

forces. And it should be a well-trained Reserve.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I think that is hardly fair, to say it has failed because it is on a volunteer basis, because there have been literally hundreds of thousands of veterans of the different branches of our armed services who had combat experience in the last war who have done their very best to get into Reserve training but have been unable to do so, and it has not been altogether due to the lack of funds. As far as the Air Force is concerned we gave them \$75,000,000 which they never did spend. This proves that it is not the fault of Congress or the Committee on the Armed Services.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I did not mean to start the argument again as to where the blame lies.

Mr. SHORT. I want to get it very clear and unmistakable that the blame does not rest on the Congress. We have got to face the facts as they are.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am endeavoring to face the facts as they are and to look ahead.

Mr. SHORT. That is all right, and Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes—I want to give him all the time I have. The only way to improve is to recognize mistakes and to be honest and courageous enough to admit that they are mistakes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not dispute the good objective of this legislation; I support it enthusiastically. It is going to take 8 or 9 months to fill up these units. We have not a large enough reserve that is trained; we must resort to the draft to a considerable extent. From the draft we get raw recruits who must be trained.

I can remember some experiences in World War II with respect to the National Guard. I remember the Twenty-seventh National Guard Division which was mobilized along with all the other divisions. It lacked 3,000 men of being at war strength. When it was mobilized that division had to spend 6 months training those new 3,000 recruits. Had it been at war strength when it was called into service it could have taken the field. None of these divisions that we are now talking about can take the field short of 6, 8 or 9 months.

That does not disturb me so deeply with respect to Korea alone. What I am thinking about is the long pull. How are we going to be sure of getting an adequate reserve composed of trained citizens? I say again, and I have been saying this for 30 years, that it can be done only by universal military training. It cannot be done in any other way. Suppose that in 1947 we had passed the UMT bill—incidentally the gentleman from New Jersey was the sponsor of it—and suppose that it had gone into effect immediately or within a reasonable period thereafter. Here we are in 1950. We would have had in our trained reserve

by this time two complete classes, each having had 1 year of training and composed of 800,000 men each, available for service when a great military mobilization might come along, and completely adequate.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. What assurance would we have had that the President or the administration would not have cut back the funds or would not have permitted that training?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I cannot tell, of course. I am trying to point out what I have believed for a great many years, that the only sound way for a democracy to preserve itself from a savage aggression is to rely upon trained citizens, trained in time of peace and subject to service only when war comes along, rather than to rely completely upon professional Regulars whom we cannot support in time of peace in large enough numbers and in sufficient strength to keep the country safe in war. We have got to face this thing some day. If this row in Korea expands into something much larger—God knows I hope it does not—we will be up against this question of reserves and we will find ourselves without them. You will simply have to call into the services through the draft raw recruits and thus for 6, 8, or 10 months break down the efficiency of your military units.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Is it not true that Australia and other countries are contemplating rejecting voluntary enlistments, and going to the compulsory method, so that there will be an even distribution of service?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not aware of what is going on in other countries. I am not in favor of rejecting volunteers. I am not in favor of rejecting men voluntarily enlisting in the Regular Army or National Guard or in the Reserves, but when you have not enough reserves and you have no means of knowing how many you will have a year from now or 2 years from now or 3 years from now, you have not the slightest idea where you are, which means you do not know where you are going.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we have heard the excellent and very apropos remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia in which he pointed out some of the military weaknesses and some of the things that may be necessary to remedy them. Subsequently we heard the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Short] in which he pointed out, I think very adequately, the possible reasons for our present military condition and pointed out with justification the responsibility for our present circumstances.

Subsequently during the debate on the bill, H. R. 9177, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH] very piously took the floor and stated that bygones should be bygones, that we should now forget the errors and mistakes of the past and go ahead from here on. He also complimented, and in that I join, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I say again that I join with him in that statement.

However, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH], not too long ago, was taking an opposite point of view concerning the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. You all are very familiar with the B-36 probe of last year. In October of 1949 the Committee on Armed Services held extensive hearings on procurement of the B-36 and related matters. Subsequently the committee filed a report, but during the hearings, if my recollection is correct, the gentleman from Indiana stomped out of the committee room and said he would not have one more thing to do with the investigation. If I am in error in regard to this, I would like to have the gentleman from Indiana correct me.

Mr. WALSH. At the completion of the gentleman's remarks I will ask for time to answer.

Mr. FORD. Very well. The Committee on Armed Services, following that investigation, in House Document 600, entitled "Unification and Strategy," summary of views and recommendations of the House Armed Services Committee, came to certain conclusions, 33 in number. All but No. 33 were approved unanimously. Eight of the members of the Committee on Armed Services objected to the approval of recommendation No. 33. Included in the minority was the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH].

For your information I will read what recommendation 33 included:

The removal of Admiral Denfeld was a reprisal against him for giving testimony to the House Armed Services Committee. This act is a blow against effective representative government in that it tends to intimidate witnesses and hence discourages the rendering of free and honest testimony to the Congress; it violated promises made to the witnesses by the committee, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Defense; and it violated the Unification Act, into which a provision was written specifically to prevent actions of this nature against the Nation's highest military and naval officers.

I say this, Members of the Committee, that I wholeheartedly approve of the action of the Committee on Armed Services under the distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia. I concur in his statement made today. I also wholeheartedly support the point of view of the gentleman from Missouri. We cannot forget bygones; we must analyze our present position by realizing what errors we have made in the past. We cannot progress in the future unless we know where we have failed heretofore. I do not intend to let statements get by on the floor of this House that gloss over and try to cover up actions of individuals and groups within our borders.

JULY 25
1950

I would like to also make a statement regarding several other comments made by the gentleman from Indiana. He said that 70 percent of our appropriations for the last few years were for military expenses. That is not accurate. What he meant to say, and I am sure he will correct it in the Record, is that 70 percent of our appropriations are for past wars, including military appropriations for future wars, appropriations for veterans' benefits and other miscellaneous items. But, he definitely said they were for military expenses and such a statement was inaccurate.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, my remarks must have been misunderstood by a few here in the House today. My remarks, following those of my distinguished friend from Missouri, were meant as an appeal for understanding and cooperation. Perhaps I was not as restrained as I should be because I disagreed somewhat with his remarks.

It is very apparent that we should get some of these things out of our system, and apparently we are doing so today. I agree with the distinguished gentleman that preceded me that my remarks should be that 70 percent of our budget is going for wars past and present and in preparation for possible future conflicts. I have at times disagreed with my distinguished chairman [Mr. VINSON]. Anyone that sits in the Committee on Armed Services recognizes his worth and his leadership. But sometimes Mr. Vinson, if he will pardon me, is not the most patient individual. He has a tendency toward running the committee in a style that is not inimitable.

As a freshman member of the Committee on Armed Services I became disturbed in the hearings on the B-36 investigation. As I felt that the younger members were not being given a chance to participate in the same, and I walked out in a huff. I saw a newspaperman friend of mine, and he asked me what had occurred. I thought I was talking largely off the record, but much to my sorrow the next day the headlines said that I accused the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] of being a Navy stooge. I later corrected this, because I had not used those words. However, the newspaperman apparently had, and I had acquiesced. I have often been sorry for those remarks. I recognize the worth of the gentleman from Georgia, but I still say that the manner in which the investigation was being held at that time did not please me. I did feel that we in the backfield, the younger members, were not given the opportunity to express ourselves fully. However, I have noticed since then that our chairman has been most considerate of the younger members of the committee. I am positive that he does not hold that against me, and I certainly do not against him, because I think the gentleman from Georgia knows more about the military needs of this country than any other man in the Nation.

I want to say something about the B-36 investigation. I signed the minority report. I am proud of that fact, and I would have signed it again. I am a lawyer. I told the House yesterday that I had practiced law for 16 years. I do not believe in hearsay evidence. I believe any man accused should be allowed to face his accuser. I think it is an outrage when any man in this body, or the other one, who has congressional immunity accuses a person of something and the individual that is accused, even though he is later vindicated, has no right of redress.

I attended practically every one of the hearings in the B-36 investigation. They were concluded only a few days after my outburst. I want to say that Secretary Matthews was unjustly accused, as was Secretary Johnson, and largely upon hearsay evidence. I felt then that the criticism leveled at Secretary Matthews was unjust, that we had heard only one side of the issue. I agree with my good friend from Illinois [Mr. ARENS] when he says that good resulted from the B-36 investigation. But I am making no apology for the B-36 bomber. It is the greatest plane now in existence, and our investigation proved this fact. I heard the late General Arnold tell us what it could do.

Mr. Chairman, where would we be today without the atomic bomb. Where would we be? Russia would be at our doorstep. The atomic bomb is a deterrent against all-out Soviet aggression. Who is going to carry the atomic bomb in case of a world conflict? Today there is only one airplane, in my opinion, that can carry it to Europe and return, and that is not giving any secrets away. It is the B-36 bomber.

Unjustly and unfairly the B-36 bomber was attacked in our committee. It was attacked upon the floor of the House and in the newspapers. After the investigation was concluded we all unanimously agreed that the charges against the B-36 and its acquisition were absolutely false. I do not feel that Admiral Denfeld was unjustly treated, and I am still standing by that statement. I can still say to you today that I am standing behind the minority report. We only disagreed in this report in one item. Seven members of the committee voted the same as I did, but on the other 29 or 30 items, I have forgotten how many there were, we were unanimous in our report. Of course, a committee of this size and importance disagrees. We disagree here today violently in our feelings. But I think if there is one thing we can do is to get it out of our systems and we can fight here on the floor of the House, but tomorrow and henceforth we will go forward fighting together to win this war. I could point out to this Member and other Members their voting records in the past. I could, if necessary, point out where he failed to vote for what I consider to be the best interest of the defense of our country. I know that I, too, have cast had votes, but what I am saying now and wanted to point out in my earlier remarks, is that these things do not matter now.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Tell me where.

Mr. WALSH. I said I am not going to do it.

Mr. FORD. Well, I am asking you to.

Mr. WALSH. I will produce the record here tomorrow, if you want it brought forth.

Mr. FORD. I certainly do.

Mr. WALSH. You are the one who brought this argument up—not me. I do not care to indulge in personalities.

Mr. FORD. But you certainly did.

Mr. WALSH. After all, my good friend, you are the one who took the floor first. I did not know you from Adam. I will have your record tomorrow and show it in the Record if you wish.

Mr. FORD. You can come to my office and I will give it to you to save time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

I do not care to get in any discussion. The point I am trying to make is that tempers are flaring here today. I hope when it is all said and done we can forget the votes we have cast in the past and the mistakes that we have made—and we have made plenty of them, all of us—and go out of this Chamber united, because we are certainly in a world conflict which we may never see the end.

As the father of four children, and I am proud of it, I am going to do my level best to see to it that those children have the opportunity to live in a free world, free of communism. I hope my vote in the future, as I hope it has been in the past, will never be cast along political lines, especially at this time when the fate of the world rests to a great extent upon us, the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I cannot add much more information on these two measures, but tempers seem to be flaring here this afternoon. After all, you know it is very pleasing to me to see the difference in the debate today and the unanimous cooperation in a matter which probably means the life or death of our Nation in the years to come. There is a big difference between now and 1939, 1940, and 1941, when we were voting on measures far into the night. Roll call after roll call occurred at that period and this body at that time was seriously divided. Not so today. These measures, which are very far-reaching, are going to pass unanimously.

It has also been pointed out to you the difficulties under which we are operating today. I do not believe it is any time to point out the faults or mistakes that may have occurred in the past. I think it is best for us at the present time, in this hour, to confine ourselves to the job ahead and not forget about the situation and the predicament and obligations that this Nation has taken upon itself.

We have listened, and I particularly have listened, for the last year to the intelligence reports around the world. We, of course, have had a policy of confinement against communism, and they

House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES FOR ALL SERVICEMEN

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on July 27 I introduced a bill to provide family allowances for all servicemen called to active duty. Three weeks has elapsed and no action has been taken by either the House or Senate on this important legislation. In the meantime men are being called to active duty, taken from their civilian jobs, and no adequate compensation is forthcoming for their dependents. In order to protect the homes and families of those called to service increases over the World War II allowances should be included in the law when finally enacted. We cannot expect families to live on the same income they received in 1943.

The necessary legislation is apparently roadblocked by some of our military leaders on purely technical grounds. I admit it is complicated legislation, but it seems to me the tremendous staffs in the Pentagon and the House and Senate committees could have worked out a fair solution by this late date. I strongly urge that our military leaders and the committee members work night and day on this problem until a bill is ready for immediate enactment.

RUSSIA SHOULD BE EXPELLED FROM THE UN

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, section 1 of article 1 of the UN Charter says that the purpose of the UN is "to maintain international peace and security." Article 6 of the UN Charter provides for expulsion of a member nation "which has persistently violated the principles contained in the Charter."

It has long been apparent that Russia has provided adequate grounds for her expulsion. In my opinion, Russia should be expelled, at least until such time as she gives good evidence that she has mended her ways. This move would place world censure where it belongs and would relieve the UN of the obviously dangerous efforts of Russia to sabotage every UN resistance to aggressions dictated from Moscow. It would also allow the strengthening of the police forces of the UN and make feasible the imposition of economic and other sanctions against Russia and her satellites.

It might be argued that there is a value in having all nations in the UN, particularly the strong ones. There is such a value, but, in my opinion, it is outweighed by the value of having Russia placed in a position where she cannot sabotage UN efforts to stop her aggressions. There are other nations not in the UN because of lesser crimes against world peace. The move would be a mere recognition of an already apparent fact, that Russia is not in any real union whatsoever except the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Some may argue that Russia cannot be expelled from the UN, because she is a permanent member of the Security Council. There is no specific statement that permanent members of the Security Council cannot be expelled from the UN, while in article 6 there is a specific statement that—

A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

It would seem to follow that a member expelled from the UN would not be able to sit or vote on the Security Council, because the Security Council is specifically limited—article 23—to members of the United Nations. It is my opinion that Russia not only can be expelled but that she should be expelled immediately.

It may be argued that Russia could block expulsion by use of the veto; but I maintain that the very nature of the proceedings imply, from necessity, that the veto could not be so used. The word "permanent" is used only as to the Security Council and does not relate to expulsions from the UN. By providing for expulsion of members of the UN the Charter implies that all members can be expelled. To hold that a member could use a veto to block its own expulsion would be to violate the explicit provision for expulsion of guilty members. Moreover, the veto power, besides being specifically limited to nonprocedural matters, is also limited as follows—article 27—"in decisions under chapter VI and under paragraph 3 of article 52 a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting." Chapter VI relates to disputes "the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security" and provides that the Security Council may "recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate."

Following expulsion of Russia, every possible pressure should be placed upon her to cease her aggressions, including the strengthening of the police forces of the UN by better organization and substantial requisitions for troops—backed by UN financing so as to eliminate inequalities of pay, and so forth. Some of these steps can be taken under chapters VI and VII without the expulsion of Russia and they should be taken now. The United States can and should impose immediate restrictions on Russia; for example, it should deny aid to coun-

tries engaging in trade and commerce with Russia and its satellites.

The expulsion of Russian satellite nations might follow or accompany the expulsion of Russia, but that is not so important because they do not have the veto power, are in a tiny minority, and may possibly be won over to freedom's cause by decisive action against Russia itself.

Another point on Russian relationships should be mentioned, the question of diplomatic recognition and relationships. The only objection I can see to severing such relationships immediately is that it might deprive us of contacts which may be useful to use in working for the cause of freedom. If diplomatic relationships are continued with Russia we should impose the same restrictions on their representatives and visitors here that Russia imposes on our representatives and visitors there. Ours are greatly restricted in freedom of movement. Theirs here should likewise be so restricted. We should establish ramparts of freedom to protect us and other freedom-loving people from clandestine attacks from our visitors from behind the iron curtain.

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

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Under article V, is not the authority of the President to call out troops limited to disturbances which may occur in America and Europe, saying nothing about Asia? Is that not true?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. The gentleman from Michigan is not referring to the UN Charter to which I am referring. There is no such restriction in the UN Charter. What he refers to is article V of the North Atlantic Treaty and the restriction to which the gentleman refers is found in article V of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF AUGUST 21

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. I do this, Mr. Speaker, in order to ask the majority leader about the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad to reply to the gentleman.

I have put down a lot of bills for next week, and I hope we will be able to dispose of as many of them as possible. I have bracketed the whole week, and this is what the order will be:

The Consent Calendar will be called on Monday.

House bill 8850, Assistant Secretaries, Department of Agriculture.

Senate bill 3357, gambling devices in interstate commerce.

House bill 9313, disposing of surplus perishable products.

House bill 9141, Agricultural Marketing Facilities Improvement Act.

S. 2317, known as the school-impact bill, aid to States for schools as the result of defense activities.

Then there are the two judgeship bills that have not been disposed of, Delaware and Alaska.

Then, H. R. 9158, amending United States Code relating to food and drugs.

H. R. 8677, relating to Panama Canal, maintenance and operation.

H. R. 8847, American-flag shipping, Great Lakes.

H. R. 8201, Administrative Practitioners Act.

S. 456, District of Columbia airport.

S. 858, scientific, technological, and engineering information.

S. 784, first, second, and third national steamship companies. That is a private bill.

There are a great many bills there, but I do not imagine there is any opposition to a considerable number of them.

It is understood that if there is to be a roll call on any bill that might come up Monday or Tuesday that the roll call will be put over until Wednesday. There are primaries in some of the States, and we have made it a policy, a wise one, I think, not to have roll calls on days when there are primaries. I am informed there are primaries in New York, also Mississippi and Wyoming on Tuesday.

The omnibus appropriation conference report, of course, will have priority, but that will not be called up before Wednesday if it is called up then. In the priority status would be the final supplemental appropriation bill. I tried to get definite information which I could pass on to the membership as to when both these matters would come up, but I am sorry I cannot say any more definitely than I have. Whether the conference report will be ready on Wednesday or not I cannot say, but it will not be ready before Wednesday; I can at least give the House that degree of definiteness.

I do not, of course, want to be committed to the order of the program, but I shall adhere to this order as strictly as I can, and will not depart from it unless there is justifiable cause. Other conference reports, of course, have priority.

Any change in the program will be announced later.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I am particularly interested in a bill pertaining to the transfer of ships from the reserve fleet to the Great Lakes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the American-flag ship bill.

Mr. BONNER. I should like to know whether the gentleman contemplates bringing that bill up before Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is H. R. 8847.

Mr. BONNER. Yes. It pertains to the transfer of ships from the reserve fleet to the Great Lakes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I cannot see that coming up before Wednesday.

Mr. BONNER. So I am safe in assuming that the bill will not come up on Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will give the gentleman the assurance that it will not come up on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wish to ask the majority leader whether if a roll call should be demanded on the measure increasing the stationery allowance of Members it will be voted upon before Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. The understanding is that any roll call that might be demanded on Monday or Tuesday will be postponed until Wednesday. That general statement, of course, answers the gentleman from Michigan, but specifically answering him, I may say that that resolution is included in it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was asking in behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] who is interested in it, he said.

Mr. McCORMACK. The postponement of a roll call, of course, involves the question of unanimous consent, but I am sure that where the leadership is agreed on such a matter that no Member will object.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I wonder if the distinguished majority leader can tell us if there is anything to the rumor that when the work here as outlined has been disposed of, including the conference reports, it is contemplated to take 3-day recesses until the 2d of September?

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish I could answer that Yes, but I cannot in good faith. All I can say is that if this program is disposed of that a very marked step in that direction will have been taken. That is why I put this program down. Some days, next week, with the indulgence of the House I may ask that we meet earlier than 12 o'clock, because with the disposition and final settlement of the supplemental appropriation bill that is all unless something is done on universal military service, and I have no knowledge of that. From what I know that is the last major piece of legislation that this House will act on, on the basis of original jurisdiction. Other matters, of course, will depend upon action of the Senate and on conference reports.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, it is the devout hope of the majority leader that the suggested rumor that I heard may be consummated?

Mr. McCORMACK. I may add that it is more than the devout hope of the gentleman from Massachusetts. The gentleman from Massachusetts will contribute in every way possible to make that rumor an actuality.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I may have something to do with the rumor too.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I ask the House leadership if it has any idea as to whether the Democratic version of the Ferguson-Mundt bill will come over here for a vote?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a subject that at the present time the mind of the gentleman from Massachusetts is completely vacant on.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That cannot be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

STILL DOING BUSINESS WITH STALIN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country know that we are at war with Russia and while our boys are dying in Korea we look at the record and see that we are still doing business with Russia and with its satellite countries. This is a strange business. Are we fighting communism or not?

On August 4 I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some tables showing the extent of that business by ECA countries in western Europe, which tables indicate that only a partial list of the items that have been going behind the iron curtain amounted to over \$1,235,000,000 in 1949. Much to my surprise in a report from the Department of Commerce I find that the good old United States of America is still doing business with Russia and with its satellite countries. True, it has not been on such an extensive basis, but in checking the record I find that for 1948 and 1949 we have shipped to iron curtain countries, including Russia, more than \$200,000,000 of supplies. This includes iron, copper, lead, zinc, motors, industrial supplies; in other words, we have again a repetition of the condition that existed prior to Pearl Harbor when we were shipping scrap iron and oil to Japan.

It was our good friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] who prior to Pearl Harbor went all over this country and called attention to the fact that unless we stopped shipping oil and scrap material to Japan that material might some day find its way into the bodies of our own men. He was a prophet. We all know what has happened. Now we have a repetition of what happened before 1941. We are selling potential war

Aug 17
1950

with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 285 which would authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy. The Committee on Rules considered this resolution and reported the rule to the House for its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Members of the House ought to know a little bit about this particular resolution. We are now considering a resolution making in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 285. House Joint Resolution 285 authorizes an appropriation of \$95,000 for the purpose of putting on a sesquicentennial celebration at West Point Military Academy, N. Y. The original bill was on the Consent Calendar. I objected to the consideration of the legislation on the Consent Calendar. Subsequently, it was stricken from the calendar by three objections. It is now before us, or will shortly be before us, in the form of House Joint Resolution 285.

Mr. Speaker, my only question in reference to this particular authorization is whether or not it is desirable to spend even \$95,000 at this time for some fanfare up at the Military Academy. I think it might be well to have the membership look at what House Joint Resolution 285 proposes. There was no warning that this particular proposal was coming before the House, so, frankly, I have not had a chance to go over it in detail, and I do not know any more about it than what I can recall at the time it was on the Consent Calendar. But I can remember this, they want \$95,000 to put on a show up at the Military Academy, a show that has no direct reference to our military effort. They want \$95,000 to dress up West Point and have some people up there, dignitaries of one sort or another, or alleged dignitaries, and spend some time and effort and the taxpayers' money to just create some fancy show.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

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

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, who does the gentleman mean by the word "they"? Who is taking on the responsibility for spending this \$95,000? Is it a commission to be appointed, or a body or group of men, to take on this responsibility, or who will have the authority to expend this money and put on this celebration?

Mr. FORD. According to House Joint Resolution 285, on pages 2, 4, and 5 they

set out who are to be members of the commission. They are all distinguished leaders.

Mr. JONAS. It is already provided who the commission shall be?

Mr. FORD. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. That commission will be clothed with the power to expend this \$95,000 and determine the nature and character of the celebration to be put on?

Mr. FORD. There is some very fancy language in here as to what is needed as I why, but it does not make much sense to me.

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

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

Mr. HILLINGS. I might say to the gentleman from Michigan that the subcommittee of which I am a member held hearings on this resolution. We had testimony on it, and explored into the very thing the gentleman has raised by way of question here this morning. The committee unanimously was satisfied that this was for a good and worth-while purpose, that would be of some benefit not only to the educational system but to our military program.

Mr. FORD. Just how will it help the educational system.

Mr. HILLINGS. One of the things this resolution is going to result in is the Conference on Education to be held at West Point for 3 days. It will be attended by approximately 125 representatives of educational institutions, the military, Government, and industry throughout the country.

Mr. FORD. What will they do?

Mr. HILLINGS. This body not so long ago passed a bill appropriating \$56,900,000,000 for military defense purposes. At this very time we are concerned about military defense and about the education of the young men in this country as it affects the military, and vice versa. We ought to give a little bit of attention to the operation of our great military academy on its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary. On that one hundred and fiftieth anniversary we should not only commemorate it, but we should take time to discuss and study our entire system of education at West Point and other military institutions.

Mr. FORD. I think that is a nice explanation, but I should like to know just what they are going to do specifically to solve the educational problems of West Point.

Mr. HILLINGS. I do not believe it is the intention of the resolution to solve the problems of the military educational program in 3 days. Certainly we are not anticipating that the \$56,900,000,000 we spend is going to solve all the military and diplomatic problems of the world. But I do think this is going to help us in not only commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this institution but by giving our educators at West Point and other institutions of similar kind throughout the country a chance to sit down and study the operation of that educational institution. Perhaps as a result of such a study it can be improved. Certainly the recent scandal at West Point has raised in the minds of many people in this country some

questions as to the operation of that educational institution. Perhaps this might help toward meeting some of those problems.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I offered this bill at the behest of the Department of Defense. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and by practically all the executive departments of the Government. Every university that has been in existence for 150 years has had conferences and celebrations of the type that is envisaged by this bill. Certainly it is not going to be a mere show or a jubilee or anything of that sort. There are three or four series of important conferences that will be held, to which will be invited educators, college presidents, and professors from all over the country, so as to spread the good gospel of military training kept within proper channels. Goodness knows we need to spread that good gospel of military training if we are to be the preeminent military nation of the world. I do not believe the gentleman should have any fear that it is going to dwindle into a mere circus or show. The gentleman has only to look at the Members who have been appointed on the commission to be assured that that will not happen.

Mr. FORD. I should like to say that maybe that convinced me it will be a show with fanfare rather than a constructive educational conference.

Mr. CELLER. You have the Chief Justice of the United States and six members to be appointed by him. You have the Speaker of the House and six Members of the House of Representatives. You also have the Governor of New York State, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Staff, United States Army, and so forth. I am sure the gentleman can have confidence in the integrity of purpose of those men. They are not going to let this be a mere circus.

Mr. FORD. I might say to the very distinguished chairman of this committee that I have faith generally in the people he mentions, but they will not be actually managing the show. But that does not tie in with what the gentleman from California said. Certainly, this list of people that you read off are not going up there for 3 days to help develop the educational system of West Point.

Mr. CELLER. They will determine the agenda and the program. It is contemplated that you will have a conference on military education and training. It is contemplated to have a conference on general education to be attended by 125 representatives of educational institutions, government, industry, the military, the press, and the professional foundations, and other groups. There is to be an athletic meeting, which would indicate or help to indicate the prowess of our athletes in this country. I think something like that is quite essential. The cost is practically inconsequential.

Mr. FORD. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that the cost is not inconsequential. Ninety-five thousand dollars, as I recall, will buy quite a bit of military equipment.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I want to say at the outset, I admire the gentleman from Michigan for the vigilant stand that he takes from the standpoint of economy. It is most commendable. I was inclined to go along with the gentleman in this picture. But is this not true, now? Here is an institution which is traditional with the American people. We are celebrating its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary. Having in mind what transpired there recently, and I merely mention it with reference to the cadets there, I have no proof as to who is right or who is wrong—I think this would be the most propitious time to celebrate this one hundred and fiftieth anniversary in the tradition of America to alert the people as to the high ideals and traditions that go with that institution. This is the way it can be done. There is no other way except through the channels we have here, do you not see?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to associate myself with the remarks and sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford]. We, of the Committee on Appropriations, cannot cut down on appropriations if the legislative committees of the Congress continue to authorize more and more expenditures. The celebration may be all right, but I see no reason why it cannot be postponed until after this emergency. Furthermore, all these generals who will go up there to celebrate, have something else more important to do right now.

Mr. FORD. I think the gentleman from New Mexico has made a very excellent point. In fact, the gentleman has made two excellent points. This celebration could well be postponed. We are at war. It seems to me that our generals and military personnel could be better used in the field or in the Pentagon, or at other military stations in order to expedite and promote the successful prosecution of the war.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HILLINGS. I certainly differ with the opinions expressed by the gentleman from New Mexico. I think we are getting to the point in our Congress, and certainly in this session of the Eighty-second Congress where we have appropriated billions and billions of dollars to help the military organizations of foreign countries. Here we are celebrating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of our own great military institution, the United States Military Academy at West Point, and we are so concerned about whether or not it is a good thing to re-

affirm our faith in that fine institution which has done so much to give us military leadership so vitally necessary throughout the world, including men like Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, and General MacArthur. We apparently are not too interested in celebrating this occasion, and doing something for our own academy, but we spend billions of dollars to help supply and honor foreign military organizations.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for the stand he is taking. I think by appropriating this \$95,000, we will be establishing a precedent of underwriting educational meetings and athletic events all over the country.

We well remember 2 years ago that we appropriated—I say we qualifiedly because I voted against it—but there was appropriated by the House of Representatives and by the Congress \$3,000,000 for the sesquicentennial celebration in Washington, which money, of course, came out of the pocketbooks of the taxpayers of this country. I am wondering just how much the people of the State of Michigan and the State of Iowa got out of that \$3,000,000 which was expended here in the sesquicentennial celebration. It is high time we put the brake on this kind of spending.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Michigan will recall that the other day I joined with him in objecting to this particular bill. I did so for a variety of reasons. First of all, I am of the opinion that until the cloud that today is above West Point is dissipated, it would be far better if we did not have such an observance as this, and especially when we take into consideration the fact that we are at war and that we need all the money we have available to buy munitions of war. Everything taken into consideration I think the viewpoint of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] should be upheld and this resolution should be defeated.

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

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

Mr. LANE. May I say to the gentleman, in reply to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. Fernandez] who stated he was a member of the Committee on Appropriations and that it was about time we should stop spending money for such purposes, that on September 14 of this year we had before the House H. R. 5054, a bill making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Resources Board for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. May I call attention to page 29 of that bill, in which we, here in the House, appropriated the \$95,000 that is now being talked about in this debate, for this sesquicentennial to be held at the Military Academy. The House passed that appropriation, and there was no opposition to that item of \$95,000. It went to the other body and it was passed

there, and it has now become legislation. In other words, may I say to my colleague that this bill is simply an authorization bill. The money has been appropriated. It was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Previously the amount asked for was \$140,000. It was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget to \$95,000. Your Committee on Appropriations went over this item, and there was no opposition to it and it has now become the law. We simply seek to have this authorization passed today, because the money has already been appropriated.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] has again expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. I would like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Lane] that the point he makes is one that all of us should remember. We approved a \$56,000,000,000 appropriation bill. We could not see the trees because of the woods. I think that points out a weakness in the procedure of having a \$56,000,000,000 appropriation bill under consideration when you do not have the time or the facilities for knowing all that is in it. If we had had that opportunity, I, for one, would have objected to this item. This is the most direct way in which I can object to the inclusion of that item.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If we did appropriate it we certainly made a mistake and it is high time we corrected it by not authorizing the expenditure.

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

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

Mr. HILLINGS. Is not the gentleman from Michigan a member of the Committee on Appropriations? Did the gentleman raise objection to this item in the appropriation bill?

Mr. FORD. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but at the time the military appropriation bill was approved, I had objected previously on the Consent Calendar to the consideration of the sesquicentennial bill which preceded this resolution. Consequently I did voice my objection in the proper way. In the second place, the Committee on Appropriations should not include unauthorized projects. I was objecting to the authorization legislation then and I am objecting to it now.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wonder if the gentleman from California [Mr. Hillings] expects you to look after the business of the whole House and all the Members? There are some folks who do all the spending and never object. I know the gentleman from Michigan has done a remarkably fine job on that committee.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

In conclusion, I want to say that this proposed fanfare which includes educators meeting for 3 days, and a track meet on one of the days, with the West Point boys against some other institutions of higher learning, is not, in my judgment, the way to spend \$95,000 during the present emergency. Certainly, it is a small item, a mighty small item; but, just the same, I would prefer to see the expenditure of \$95,000 for whatever military equipment can be purchased with that amount of money.

The Romans in the old days, you know, used to put on fantastic celebrations; they had their gladiators running up, down, and around the arenas. We may be doing the same thing in a small way by approving \$95,000 for this celebration. In my estimation this rule ought to be disapproved.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I would like to ask where the Romans are now.

Mr. FORD. I assume everybody knows where they are; certainly that nation fell by the wayside.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH.]

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, although I find myself a bit unhappy to be in opposition to the gentleman from Michigan and some of the other Members of the House. As has been indicated before, this is an authorization bill. The great Committee on Appropriations of the House has already appropriated the funds which would be necessary under this bill. The rule makes in order for consideration the basic legislation to authorize it.

To have this celebration is in accordance with custom and tradition that has been long in effect in America. I am sure that when the University of Michigan reached its one hundredth anniversary there was a great celebration there; I am sure that when the University of Iowa reaches its one hundredth anniversary there will likewise be a celebration there; and the same is true of the great university in New Mexico, and I am hopeful that that will be the case when the Ohio State University reaches its one hundredth anniversary. Harvard, Yale, all those great institutions of higher learning which have furnished us with leaders all through our years have established this fine custom and tradition. At this celebration will be the educational leaders from all over America.

It seems to me that in view of the thousands, millions, and billions of dollars being expended for other purposes, that the \$95,000 which has already been appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations will, by comparison, be well spent, indeed. I hope every Member of the House will support the rule and finally the resolution.

I want to make just one more comment: For a century and a half the Military Academy not only has furnished the military leaders of the Nation but has also furnished many of the business and professional leaders of the Nation. I think this celebration, a review of the

Academy's history and a projection of that which is to come, is justified.

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

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

Mr. LECOMPTE. Why did the gentleman say that when the University of Iowa reaches 100 years? It is more than a hundred years old.

Mr. McCULLOCH. When it reaches 150 years. I am sorry for the error.

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

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

Mr. JONAS. There are already precedents for the gentleman's argument. As I recall, when the West Point Academy was 100 years old there was something done from a national standpoint to impress that very significant event upon the people of the United States by congressional act.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I have a recollection that that was the testimony before the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 44, noes 8.

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

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

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 179, nays 149, not voting 100, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]
YEAS—179

Albert	Corbett	Hale
Anderson,	Cox	Hall, Edwin
Calif.	Crosser	Arthur
Arends	Davis, Tenn.	Eall,
Aspinall	Dawson	Leonard W.
Ayres	DeGraffenried	Harris
Bailey	Denton	Harrison, Va.
Bardeen	Dollinger	Havenner
Beckworth	Dolliver	Heller
Bender	Donohue	Hillings
Bennett, Mich.	Doughton	Hoffman, Ill.
Bentzen	Doyle	Hollifield
Blatnik	Durham	Holmes
Bolton	Eaton	Horan
Bonner	Eberharter	Howell
Boykin	Ellsworth	Hunter
Brehm	Elston	Icard
Brown, Ga.	Evins	Jackson, Wash.
Bryson	Faghan	James
Buchanan	Fenton	Jarman
Burleson	Fine	Jenkins
Burns, Ind.	Flood	Jonas
Burton	Forand	Jones,
Byrne, N. Y.	Ferrester	Hamilton C.
Cannon	Frutier	Jones,
Carlyle	Furcate	Woodrow W.
Carahan	Furedo	Karsten, Mo.
Celler	Gamble	Kee
Chatham	Gary	Kelly, N. Y.
Chitt	Gathings	Kerr
Clemoweth	Gordon	Kilday
Clemente	Graham	Kitwan
Colmer	Greenwood	Klein
Cooley	Gregory	Kluczynski
Cooper	Hagen	Lano

Lanham	O'Brien, Mich.	St. George
Laracade	O'Neill	Sasser
Lesinski	O'Toole	Secrest
Lind	Patman	Sheppard
McCarthy	Patten	Sieminski
McCormack	Philbin	Smith, Va.
McCulloch	Pickett	Springer
McGregor	Poore	Stagers
Machrowicz	Preston	Steed
Madden	Price	Stigler
Mahon	Priest	Tackett
Mansfield	Rabaut	Teague
Martin, Mass.	Radwan	Telfeison
Merrow	Rains	Trimble
Miller, N. Y.	Ramsay	Van Zandt
Mills	Reed, Ill.	Vorys
Mitchell	Rhodes	Walter
Morano	Richards	Weichel
Morgan	Riley	Wickersham
Morris	Rivers	Wier
Morrison	Roberts	Willis
Morten	Robeson	Withrow
Multer	Rodino	Wolverton
Murdock	Rogers, Colo.	Yates
Nicholson	Rogers, Mass.	Zablocki
Norrell	Rogers, Tex.	
O'Brien, Ill.	Sadiak	

NAYS—149

Abernethy	Goodwin	O'Konski
Acifer	Gore	Ostertag
Addonizio	Granahan	Patterson
Allen, Ill.	Grant	Polk
Andersen,	Green	Potter
H. Carl	Gross	Poulson
Andersen,	Halleck	Rankin
August H.	Hand	Reams
Andrews	Harden	Reece, Tenn.
Anfuso	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Auchincloss	Hays, Ohio	Rees, Kans.
Baker	Hedrick	Riehlman
Bakewell	Herter	Saylor
Bates, Mass.	Heselton	Schwabe
Battle	Hill	Scrivner
Beamer	Hinsshaw	Scudder
Belcher	Hovven	Seely-Brown
Bennett, Fla.	Hoffman, Mich.	Shafer
Berry	Hope	Sheehan
Betts	Hull	Simpson, Ill.
Bishop	Jenison	Simpson, Pa.
Buggs, Del.	Jensen	Sittler
Bow	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Kans.
Brownson	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Miss.
Budge	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Buffett	Kearns	Stanley
Burdick	Keating	Sutton
Bush	Kersten, Wis.	Taber
Butler	Kilburn	Talle
Camp	Lantaff	Taylor
Canfield	LeCompte	Thomas
Chipperfield	Lovre	Thompson,
Church	McConnell	Mich.
Cleveland	McGuire	Vail
Cole, Kans.	McKinnon	Van Pelt
Cotton	McMillan	Velde
Crumpacker	McMullen	Versell
Cunningham	McVey	Welch
Curtis, Mo.	Mack, Wash.	Wharton
Curtis, Nebr.	Magee	Wheeler
Davis, Ga.	Marshall	Whitten
Davis, Wis.	Mason	Widnall
Devereux	Mender	Wigglesworth
Dondero	Miller, Md.	Williams, Miss.
Elliott	Miller, Nebr.	Williams, N. Y.
Falcon	Moulder	Wilson, Ind.
Fernandez	Mumma	Wolcott
Fisher	Murray, Tenn.	Wood, Idaho
Ford	Nelson	Woodruff
Fulton	Norblad	Yorty
George	O'Hara	

NOT VOTING—100

Aandahl	Cole, N. Y.	Hays, Ark.
Abbutt	Combs	Hebert
Allen, Calif.	Coudert	Heffernan
Allen, La.	Crawford	Herlong
Arnell	Deque	Hess
Armstrong	Deane	Irvine
Baring	Delaney	Jackson, Calif.
Barrett	Dempsey	Javits
Bates, Ky.	Denny	Johnson
Beall	D'Ewart	Judd
Blackney	Dingell	Kearney
Boggs, La.	Donovan	Kelley, Pa.
Rolling	Dorn	Kennedy
Besore	Engle	Keogh
Bramblett	Fearty	King
Bray	Garmatz	Latham
Brooks	Gavin	Lucas
Brown, Ohio	Golden	Lyte
Buckley	Changer	McDonough
Bushy	Cowan	McGrath
Byrnes, Wis.	Hardy	Mack, Ill.
Case	Harrison, Wyo.	Martin, Iowa
Chudoff	Hart	Miler, Calif.

April 9
1952

Russian Air Force. Without such an Air Force we cannot protect ourselves and certainly we could offer no real protection or assistance to our allies or to our troops overseas.

Mr. Chairman, I sympathize completely with all efforts to save money. I have joined in the billions of dollars in cuts that have already been made in the appropriation bills that have been before us this year, and I have offered several of the amendments. But here we are dealing with American security, of production of jets and bombers, and of personnel to operate them. Let us not be deceived by Russian promises and propaganda and let us not deceive ourselves. We know the soothing words of Stalin are meaningless. We must not relax our efforts or reduce our program that is outlined. We must provide for the 126 groups and then move on to the 143-group program.

This is a time for action—not for talk. We need to get on with the job.

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. FISHER was given to Mr. GORE.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, in 2½ minutes one could hardly touch this subject, so at the outset I want to say that I corroborate fully the statement made by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORR]. I know that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORR] is as familiar with the necessity of the project involved as any Member of the House.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have been deeply interested in the Arnold Engineering Development Laboratory since its inception. I think the issue involved here, however, is not the actual operation in the future of the laboratory, but whether or not we are going to try on the floor of the Congress this company and determine its efficiency. That, I submit, we are not in a position to determine in such a short time. The ARO Co., which has been granted a contract by the Air Force to operate the laboratory, is under a sort of indictment before this House today, without any information from any congressional committee, which gives to the membership the facts involved. The company itself was not asked to appear before any congressional committee, before any agency of this Congress, or the Air Force, to present an answer to any charges made against it.

I am interested in this project. I am interested enough to want to see it continued, without any set-backs. I know the importance of the development of aircraft in this country, both to the military and to commercial aircraft. I want to say to the membership of the House I subscribe 100 percent to the position taken by the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORR] but I happen to have been a mem-

ber of this subcommittee which went into the contractual relations the Air Force has with ARO Corp., and as a result of the hearings, which I attended, on this contract, I firmly believe that the amendment should be defeated and that the committee's decision as set forth in the bill should stand.

The members of the committee should get part 2 of the Department of Defense appropriation hearings for 1953. If you will study those hearings, you will find full support for the abrogation of this contract that the Air Force has with the ARO Corp. You will find that this corporation started out with a capital stock of \$150,000. Not much risk for a guaranteed return. You will find that the people who formed the corporation and obtained the contract are not experts and this is a technical job. You will find in the hearings a memorandum from the Air Force that the decision to give this contract to this company was made by the then Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Symington. You will also find in the hearings that the executive director of the corporation was for some time public relations officer for the Air Force at the time that Mr. Symington was Secretary of the Air Force. Certainly he is no technical expert on aerodynamics. You will also find, although I doubt if this is in the hearings, that the Inspector General investigated the organization for the Armed Forces and made certain recommendations that this contract be revised and that the Air Force itself do much of the job. I understand the General Accounting Office is also investigating this contract.

In conclusion, on the basis of the testimony before the subcommittee, I believe this amendment should be defeated.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the great Air Engineering Development Center is located in the district which I have the honor to represent—the Fifth District of Tennessee—and I should be remiss and derelict in my duty if I did not rise on this occasion to present to the membership of the House any facts and information possible and desired in this connection.

The AEDC itself needs no extended description—the House is well acquainted with this important project, and the purposes for which it is being constructed—namely to put our Nation out front in the field of aeronautical engineering and experimentation.

We know from previous discussion of this project on the floor of the House that when it has been brought to final completion, the AEDC will be one of the greatest achievements of its kind in the world.

The greatness of the undertaking in our defense and the security of our Nation has been indicated by the fact that this center has been named for and dedicated as a memorial to one of the greatest builders of air power in our Nation's history—the late Gen. H. H. "Hap" Arnold.

Construction of this project was started in 1949—I was pleased to be pres-

ent in Tennessee last year when the President dedicated this great center.

In the 2 years since this project has been underway much progress has been achieved. A staff of highly skilled and competent technicians, scientists, and engineers have been recruited.

At the present time, the construction accomplishments may be listed as follows:

First. The engine test facility for testing turbojets and ramjets—that is, very high-powered jets—is proceeding steadily. One unit is expected to be in operation by November of this year.

Second. The rail receiving and shipping facilities have been completed.

Third. The headquarters administrative building is 90 percent complete.

Fourth. The foundation has been set for the propulsion wind tunnel facility and the design completed.

Fifth. The gas dynamics facility is 25 percent complete.

Sixth. Operational units for engine testing are scheduled for May of next year. The complete operational set-up for the propulsion wind tunnel is scheduled for completion in 1958.

The AEDC has been planned by the Air Force for a number of years.

The National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, NACA, has worked with the Research and Development Board of the Air Force and other agencies in developing this unitary wind tunnel plan—unitary to include the Navy, the Air Force, NACA, and others.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is a big project—one in which the people of my district are justly proud and one that affects the safety and security of our country.

There are no facilities to equal this great project unless it is behind the iron curtain.

When this facility is completed, we will have a facility for testing all types of jets and other high-powered planes at supersonic and transonic speeds. This project is designed to put our Nation out front in the field of aeronautical engineering.

It is well known fact that information obtained from the records and personnel of the Germans during and following World War II has been of the greatest assistance in developing this wind tunnel facility which is designed to enable America to test and to build aircraft superior to the Russian MIG's and to insure the maintenance of United States air superiority.

I point these facts out—that this project is important—and to urge that nothing be done here today to impair the growth and usefulness of this center.

I am sure that my friend and esteemed colleague, Congressman Gore, knows that I regard him highly and with much affection and certainly would join with him or other Members of this body in opposing any waste or extravagance in Government where it is shown to exist.

If there is waste or extravagance in this project it should be eliminated.

I trust and urge, however, that no action be taken here today that will jeopardize this great defense project in Tennessee—that no action will be taken

that it surrounds with the safety which Congress demands, the appropriations which the Congress makes. The appropriation is recommended on the basis of categories, so much for runway and apron paving, maintenance and shop facilities, and so forth. There will be no transfers between categories. We did give them the opportunity of transferring 10 percent between commands but within the same category. The names of all the bases on which this money is to be spent in the United States are listed in this report, the committee has been given the location of the bases abroad on which they propose to spend the money, but, of course, those bases are in confidence and cannot be published.

Mr. Chairman, in regard to the Army let me give you some of the principal items which are listed by categories: Research and development, sixty-five and two-tenths million; warehousing and storage, eleven and nine-tenths; maintenance and shops for these new heavy implements of war which are coming off the assembly lines thirty-one and one-tenth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. RILEY. Continuing, permanent barracks, thirty-eight and one-tenth million; anti-aircraft, twenty-five million; land acquisition, eighteen and one-tenth million. This land is largely at Fort Bragg, N. C.; Fort Hood, Tex.; Fort Knox, Ky.; to take care of the longer range artillery which is coming off the lines. We simply must have more land on which to practice with these modern guns.

Expansion of base utilities, sixteen and four-tenths; training facilities, fifteen and four-tenths. A total of \$260,000,000 requested at home and \$393,000,000 requested abroad for the Army.

For the Navy, shipyard facilities, twenty-six and eight-tenths million; fleet facilities, thirty-three and eight-tenths; aviation facilities, one hundred and fifty and two-tenths; supply facilities, thirty-four and eight-tenths; Marine Corps facilities, twenty-four and two-tenths; ordnance facilities, fifty-four and eight-tenths; yards and docks, twenty-three and one-tenth. Zone of the interior, two hundred and sixty-seven million requested; abroad, one hundred and thirty-seven million requested; largely, you see, for storage of fuel, ammunition, and things of that kind, also proper utilities to take care of the great fleet.

In the Air Force will you note that pavements are \$373,000,000. I want to say here that the operation of facilities for all these services must be constructed first and the auxiliary structures secondly. Operational facilities, fuel lines, and so forth, two hundred and six million; housing for troops—no family housing at home but some abroad—one hundred and eighty-one million; maintenance and storage shops, two hundred and eleven and five-tenths million. Zone of the interior, five hundred and sixty million requested; overseas, six hundred and ninety million requested.

We believe, Mr. Chairman, we have brought you a sound justification for the requests of the armed services. We believe we have given them all the money they can properly spend between now and next June. We believe that we are providing for the defense of the United States in its ever expanding defense program and we hope that you will consider favorably the recommendations made by the committee.

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

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

Mr. BROOKS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this would cover all of the money that could be spent between now and next June?

Mr. RILEY. I feel that way, yes.

Mr. BROOKS. That is not the information that I have obtained. As I understand it, in your hearings is a statement that this money will just last until the 1st of March rather than June.

Mr. RILEY. I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana that the lowest estimate we have is that it will last until the 1st of April. I believe the majority of the committee are of the opinion that it will last until June. I do not believe that this money can be properly obligated before June.

Mr. BROOKS. There is a \$550,000,000 cut in the Air Force?

Mr. RILEY. Either a cut or deferment.

Mr. BROOKS. That reduction, as I understood, was put in there with the idea that beginning in the early part of January we could get another appropriation to continue the work in the Air Force, otherwise it will be interrupted.

The gentleman does not share that view though, does he?

Mr. RILEY. The Air Force has unobligated as of June 30, 1952, in round numbers, \$1,500,000,000. This committee is recommending \$1,200,000,000 which would give \$2,700,000,000 to be obligated between now and next June. If the Air Force takes that and does a good job, I will be one of the happiest people in this country.

Mr. BROOKS. I agree with the gentleman in reference to round numbers, but all of it is not for public works. Some of it is for overseas and designated by the Congress, wisely, for certain purposes. But, for your general air program, you really are leaving the matter in shape where we will have to put through a bill early next year, otherwise the air program will be interrupted; is that not true?

Mr. RILEY. I do not think so. If the Air Force finds it is running out of money between now and next April 1 or June 1, this committee will be glad to hear any application that they may make for additional funds.

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

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I want to ask the gentleman whether he has read the last report of the Johnson committee of the other body, dealing with the Air Force. According to that report we are confronted with a very serious situation,

concerning the preparedness of our country.

Mr. RILEY. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that this committee has been making a study of the construction program since early last February. We have had our own hearings, our own testimony, our own investigators in regard to the operations of all the services, including the Air Force.

Mrs. BOLTON. Have you compared the findings with those of the other committee?

Mr. RILEY. We have also read some of the testimony of the Johnson committee, but we believe that our testimony is fully as adequate as theirs.

Mrs. BOLTON. And your testimony is available, is it?

Mr. RILEY. Yes. Most of the hearings have been published, and are available if the gentlewoman cares to read them.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. Chairman, my remarks will be confined to the emergency agencies which comprise chapter 10 of the bill. The portion of the bill to which I will refer begins on page 37 and extends through page 42, and in the committee report it begins on page 60 and runs through page 66.

The emergency agencies subcommittee took the following action which I think the Committee of the Whole should understand. I would first like to refer to the action which was taken in reference to the Defense Production Administration. We made a cut of 21 percent in the budget request for this particular agency. For the Defense Transport Administration the subcommittee has recommended a cut of 12 percent.

For the Small Defense Plants Administration we have made a rather minor reduction totaling 16 percent.

For the Federal Security Agency the reduction totals 26 percent.

For the Department of Agriculture the reduction is 33½ percent.

For the Department of Commerce the reduction is 28 percent. Dollarwise it is \$10,000,000.

For the Department of the Interior the reduction is 37 percent below the budget request, a dollar reduction of \$1,500,000.

The Department of Justice has received a reduction percentagewise of 59 percent, a reduction dollarwise totaling \$125,000.

The Department of Labor has a percentage reduction of 16 percent. Dollarwise that amounts to \$550,000.

Out of the funds requested totaling \$61,610,000 our subcommittee has recommended funds totaling \$44,190,000 a total dollar reduction of \$17,420,000 a percentagewise reduction of 28 percent.

You will find that in the bill there are certain omissions, omissions which I think are legitimate, at this point, anyhow. The committee did not take any action on the budget request for the Economic Stabilization Agency and all of its component parts. The Economic Stabilization Agency requested \$103,250,000 for the next fiscal year. That is an

increase of about \$2,500,000 over the current fiscal year. In other words, the Economic Stabilization Agency, despite their own admission that their job is not quite as all-encompassing as it has been, wants the Congress to increase the funds for the coming fiscal year. This point of view is a little ridiculous, in my judgment.

The committee has not made any recommendation concerning this agency because at the time we marked up the bill the Defense Production Act had not as yet been approved in the House of Representatives. It is my understanding that the House will not include any amount for this agency in this bill. When the appropriation bill goes to the Senate they can put in what they see fit and we can adjust it in conference.

Let me give you a situation, however, which points out the ridiculousness of some of the budget requests, that come before the Committee on Appropriations. Last year for the Economic Stabilization Agency the budget requested \$143,430,000. Mr. Charles Wilson, Mr. Eric Johnston, and Mike DiSalle all came up and pleaded with the committee for \$143,430,000. The Congress finally approved for those agencies that are part of the Economic Stabilization Agency \$100,553,375. In other words, we cut that appropriation almost \$43,000,000. Yet in the testimony that was taken by our committee this year on their budget request for the next fiscal year practically every agency admitted they had enough money to do the job that was assigned to them. It just points out the complete ridiculousness of the Bureau of the Budget request for this kind of agency.

I should like to turn for just a minute to the budget request that was submitted for the Office of Price Stabilization. As I indicated, we are not including any funds in this bill for this agency. Nevertheless, I think you should know what the Bureau of the Budget requested.

The Bureau of the Budget has suggested that Congress approve for OPS for the next fiscal year \$68,420,000. They want 12,741 permanent positions for OPS. That is slightly less dollarwise than the Congress approved for OPS last year. The budget this year for OPS totaled \$69,430,000 for 13,131 permanent positions.

I am sure everyone thinks OPS has had too much money and too many jobs, but let me show you some factual evidence which will substantiate that statement and that belief.

The House Committee on Appropriations in January and February of this year undertook investigations of the operations of four district offices of the OPS—one in Grand Rapids, Mich., one in Atlanta, Ga., one in Birmingham, Ala., and one at Omaha, Nebr. Following local complaints I requested the investigation of the Grand Rapids office, which is in my district. Here is a copy of the investigation. It is most revealing. It shows without question of doubt that there is substantial overstaffing and there is extreme duplication. In addition the various investigations point out that we ought to cut out all regional offices for the OPS. There is no need

for any continuation of the 14 regional offices throughout the United States for OPS. I cannot tell you how much money they involve, but the reports made by our investigators, the investigators for the Committee on Appropriations, indicate clearly that there is little need for any of the regional offices. These four investigations further show that there could be at least a 50-percent reduction in the appropriations for OPS generally. Conditions in OPS have been very bad for the past year with a budget of \$69,430,000. One wonders how much worse it would have been if the Congress had approved the budget request of \$105,500,000.

I respectfully request that you turn to the emergency agency hearings. I think they start at page 439 of that particular volume. During the hearings the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and I interrogated Mr. Putman and Mr. Arnall throughout these hearings you will see without any doubt whatsoever that that agency, the Economic Stabilization Agency and its component parts is greatly overstaffed. It has received for the past fiscal year altogether too much money, and it is my hope in conference, we will be able to reduce substantially the funds for the coming fiscal year for all agencies that come under Mr. Putnam's jurisdiction.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I do not know if you found in your investigations that they have a great number of people employed, sort of public relations people, to go out and sell the idea of the beauty and benefits of this OPS. I know that is being abused in my own State of Illinois. I know that from my own personal knowledge.

Mr. FORD. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois, there is no doubt that the numerous information officers have not been doing the job that they should have been doing, instead they have been going out throughout the length and breadth of the land trying to sell the need and necessity for the continuation of OPS.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the building up of the Armed Forces of this Nation to the point where we can adequately defend ourselves in the Communist world of today, and to protect this Nation for future generations, I want to call to the attention of the committee a few facts which I have prepared, which have appeared in the public press and on the radio concerning the conduct of this Nation in carrying on the Korean meat-grinding operation. Along with other Americans, I am continually amazed, shocked, infuriated, disgusted, and now am contemptuous of the criticism leveled at

this Nation by members of the United Nations for the manner in which we are conducting the meat-grinding operations in Korea. At this time the Department of Defense admits officially—and I speak on my own responsibility because I have not cleared this with the Department of Defense and do not propose to—they admit at least 100,000 of the flower of American youth have been wounded or killed or are missing in this questionable conflict. At this time \$400,000,000 are being spent monthly, and over \$7,000,000,000 have been spent on the Korean war.

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

Mr. RIVERS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Does the gentleman from South Carolina appreciate the fact that the casualties he refers to are only the battle casualties in Korea, and the casualties off of the front are more than that?

Mr. RIVERS. I am not at all surprised.

America has furnished over 93 percent of all the air power in Korea, over 85 percent of all the naval support in Korea. It has financed—that is a very sensitive term; that is the most sensitive nerve in your body—has financed over 90 percent of all the United Nations in Korea; has over 50 percent of all the ground troops in Korea; and to make things even more alarming, of the 17 United Nations in Korea or represented on the peninsula, 15 of the nations contribute only 10 percent or less of the ground troops on that peninsula. The South Koreans who live there did not have any place else to go. They are fighting for their homes. I do not blame them, and they did a pretty good job. We financed them. There was nobody else to finance them. They contributed roughly 41 percent of all the troops in Korea. Those two countries, South Korea and the United States, contributed over 91 percent of all the ground troops in that part of the world. The rest of them, and I will name them, Britain, Luxemburg, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Greece, New Zealand, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, have provided 1.56 percent of the ground troops.

Incidentally, the other day the Prime Minister of Canada did not like the fact that some Canadians were sent to Koje to try to preserve order. He complained to Truman. I do not know why he did not complain to the United Nations.

Then we get down to Great Britain. They contributed 3.69 percent—less than 3 3/4 percent of the ground troops in Korea.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is talking my language.

Mr. RIVERS. Any old port in a storm.

Mr. GROSS. I am not going to knock him off the track when he talks that way. I saw figures the other day

appropriations. If it can be done, fine. I hope it can be done, but, if it cannot, why, we will be confronted here with a deficiency appropriation and not a supplemental appropriation. It certainly is worth while to see if it can be done. If it can be absorbed, it should be absorbed. But, if it cannot be absorbed, then later we obviously will be required to make direct appropriations to carry out these authorizations. But it is worth while giving it an honest trial. For that reason, I am supporting wholeheartedly the committee's position with reference to the transfer of the money from existing appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have been somewhat intrigued by the comments of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, minority ranking member of the Military Subcommittee on Appropriations and the followup made by the very distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services.

I think a careful and somewhat unbiased analysis of whether or not this is the consideration of the Truman budget, at least as far as the military is concerned, would reveal several important factors which I believe effectively indicate that we are considering a Truman budget.

First, if you go down the list of the statutes causing the money requests in this bill you will find, I think, in the hearings before the respective legislative committees that in most cases the legislation was affirmatively approved or recommended by the previous administration. Let us take them one by one.

As to the increase in military pay, I think President Truman sent a favorable message to the 82d Congress and I believe his spokesmen came before the Committee on Armed Services advocating the enactment of a military pay-increase bill.

Second, I believe the only exception is the combat-duty pay. It is my recollection that the Department of Defense, speaking for President Truman, went on record before the Committee on Armed Services opposed to combat-duty pay.

Third, as to the mustering-out payments, it is my recollection that the Bureau of the Budget submitted to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs a recommendation for a GI bill which included a mustering-out pay provision.

Fourth, as to uniform allowances, it is my recollection that the previous administration did recommend legislation likewise.

Further, I do not recall any veto by Mr. Truman on any of the aforementioned measures. If he was opposed to them he could have exercised his veto prerogative. Finally, in House Document No. 62, which encompasses all of these supplemental appropriations, the funds themselves were requested by President Truman.

Do not take my previous statements as any indication that Congress should have a clear conscience. I might say, that oftentimes we, the House and the Senate, pretty sadly and rather illogically

abandon our responsibilities on legislation. I think as to some of the legislation I have mentioned, that the distinguished gentleman from Texas has mentioned, and that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia has mentioned, we should have taken a little more time in their consideration.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. If this administration wants to proceed with a Truman budget rather than work out a budget of its own, I think it certainly has a right to adopt the Truman budget. But my point is, I think Congress, the Members on the Republican side and those on the Democratic side of the House, are entitled to know whether the administration now in power, and the Republican administration is in power in the White House and in Congress, is for or against the budget estimates being considered in this bill. That is the only thing I want to know. The Congress and the country are entitled to know. I am not clear on it. I believe the present administration is for the budget estimates which are before us in this measure, but I cannot actually prove it. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. FORD. As far as I know, but I will say to the gentleman from Texas that I do not know whether or not this budget has been approved by the new administration. I do not think they are objecting to any of the reductions which have been made by the House Committee on Appropriations or any reductions we make on the floor of the House.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. But there is at stake here more than a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money. In the name of forthrightness and good faith should not the administration tell us whether or not it has approved and does approve of this proposed huge expenditure of the taxpayers' money? Should we be left on the sidelines with no information and recommendation from the party now in power?

Mr. FORD. In the Army section alone these four statutes caused President Truman to request an expenditure of \$181,300,000 for pay and allowances; for combat-duty pay \$153,400,000; for mustering-out payments \$373 million; and for uniform allowances \$514 million. A total of \$708,214,000 just for the Army alone as a result of legislation which the preceding Congress approved in the dying days of the last session. I wish to say this in defense of the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense, in my judgment, has cooperated since January 20 in trying to seek the means and methods by which they could absorb some of the added costs which the Congress placed on them in the last session. I hope that attitude on the part of the Department of Defense prevails in the months ahead. I believe it will. With such cooperation by all in the executive branch of the Government, plus real economy efforts by the Congress, I believe a tax-reduction bill can be approved by the House and Senate in this session.

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

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed surprised that the House Appropriations Committee comes before us today with a proposal that places the United States Government in the untenable position of repudiating its obligations to more than 2,300 communities in this Nation. By omitting school funds under the Federal program of financing school services in areas of heavy Government defense projects the committee does just that.

In the early days of the New Deal when President Roosevelt took the Nation off the gold standard I am reminded of the time when that great Virginia Democrat, the Honorable Carter Glass, took the Senate floor, pulled a \$5 bill from his pocket, and in that scathing biting voice so familiar to the Senate, took the Government to task for depreciating the currency and the savings of the people. My own party applauded his action.

Yet today some members of my party come forward with a proposal which would likewise compel the Government to ignore its obligations. Uncle Sam is obligated by the past action of Congress to come to the assistance of schools located in certain specified areas and under certain specified conditions. These more than 2,300 communities including those in my own district in Virginia meet those specified conditions. Yet my colleagues from the House Appropriations Committee say that regardless of this previous commitment of Congress these communities shall be denied funds which rightfully belong to them. When I say the funds rightly belong to them it is an understatement of fact. These school funds are only a portion of the funds that rightfully belong to them.

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

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Would the gentleman inform the House, or the committee rather, what the vote was in committee on this proposal?

Mr. BROYHILL. I do not know, sir. Mr. BOGGS. Can the gentleman find out from the committee?

Mr. BROYHILL. Can anyone tell me what the vote was or can anyone tell the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. CANFIELD. Why does the gentleman not ask the ranking Member, the former chairman of the committee?

Mr. BOGGS. Will the gentleman yield further so that I may ask that question?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. The Chairman is the head of the committee. I suggest that the gentleman address that question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BOGGS. Is this a state secret? Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Does the gentleman have any information as to what the vote was in the committee?

Mr. BROYHILL. No, I do not. I am not concerned with what the vote was. I am concerned with the committee's report.

refused to go along. In digging into this vocational education program I find that the military are setting up vocational schools all over the country, although facilities already exist in our public school systems, our private vocational schools, and our industrial schools. It is complete duplication and a costly duplication. The military are not educators or trainers and they ought to get out of the business except that which pertains strictly to military training.

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

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Does not the gentleman feel that this may be the first step in the Army drive for UMT again?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I certainly do, and I again want to commend the gentleman for bringing the matter up, although I cannot agree with going along for more money.

Mr. YATES. The reason for my asking for additional funds is the fact that had I sought to do it any other way, it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I endorse the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I think the junior ROTC is a definite asset to our Military Establishment and a wonderful training organization for high-school boys. I do not believe that any Member of this House wants to see the junior ROTC disturbed in any manner. I am certain that there are few Members of the House who knew that there was a step afoot to eventually destroy this program.

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

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, our distinguished committee chairman.

Mr. SHORT. I want to simply say, Mr. Chairman, that I am heartily in accord with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I think it has much merit. If the armed services had paid attention to carry out the clear intent of the Congress relative to the ROTC and our Reserve forces, there would not be this continuous drive for UMT.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from Missouri, my distinguished chairman.

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

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

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for the sound and sensible stand he is taking on this issue. Probably we who come from the larger areas, like the city of Chicago, where we have great institutions of learning, and who are going to have a great many ROTC units, realize more than they do in any other section of the country the necessity for maintaining the original personnel instead of cutting them down like they have done in this bill. I support the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Emphasizing what the gentleman from Illinois said, Lane Tech-

nical High School in Chicago has an ROTC unit of 700 students, and under the revised Army program today there is one sergeant in charge of that magnificent establishment. I think this amendment must be approved.

Mr. PRICE. I think the gentleman from Illinois is absolutely right. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be adopted.

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

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, because I have personally observed the great benefits accruing to the boys who had the opportunity to be trained in ROTC units in several high schools in California, together with the fact that I have personally observed over a term of years great resulting benefits from the presence and activities of ROTC units in the same high schools to the community at large; and, because such result to the individual concerned as well as to the total high school populations and to the communities involved, naturally resulted in great good to our Nation, I therefore, gladly support the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Why any segment of our total Military Establishment would these days, seek to cut down the number of ROTC units in our high schools, when they have so recently strenuously advocated universal military training, appears to me inconsistent and poorly conceived. Granting that they have said that they do not have trained officers to allocate to these ROTC units, yet, Mr. Chairman, I ask if there is any more important segment of our male youth population to be trained in a preliminary way, as is that segment of youth which is in the last 2 years of our senior high schools? But, because the Army has apparently taken their present position to delete a considerable number of high school ROTC's for the reasons that they claim they cannot spare the number of suitable trained officers for such work, I believe it is in the interest of our national security and defense that we add this \$2 million to the budget so that our Defense Department can obtain either Active or Reserve Army personnel to furnish this strategic and essential training supervision for these American lads.

I am pleased to see that my distinguished Armed Services Committee chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] on the Republican side of this House, also advocates this increase as represented by the Yates amendment.

May I again urge that these high school ROTC units are very essential and very valuable in the total scheme of our national military preparation, for our own national defense against Communist military aggression when and if it comes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I relate that I also regret that there are not more of the 1,400 junior and senior colleges in the United States who have the benefits

of the college ROTC units. There are only about 450 American junior and senior colleges, I am informed, which do have the ROTC units.

Being fully aware as I am, that the policy of the present administration recites that it does not authorize the establishment of ROTC units in junior colleges for the reason, it is said, that they do not have sufficient money nor personnel to establish these units in the total number of 1,400 colleges not now having them, I also emphasize in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that here again in my judgment, is a very serious error; as it relates to our total national defense and security against any potential military aggressor.

I understand that about 50 percent of the students graduating from junior colleges in the United States continue on to undertake studies in our senior colleges and that about only 40 percent who attend senior college actually graduate. This and other factors, I recognize, may be a serious attrition percentage, between the freshmen who enter the senior college grades and those who graduate therefrom. Naturally, therefore, the Department of the Army now claims that its policy of not establishing ROTC units in junior colleges is justified.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge and emphasize that it be duly recognized, that it is ultimately far better to have students in our senior high schools and in our junior and senior colleges obtain as much of their military training as possible at the time they are in their respective high school or college grades or in connection with their usual high school and college attendance. This policy, even though it may cost considerable more money in the long run, I believe is sensible and sound.

Time does not permit me here this morning to state that there is, of course, a serious impact upon educational institutions which do not have an ROTC unit as compared with those that do. So I recommend that as our Military Establishment proceeds in consideration of its basic policy that it review the same as relates to ROTC units in our senior high schools and also in our junior and senior college educational institutions. Let us not miss the boat in these areas of looking after our national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in my statement in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, I do not mean to cast any disparaging remarks concerning the junior ROTC program. It is simply a practical matter—where do we get the most results for the money spent. The Army has in its overall reserve program four different component programs. They have the regular reserve program, they have the senior college program, they have the first 2-year-college program, and then they have the junior- or high-school program.

The Army under the present strength setup has just so many officers and enlisted men they can assign to this type of a program, and the Army has to make a decision as to whether or not they get the most value out of assigning these

people to the regular reserve program, which is an important part of our reserve-training setup, or whether they should assign their training personnel, officers and enlisted men, to a high-school-student group.

It is the considered opinion of the Army that they get more value for the defense of the country out of the assignment of their training personnel to the reserve program as such, the senior-college program and the first 2-year-college program. They feel they must assign their officer and enlisted strength to those particular programs.

The Army has its problem. They have so many officers and so many enlisted men. The Congress demands that they keep up their combat strength. If you do that, you have to have some reductions along the line elsewhere. We believe, based on the Army's presentation, that if they make the proper allocations we can get adequate officer and enlisted personnel in these various junior-high-school programs.

I have talked with the gentleman from Illinois about it, and I think that the Army has unfairly treated the city of Chicago in the allocation of the officers and enlisted men to this program. I have assured him, as he well knows, that I will work with him in trying to get from the Army a more realistic assignment. If we approach it that way, rather than adding dollars, I think we can achieve success.

One more thing. There is a technical objection to the gentleman's amendment. Actually this place in the bill is not the proper place for more money for more officers and enlisted men for this program. The pay of the Army is in the first paragraph of the Department of the Army section, so that in reality this amendment should come in the part relating to military personnel, Army.

In closing, let me reemphasize and reiterate one point. The Army feels, as we brought out in the testimony on page 417, that the Army is not getting the maximum value out of this program. The Army supplies the personnel for the training, the Army pays the bill, but a large percentage of those who get the training eventually go into the Navy or into the Air Force. The Army believes that this should be a servicewide supported program and not a charge against the Army as such.

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

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

Mr. YATES. With reference to what the gentleman has stated about the Army position that its college programs are more important, we know there are many high-school boys who do not go to college and they should be given the opportunity to have additional training, such as that offered by the high-school ROTC program. Second, when the Army talks about the fact that it does not have sufficient personnel, let me refer the gentleman to the Army Times of September 27, 1952—I think the gentleman from Florida spoke about it yesterday—which stated that the Army is cutting back its OCS schools so that the Army itself is

depriving itself of the officers who could logically go into this program.

Mr. FORD. We are cutting back our OCS programs because we now have an even flow of officers coming from our various training programs. We have built up to where we can actually produce officers at the required rate.

In conclusion, let me say again that the Army feels that in this program they are not getting the best value for the dollar expended, when you compare it with the regular Reserve Corps, when you compare it with the college Reserve training program, and when you compare it with the first 2-year-college-training program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 29, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, ARMY

For necessary expenses of basic and applied scientific research, evaluation, and development, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease and operation of facilities and equipment, not otherwise provided for; \$345 million, to remain available until expended.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NELSON: On page 13, line 19, at the end of the sentence add the following new sentence to the paragraph: "No part of any funds herein appropriated shall be used to maintain or aid in maintaining a tire-testing facility for any of the technical services of the Army at any place within or without the continental limits of the United States either directly or in collaboration with any other department or agency of the Government or with any private concern."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON] is recognized in support of his amendment.

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

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I have consulted with the gentleman from Maine, and I think he has also consulted with the ranking minority Member, the distinguished gentleman from Texas. Inasmuch as this amendment conforms to the committee recommendation as expressed on page 27 of the committee report, we have no objection to the inclusion of this language in the bill.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Activities of the Committee on Armed Services.

This committee has without much fanfare been devoting a great deal of time to investigations of various phases of procurement by each branch of the armed services in an effort to eliminate waste and extravagance.

Some time ago it completed an investigation of a tire-testing station at

Camp Bullis, Tex., which has been operated by the Army in conjunction with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The operation of this station cost over \$2 million in 1953 and was estimated to cost more in 1954. The tests conducted at this station exactly duplicate similar tests conducted by private industry on tires furnished to the Army and to the Government, whose performance is guaranteed by the private industry furnishing them. But as is usual, it is not a duplication but an embellishment. Where a private manufacturer for similar test purposes employs 99 people, the Government at Camp Bullis was employing 284.

Upon recommendation of our subcommittee, the Appropriations Committee, on page 27 of its report directs that the Army cease using appropriated funds for this purpose. It is the thought of our subcommittee that the Army should be specifically directed by law not to use any of its funds for this purpose, either at Camp Bullis or anywhere else within or outside the continental United States. It is for this purpose that the amendment is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 13, line 18, strike out "\$345,000,000" and insert "\$370,000,000."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment proposes to restore to the bill the amount requested by the administration in its revised 1954 budget for research and development on the part of the Army. Mr. Chairman, in order to economize on the time of the House, I would like to say that if this amendment should carry, I would propose to offer similar amendments to other sections of the bill which relate to research and development in order to restore those amounts to the amounts for that purpose requested by the administration. It would in total mean a restoration of \$107,400,000 which is the aggregate of the amounts cut by the committee in the items for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and would result in restoring the bill in respect to research and development to the budget amounts requested by the administration.

Mr. Chairman, the fundamental argument in this is twofold. First, we are all thoroughly aware of the critical importance of the whole research and development program to the future of our country in terms of our own national security. This, too, is one area in which the rivalry is tremendous between ourselves and the Soviet Union and in which we have to be extremely alert and do an outstanding job.

Mr. Chairman, when one looks at the various projects—and I have tried to read into the situation—which are being worked on by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and find that they include, among many other major headings, guided missiles, surface to surface in the Army; guided missiles for defense

and attack in the Air Force; rockets of various kinds in the Army; combat armor in the Army; treatment of casualties in the ground forces; and, of course, innovations in the whole field of jet-propelled aircraft one realizes the critical importance of this whole situation.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, involves a fundamental question of policy. It is perfectly true that the committee could differ with the administration upon what it will allow in this highly important field of research and development. I may say the administration itself cut \$270 million out of the aggregate research and development program for all of the armed services from the amount recommended by the Truman administration—cut it down from one billion and seven hundred plus millions of dollars to \$1,500,000,000 in round figures. The committee will tell you, and it is quite true, that there are indirect items contained in this appropriation bill which will make the aggregate figure for research and development roughly \$2 billion. The committee has cut items of approximately \$910 million, which can be identified in the bill, by \$107 million, so you have something over a 10-percent cut in the bill in the specific research and development items. I think this involves the fundamental principle for those of us who have decided we will go ahead and back the administration in its complete package for the national security of the country, that we should stand up for the administration's program to the letter, and, therefore, restore the items of the administration's request which have been stricken out, such as this one.

If we are going to take the arguments as to the administration's position in respect to the cut of the aircraft figures, then let us at least stick by the administration in all of its recommendations as to what it thinks is necessary on research and development. If you want the administration to carry the responsibility of its budget requests, give it the authority.

This is the first instance, so far in this bill, where the House is being asked to restore a figure to exactly what the administration asked for in its so-called 1954 version.

I should like to read what the Chairman of the Research and Development Board, which handles the coordination and advisory end of this program for all of the armed services, had to say. He is Dr. Whitman, a very distinguished scientist, and a leader in this whole field; and, as I say, the head of the Research and Development Board of the Defense Administration.

Based upon full consideration of the evaluation of the threat of foreign aggression, it is my conviction that we can secure technical superiority in weapons and techniques in order to offset the great numerical superiority of our probable enemies, and from my knowledge of the research and development programs for military purposes, I sincerely believe that any marked reduction in the research and development fund would gravely compromise the security of the Nation.

I emphasize those words, "would gravely compromise the security of the Nation."

When you look at the committee report and see why the committee made the cuts—and we understand the anatomy of committees in this House only too well—they made the cuts apparently because their general reaction was that the item ought to be cut down somewhat. They say so in practically so many words on page 26 of the committee report under the heading "Research and Development" relating to the Army. This is what they say:

The committee recommendation is based on a number of general reactions obtained during the hearings on this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to do it, but I am constrained to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. Mr. JAVITS. The amount involved in the last amendment adopted as to tire testing was only \$500,000 so that we should not be confined by that on the amendment I offer.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has offered an amendment to increase the funds to be appropriated for research and development for the Department of the Army. If you will listen for a minute you will see the sound reasons why our subcommittee did take such action in making the recommendation of \$345 million for research and development for the Army for the fiscal year 1954.

As of June 30, 1953, the research and development program for the Department of the Army will have \$39,875,000 which they have not obligated, much less spent. This figure of \$39,875,000, which they have not obligated as of June 30, does carry over into the fiscal year 1954. That figure was not anticipated to be as large at the time the revised budget was submitted to the Congress.

In addition to the unobligated funds, the research and development program for the Department of the Army has \$437 million unexpended. That is considerably more than the figure they requested for the fiscal year 1954.

I repeat again two figures: The research and development program, Department of the Army, has unobligated \$39,875,000; and they have unexpended \$437 million.

Our committee during the testimony on this program was presented with an excellent group of witnesses by General Nichols and his staff. They did an outstanding job in explaining to the subcommittee what the research and development program of the Department of the Army was trying to do. Not one member of our committee wants to hurt or harm in any way whatsoever any of the worthwhile research and development programs.

We cut the program only 6.8 percent, and our reductions are explained in the

committee report. But let me give you several specific examples. I refer to page 1546 of the committee hearings where the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] brought this point up and I am quoting:

Mr. SIKES. Here is something from the personnel research section of the research and development progress report under subtask 5 entitled, "A Method for Synthesis of Factor Analysis Studies." It states here:

"The technique of factor analysis is a widely used and important research tool aimed at giving a better understanding of the underlying abilities that personnel tests measure. In the area of test construction and administration, the method of factor analysis can be used to answer the question: How many traits, or abilities—or for convenience, factors—are measured by a given test or set of tests? Such information is used in improving the effectiveness of tests and test batteries. To date the technique of factor analysis has been developed to produce this information for the tests used in only one study at a time."

I repeat that our committee felt that the research and development program of the Department of the Army could do away with some of this kind of research.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. It is perfectly all right for the gentleman to quote me as saying that I still do not know what it means.

Mr. FORD. It was the consensus of the other members of the committee along with the gentleman from Florida that we did not understand the explanation.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman say it is a standard of judgment for the Congress on research and development that the committee must understand the project before it can approve it?

Mr. FORD. We think they ought to be able to supply the committee with some kind of an explanation that ordinary people can understand.

Mr. JAVITS. I think that is normally true; but at the same time I do not think that in a highly technical research and development program you can set as a standard of judgment the proposition that nonscientists should understand a scientific subject.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title III of the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there amendment to title III?

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself briefly to a portion of House Report

your views, certainly, but I do not happen to agree with all of them.

Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. As I heard the gentleman read the letter, it seems to me the President said he reviewed it personally.

Mr. SCRIVNER. He did.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And he approved of it, and the National Security Council also checked this budget.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. And they checked the forces and the figures contained in it and approved of it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, sir; and he discussed it with the Secretary of Defense, and officials in the Defense Department, certainly.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. So that it could not be said that it was written by one man or Secretary Wilson or anybody in some exclusive way and in a vacuum so to speak.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Of course it was not, and the gentleman from Texas realizes that.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. VURSELL. Is it fair to assume that the National Security Council and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense, and all of them including President Eisenhower with his vast military experience, after they have passed on it, that the Congress should take their advice rather than the advice of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. SCRIVNER. I am perfectly content to follow their advice.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I decline to yield further at this time.

As I have said, I have perfect reliance upon the integrity, patriotism, the intimate military knowledge of the President of the United States. When he says he is acquainted with the details of this budget, and he has accepted it, and it is his, I am satisfied thoroughly, and I accepted it as President Eisenhower's budget.

In that same hearing in 1950, General Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff, who is now asking us to take his version of the budget, and add \$1.1 billion more than President Eisenhower has requested, said this:

The amount of money that should be allocated to the Air Force for its part of national defense is the responsibility of a higher echelon than the Chief of Staff.

If it was true then, it is true today.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman quoted from General Vandenberg. Let me quote him a while. General Vandenberg said:

It is the job of my civilian superiors and the Congress to balance military needs against other national needs. In that balancing process, we military leaders have

neither the responsibility, the training, nor the staff to engage. It is simply out of our province.

This is still General Vandenberg talking:

Therefore, I desire to make it a matter of record that, of course, I support wholeheartedly whatever decision may finally be made as to the money allocated to the Air Force. It then becomes our job after the appropriation of this money to obtain the best defense possible with that money.

I repeat that is General Vandenberg's testimony.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to appear to be heckling the gentleman from Kansas because I have no such desire. I think it is true it is up to the civilians in the Government to determine what the figure shall be. It is up to the military to measure the strength required. If we can get the 143 wings for much less money, it is up to us to get it. But the strength is the thing the military men should recommend.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Let these new Chiefs of Staff work on this awhile. Let them come up with the answer, and whatever they come up with, I shall go along with the gentlemen, if it is anywhere near reasonable.

General Bradley is quite often quoted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. General Bradley has always said, and did then, that by the elimination of bad practices in the military services, we could save a lot of money. He said:

We must not destroy our country and its strength by spending too much from year to year.

General Bradley said that we must not throw this country into economic collapse and spoil its industrial potential. He emphasized the point that it was the President and Congress and not the military that was to determine how much economic conditions should govern. Mr. SYMINGTON also said that destruction through economic chaos could be as bad as destruction in battle, and he stated, finally, that it was beyond the scope of the Air Force responsibility or authority to decide how much money should be appropriated or how it should be allocated between the services.

EISENHOWER PROGRAM

More recently, before the junior chamber of commerce, as you can read in the hearings, President Eisenhower said:

I wish to speak simply of two of these truths. The first is this: Our military strength and our economic strength are truly one, and neither can sensibly be purchased at the price of destroying the other. * * *

The defense against this peril then must be carefully planned and steadfastly maintained. It cannot be a mere repetition of today's reflex to yesterday's crisis. It cannot be a thing of frenzies and alarm. It must be a thing of thought and order and efficiency.

Precisely such a defense is now being built for our country. I personally believe it does several things. It soberly promises more efficient military production. It realistically assesses our long-term economic capacity. It demands the elimination of luxury, waste, and duplication in all military activity. And

it allocates funds as justly and wisely as possible among the three armed services.

First. We must remember always that reasonable defense posture is not won by juggling magic numbers, even with an air of great authority. There is no wonderfully sure number of planes or ships or divisions—or billions of dollars—that can automatically guarantee security. The most uncompromising advocates of such magic numbers have themselves changed their calculations almost from year to year. Such changes are reasonable, as technological advance requires. But the insistence that the latest change is final, definitive, and unchallengeable—that is not reasonable.

Second. We must remember that all our plans must realistically take account—not just this year but every year—of colossal and continuing technological change. We are living in a time of revolution in military science. Today 25 aircraft equipped with modern weapons can in a single attack visit upon an enemy as much explosive violence as was hurled at Germany by our entire air effort throughout 4 years of World War II.

Mr. Eisenhower is consistent, as a general, as a retired officer, and as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. His views on a healthy balance between military and economic strength are the same.

Others might do well to be consistent, too.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, this is a sound program. It is a program that will give us a strong defense without further weakening us financially. It is a program we can carry, though with difficulty, until we can have greater assurance of peace. It is a program that permits a new look at the defense program and forces in this age of astoundingly rapid atomic development. It is a program for an adequate national defense, with reduced spending, based on elimination of waste, luxury, and duplication; realistic procurement; proven business practices and sound business economy.

It is a program recommended by President Eisenhower, whose military judgment is based on sound and varied experience of many years, in many capacities, including serving as Supreme Commander of the Allied Forces in Europe in World War II, and as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is a program that we have to support, because it is based upon facts and not upon a fictional magic number. The choice is yours to make. Will you choose Vandenberg's mythical wings or President Eisenhower's real combat-ready wings?

Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], who is chairman of the Army subcommittee of the Military Appropriations Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman from Kansas has consumed an hour and 40 minutes and the gentleman from Texas 45 minutes.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in presenting the Army portion of the military appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1954 I shall try to approach the various problems candidly and as unemotionally as possible. I am delighted to present this part of the budget to the Committee as the unanimous report from our sub-sub-

committee or Army section of the full Military Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

It has been an extreme pleasure for me to participate in these long and complicated hearings and to work on this part of the bill in detail. We have a sub-subcommittee of three members. One of the three is the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER], a man who has contributed immeasurably to our work because of his long experience as a member of the Army in World Wars I and II. Another superb member of our sub-subcommittee and the minority member is the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], who had in previous years been chairman of the group. His long experience in this field, his vast knowledge, and his great analytical ability were invaluable to the work of the committee. It has been a pleasure and honor for me to be chairman of this fine team.

It would also be unforgivable on my part if I did not congratulate and give due recognition to the subcommittee clerk, Bob Michaels. His fine ability, his great energy, and his analytical talent have been most helpful to our group.

The revised budget was developed and presented by the Army under the new Secretary, Mr. Robert Stevens at a time when the Army was in a period of transition from the previous administration, to the new one. In my opinion the new Secretary of the Army has done a magnificent job in handling his responsibilities in this very difficult period for the Army, doing that job with a minimum of difficulties in upsetting the routine of the Army itself. We should compliment Gen. J. Lawton Collins for his able stewardship of the Army for the past 4 years. He has achieved an enviable record and set a high standard for his successors. Mr. Chairman, all of us wish him well in his new responsibility.

The sub-subcommittee report complimented the Army for its overall presentation of the justifications. I want to reemphasize that point. General Honnen, his staff, and those who testified on the budget details did a very commendable job.

One matter has developed since the Army hearings were published, a matter that is of grave concern not only to the three of us on the Army subcommittee but to every member of the military appropriations subcommittee because that subcommittee over a long period of time before I ever became a member of the group has had the highest reputation for integrity in protecting the secrets of the Department of Defense. Consequently, every member of that subcommittee was dumbfounded—amazed—to read a newspaper story emanating from the Associated Press in Washington which appeared in most newspapers throughout the country under various headlines.

I have in my hand the story as it appeared in the Christian Science Monitor under date of June 25, 1953. The headline is as follows: "Pentagon Appalled—Security Secrets Leak Out."

I will not bother the committee with the details contained in the Associated

Press article, but there is one vital paragraph that reads as follows:

PENTAGON JARRED

Army officials expressed amazement and appeared appalled when copies of the 1,667-page printed testimony released by the subcommittee reached the Pentagon.

For your information, I hold in my hand a copy of that newspaper clipping.

This same article appeared in various other newspapers throughout the country. I have here the article as it appeared in the Grand Haven Daily Tribune. The Daily Tribune article shows a byline of Elton C. Fay. The article is somewhat shorter but it contains the particular paragraph which disturbs our subcommittee.

Upon reading those news stories, I called the Secretary of the Army. Other members of the subcommittee likewise contacted responsible people in the Defense Department. A very careful examination of the entire situation was made and within a day or so after this news story by the Associated Press I received the following letter from the Secretary of the Army which I will read to the membership of the committee because it clears up a point that I believe all of us are interested in and I am sure the people at home are concerned about. This letter is dated June 26, 1953, and reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,

Washington, June 26, 1953.

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of the Army Appropriations,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORD: In driving to my office this morning I was greatly surprised to see newspaper stories about some so-called security slips—allegedly contained in your committee's currently released report of its appropriation hearings.

As soon as I reached my office I asked that the staff present me with all the facts before the close of business. This afternoon the Vice Chief of Staff, accompanied by the Deputy Chief and the senior and responsible staff officers who had edited the Army's testimony met in my office—where the subject was discussed in great detail. As a result I am convinced of two things. First, that there actually was no security slip; that we in the Army were pursuing the policy of making available, "on the record," to the committee as much information as possible. Secondly, that the committee's printed report contained only the edited testimony submitted to it by the Army and cleared by the Army for inclusion in the printed record.

All of us in the Army realize that the committee has handled this matter in the same excellent manner and with the same security consciousness that it has always accorded such testimonies. We know full well that we can strike out or eliminate from the record any item where the matter of security is involved.

I sincerely regret the nature of the publicity which has occurred and wish to assure you of my great appreciation of the meticulously careful manner in which the committee always deals with security matters.

With highest personal regards, I am

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

One further point on this matter. I think it is important to put in the record the precise method by which all three

sub-subcommittees proceed when we conduct our hearings on the Department of Defense budget. Witnesses are first heard in executive session, where the only people in attendance are the members of the committee, the committee staff, and the witnesses for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. No other person is permitted to be in the committee room. Secondly, when a witness testifies, that witness has the prerogative of saying right from the outset, "I want this testimony off the record." And if he makes that request the reporter does not take down one word. In other words, from the very beginning if the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force witnesses wish to leave something off the record, it is never taken down by the reporter in any way whatsoever.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Does it not also even go to the questions asked? When members of the committee ask a question, if the question is even considered perhaps bordering on a security risk, the question is also taken off the record?

Mr. FORD. That is absolutely correct.

The next precaution, and this is scrupulously and meticulously carried out, if the reporter takes down the statements made by the witnesses and the questions asked by those interrogating. The typewritten transcript—and I have in my hand a copy of a part of that to which the Associated Press article referred—is taken over to the Pentagon; it is given to the Army officials with the specific direction that they have authority to strike from the typewritten transcript that which they feel should not be printed in the final printed hearings of the committee. And, I have here the testimony showing what the Army did in this particular situation. It indicates that the Army did delete a substantial part of what they testified to before the committee.

However, this is not the last precaution that is taken by the committee. After the typewritten transcript has been carefully edited by the Army to remove every word, phrase, every sentence and every number that is secret, the typewritten transcript goes to the printer. We then receive what is called a page proof, and I have in my hand the page proof which refers to the story that appeared in the Associated Press article. This page proof is sent to the Department of the Army for perusal and they have full authority again to read and delete any material that they wish to strike from the printed record on the basis its publication would involve national security.

In substance, that procedure is what is followed in every instance. This subcommittee on the Department of the Army has never questioned the right of the Army to strike from the record anything involving national security.

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

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

Mr. HERLONG. Does the gentleman know or have any information which

July 1
1953

would throw some light on where the Associated Press got such a story?

Mr. FORD. I have no idea. It is my understanding the Secretary of the Army is making an investigation.

The thing that bothers me is this: In the first place, the committee has been scrupulously, meticulously careful in this matter. The responsible officials in the Department of the Army have assured our committee through the letter which I read that they feel there was no violation of security. Furthermore, they believe that the committee's procedure is ideal as far as they are concerned. It is disturbing that some minor official in the Department of the Army, who for some reason or other refuses to reveal his identity, has misinformed the public and created the erroneous impression that there has been a failure of responsibility by the Congress and the Department of the Army. It is dangerous and unhealthy for some minor, anonymous official in the Department of the Army to spread this inaccurate and erroneous story.

The Department of the Army's original budget request, made on January 9, 1953, was for \$12,109,591,000. The so-called revised budget, which was presented to the committee later in the year after review by the new administration, requested the amount of \$13,671,000,000.

One of the statements made here earlier today by one of the Members would leave the impression that the Army's budget as revised was larger whereas the comparable budgets for the Air Force and Navy were smaller. Superficially that is correct, but that analysis is in reality inaccurate and unfair. In truth the Army sustained a reduction of approximately a billion dollars in the review between the original budget and the revised budget. The exact figures are shown on page 16 of the committee report. The Army increase over the original January 9, 1953 budget results from two new budget policies of the Department of Defense.

For the first time since the outbreak of the Korean war the Department of Defense presented a budget which contemplates the continuation of the Korean war in the next fiscal year for the full 12-month period. That was a broad policy change that was followed through all three branches of the service.

Furthermore, in the Army's budget there are additional funds for a substantial augmentation of fighting ROK units in Korea. The net result means the Department of the Army in the revised budget requested a dollar figure over the so-called original budget. We should not forget that the Army itself, in dollars in the budget review, sustained a \$1 billion cut. The \$2,500,000,000 increase results from the recognition that we should budget in advance for 12 months of a Korean war, and that it is to our advantage to augment and supply the Korean ROK forces.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Is it not also a fact that in the Army budget the sum of \$350 million, amounting to approximately 2½ percent of the budget,

is for funds that are used exclusively for the support of the two other services, and which do not directly benefit the Army in any way?

Mr. FORD. That is entirely correct. The gentleman from Maryland has brought out a very important point.

The Department of the Army's budget contains in many instances funds which, in the end result, are principally beneficial for the other two branches of the service. I feel, and I believe the other members of our subcommittee concur, that these expenditures should be charged to the other two branches of the service rather than make that a responsibility of the Army's budget.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. There is also another item there which, due to a peculiar budget situation, reflects in a way against the Army. Is it not a fact that, in the Korean war expenses, all of the major combat expenses, particularly for the Marines and ROK troops engaged in action there, are also charged in the Army's budget?

Mr. FORD. That is absolutely correct.

The committee reduced the Army's budget from \$13,671,000,000 to \$12,982,000,000, or a reduction of \$689 million. However, of that \$689 million, \$240,137,418 was volunteered by the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense. So slightly over one-third of the amount recommended for reduction for the Army was volunteered either by the Department of Defense or the Department of the Army. The net result is this. The Army's budget under the two policy changes is approximately 1 percent higher than it was in fiscal year 1953. It is approximately 7.2 percent higher than the January 9 submission. It is approximately 5 percent lower than the revised budget as presented to the committee.

Turning to the individual items, first let us take up Military Personnel—Army. This is discussed in detail on page 18 of the committee report. The net reduction here totals \$67,314,000. The revised budget for the fiscal year 1954 totaled \$4,776,173,000 for Military Personnel—Army. The reduction proposed by the committee amounts to a cut of 1.4 percent.

One of the significant changes are as follows: The committee reduced the ratio of officers to enlisted personnel, as presented by the Department of the Army back to the ratio that existed on July 1, 1951. It was the feeling of the committee from its analysis that that ratio was preferable to the one presented to the committee by the Army. The committee views are so expressed on page 19 of the committee report.

Subsequent to the preparation of this report, responsible officials in the Department of the Army have come to me, to the distinguished minority member of our subcommittee [Mr. SIKES], and to the other member on the majority side [Mr. MILLER], with the request that we do not hold the Army in this instance to the committee's recommendation. It was contended that we picked a bad month to fix the ratio between enlisted men and officers. The committee does not wish to be arbitrary about this mat-

ter even though the committee believes its point is well taken. In a desire to give the Department of the Army flexibility, it is the view of our Army subcommittee that if the Army is willing to absorb the same dollar reduction of \$19,864,000, our sub-subcommittee has no objection to relieving the Department of the Army from that precise officer-enlisted man ratio which we recommended.

There is, however, one point which we want to make, and I am sure the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] will confirm it. We do not want that \$19,864,000 absorbed by the Department of the Army by refusing to give enlisted personnel their deserved and earned promotions. There is ample money provided for the proper promotion of enlisted personnel, and we expect the Department of the Army to leave those funds untouched. In other words, we expect the Department of the Army to absorb \$19,864,000 out of other areas, and I think we can have their assurance on that point.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. At that point I want to concur in what the chairman has said, and to state that it meets with my complete approval.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. In order to keep the record straight, and as the third member of that group, I am very glad to concur with the chairman in his remarks, and also the remarks of our respected friend from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman.

Rather than go into some of the details about individual reductions, I refer you to the committee report, which sets out in detail the basis for the reductions that have been made by our sub-subcommittee.

Now, turning to "Maintenance and operations—Army," the revised budget called for an appropriation of \$4,720,000,000. The committee recommended \$4,329,594,000. That is a decrease of \$390,406,000. It is a percentage cut of 8.3.

There is one item which is rather large, which needs some explanation. One hundred ninety-seven million dollars of the \$390,406,000 refers to a change in language which the committee approved, which had been recommended by the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army. The Department wanted authority to accept currency, commodities, services, and properties in areas throughout the world.

The subcommittee has agreed to permit the Department of the Army and the other branches of the service to accept commodities, property, and services from other nations. By that change in language we have been able to save \$197 million in the maintenance and operation portion of the Department of the Army budget. To give you the details

of this part of the Department of the Army budget would take considerable time. I would prefer to refer you to the specific details as outlined in the committee report on pages 20 to 23.

The next item is "Procurement and production, Army." The revised budget called for the appropriation of \$3,395,633,000. The committee bill is \$3,224,633,000. It is a decrease of \$170,633,000, a 5-percent cut. Again I refer you to the details explaining the reduction as carried in the committee report on pages 23 and 24.

There is one point I want to emphasize, however: Seventy percent of the new funds in procurement and production are for ammunition and ammunition facilities. The committee has some concern about whether or not the Army is not now embarking upon an over-expansive ammunition program. That is understandable because of all the discussion that occurred in recent months about the alleged ammunition shortage. I think it would be well for every Member of the House to read the committee's comments on page 24 of the committee report.

We did make some reasonable reductions in the procurement and production portion of the budget of the Army. The basis on which those reductions are made is set forth on page 24 at the top of the committee report. We have been careful, we have been analytical. I think the Army can live and do a fine job within the committee's recommendations.

We have been meticulously careful to give the Army the authority to go ahead with weapons. Practically all of the reductions made by the committee refer to support items. The reductions in this field are particularly aimed at the items of procurement which we think can be obtained off the shelf from the civilian economy without all the additional modifications that the Army from time to time likes to add to these commercial vehicles.

The next item is military construction, Army civilian components. The revised budget was \$9,094,000. The committee has made no reduction whatsoever in this item, and we have in addition later in the bill given the Department of the Army authority to go ahead with non-Armory construction without any contribution by the various States.

The next item is Reserve personnel requirements.

We have made a realistic reduction in this item. The revised budget request totaled \$102,909,000. The committee bill is \$85,500,000, a reduction of \$17,409,000, a cut of 16.9 percent. This reduction was made because in the past the Reserve program of the Army has not come up to the predicted strength. The record in this regard is most disappointing to the committee.

The committee has stated in the committee report beginning on page 25 that if the Reserve officials can show they are meeting their quotas the committee will be glad to entertain and approve a request for additional funds. The Reserve officials have said that by October 1 of this year, they will know the answer. If the answer is that they need more money this committee will be

glad to have a request for additional funds. We want a strong Reserve, but to date we have been extremely disappointed in the monthly strength figures.

The next item is the Army National Guard. The revised budget called for the appropriation of \$211,273,000. The committee recommends \$210,035,000, a decrease of \$1,238,000, a cut of 6 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the committee is pleased with the progress of the Army National Guard. They have been meeting their monthly strength requirements and I believe that they will in the months and years ahead continue to meet their requirements. The Army National Guard is an integral and important part of our national-defense program. A very minor reduction was made in the Army National Guard budget. Their air or aviation program was badly presented. The Army National Guard requested \$20,000 for station allowances in Alaska. We specifically deleted that amount in the budget.

The committee made some other very minor adjustments. We believe the Army National Guard can do the job adequately with the funds we have recommended. The cut is a very minor reduction in their program.

The next item is research and development. The revised budget called for the appropriation of \$370 million. The committee has proposed \$345 million, a cut of \$25 million, a 6.8 percent reduction. The committee sincerely believes in research and development. It is vital to national security. General Nichols and his staff did an excellent job in presenting most of the funds for the projects they requested. The committee has set forth in its report on pages 26 and 27 the reason why it made a reduction of \$25 million. We think the research and development program in the Department of the Army can proceed well and effectively with the money we have appropriated.

The next item is the promotion of rifle practice. The committee had a request for \$100,000 for this program. The committee has gone along with that recommendation with certain policy suggestions as set forth on page 27 of the committee report.

The committee in the next item, Operation and Maintenance, Alaska Communications System, made no cut whatsoever. The revised budget for the Alaska communications system was \$11,185,000 and it was approved without change.

During the testimony before the committee it was brought out that in Alaska the Alaska communications system had not raised its telephone rates since 1945. The Department of the Army owns and operates the telephone and telegraph system in Alaska. In the hearings the committee made rather strong statements to the effect that the Army should take an immediate look at the situation. The committee is pleased to report that

on June 10 the committee received a letter from the Under Secretary of the Army, Earl D. Johnson, that as of July 15, 1953, an increase in rates will be made for telephone service on calls of 100 miles or less. The committee is not convinced that that is enough, however. The committee believes that the increase in telephone rates should include long-distance calls. We do not believe that the justification given for the failure to do so is sound or adequate. We look forward to notification that the long-distance rates, as well as those rates under 100 miles, will be increased in the very near future.

The next item pertains to civilian relief in Korea. The budget request was \$75 million. The committee reduced that to \$53 million, a reduction of \$17 million, a cut of 22.7 percent. The reason for that reduction is spelled out in the committee report on page 28.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say this: In my opinion the Department of the Army can do its job effectively and well with the money that we have recommended. It will permit 20 divisions, 18 regiments and regimental combat teams. It will permit 109 anti-aircraft battalions and 150 combat battalions. It will be a strong Army, an Army of which we can all be proud. It will be well led, properly clothed and fed, excellently trained and competent on the battlefield. I urge the members of the committee to support the bill as reported.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I have not at any time served on a subcommittee where there was greater harmony between the members or a more sincere and conscientious effort on the part of everyone to do the best job possible. It has been a most pleasing experience to go through week after week of extremely difficult work where that feeling prevailed. I want to pay sincere tribute to the men who served with me on the subcommittee. The chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], did an excellent job. He was always fair and courteous, always anxious to get all the facts, and in his assignment as a committee chairman—which certainly is a major assignment—he has covered himself with distinction. I want to pay tribute, too, to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER], a member of the subcommittee, who because of his great interest and because of an excellent background of information and experience, gave invaluable aid throughout the hearings and preparation of the bill. We were very fortunate, too, in having the services of one of the ablest clerks of the congressional staff, Robert L. Michaels. What I have said about the Army subcommittee I want to extend without stint to the full Subcommittee on Military Appropriations. The chairman, the acting chairman, and all of the members of the majority were completely fair, conscientious, and cooperative in their work and in their efforts to bring out a good bill. On my own side of the aisle I benefited, as I have on previous occasions, by the excellent leadership,

opposed A.F. Cuts

July 2 1953

Mein Kampf. Civilization cannot stand world war III.

The buzz bombs, guided missiles, robot planes, B-36's, and the atomic bomb would blot out all civilization throughout the world. Mr. Chairman, the fate of America, the fate of the world is in the balance; it is for these reasons therefore, that I shall support this amendment. God grant another war will never come, but if it does, let us be in a position to "praise the Lord and pass the ammunition," so that the words of that beautiful War II song might prevail everlastingly:

There will be bluebirds over
The white cliffs of Dover;
Tomorrow just you wait and see;
And there will be love and laughter
And peace forever after;
Tomorrow when the world is free.

War is costly business. So is preparation and building up military strength, especially airpower. However, our freedom is worth any sum that it may cost us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, under the Eisenhower budget for the Air Force, the personnel and strength for July 1, 1954, will be 960,000. Under the Mahon amendment the end strength of the Air Force on July 1, 1954, will be about 1,035,000.

On July 7, 1952, the Senate Preparedness Committee, chaired by the distinguished Senator from the State of Texas, LYNDON JOHNSON, made a report on the utilization of manpower. At that time the personnel for the Air Force totaled approximately 973,000. This figure is more than what the Eisenhower Air Force program recommends and less than what the Mahon amendment proposes. Here is what the Johnson Preparedness Committee on page 3 had to say about the manpower utilization by the Air Force:

In the field of manpower, however, our studies have produced a totally different result. Here we have found a high degree of waste—inexcusable waste—and an unconscionable amount of inefficiency. There is no reason why this waste cannot be removed to the benefit both of our defenses and our economic health.

Then the committee had this to say. I repeat this is the report under the jurisdiction of the senior Senator from the State of Texas, an experienced military authority in the Congress. Here is a further comment in this report which was issued last July:

The old Army game of using 5 men to do the work of 1 does not appear to have been discarded when the Air Force divorced the Army.

Then there is another comment by this Preparedness Committee under the jurisdiction of the senior Senator from the State of Texas, the present minority leader of the other body:

For that period—for the period of the international tensions—we must resign ourselves to huge defense budgets. But we must not—we cannot—resign ourselves to budgets so swollen that our economic structure threatens to burst at every seam and

let loose upon our citizenry a floodtide of inflation and bankruptcy.

The sins of the past—the failure of every American to wage a coordinated and ruthless campaign against waste—have caught up with us. Already, there are responsible officials who appear to believe that we have spent so much money already that we do not dare to spend more for weapons that are vitally needed.

The Mahon amendment should be defeated. The personnel requirements under the Eisenhower Air Force program are sound and in accord with observations, comments, and recommendations of the 40th Report of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, Democrat minority leader in the 83d Congress, was chairman of this group. The other members of the subcommittee were Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Senator LESTER C. HUNT, Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, and Senator WAYNE MORSE. The members of this investigating subcommittee should individually support the Eisenhower Air Force budget for their suggestions are practically identical.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. TABER), the chairman of the committee, to close debate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan has just analyzed one of the items involving \$172 million in this amendment. He has done it magnificently. That item is clearly not needed. There is nothing in this amendment that would bring an increased number of air wings one day earlier. It only provides for transport planes and training planes of which an inventory taken by the Department showed that they had plenty in sight and on order.

This budget was made in this way: In January it was \$16,800,000,000. The Air Force itself, the military end of it, then cut it by \$1,600,000,000. The cut made by the heads of the Departments of the revised budget was only \$3,500,000,000. The plane-construction item would not do any good. The \$600 million additional for maintenance and operation simply allows them to make worse their present record where they have 1½ people doing the work that 1 person ought to do. I know this from going around and seeing it. What is the use of our adding \$1,095,000,000 to this bill when it cannot do any good and it cannot help our national defense? We have had placed in charge of the Air Force and in charge of the Department of Defense the very best business people that the United States could produce. They have gone through this situation, and as a result they have reduced the lead time from approximately 24 months to approximately 16 months on plane construction. That is the average. They are going to give us full-fledged national defense. Let us give them a chance. Do not give them money which they do not need, and which they themselves say they do not need, and which will not produce a single, additional wing for the Air Force. Why should we waste money when it is perfectly apparent that we are just throwing it down the river. I do

not like to approach my responsibility in that way. I hope this House will defeat this amendment and preserve sanity in our Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to title V, the Clerk will read.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VI may be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to pay tribute to the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the Department of Defense, Hon. RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts.

He was taken sick about 2½ weeks ago and had to go to the hospital. I am glad to say he is now out of the hospital and is recuperating at his place on the north shore.

He has been the most devoted worker I have ever known on this committee, working day and night at his job. I really believe that the strain under which he placed himself and the continuous devotion to his duties and his responsibility caused his sickness. I am glad to report that he seems to be on the way to recovery and I wish him the best of everything.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to concur in the remarks which have just been made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TABER), with regard to the No. 2 Republican member of that committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts, DICK WIGGLESWORTH. All members of the committee on this side share those views, I would like to say to the gentleman from New York.

If there has ever been a more devoted patriot in the Congress than DICK WIGGLESWORTH, I cannot identify him at this time. He has worked long hours through the years and he has been a stalwart supporter of the cause of national defense and good government.

We are sorry he cannot be here, but we expect to see him soon and we wish him well.

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

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

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Texas because DICK WIGGLESWORTH does typify old New England and Massachusetts.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title VI?

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

July 2
1953

TABLE I.—Government hospitals in the Canal Zone

Agency	Hospital	Location	Capacity (beds)		Beds occupied 1952
			Normal	Emergency	
Navy.....	Coco Solo.....	Atlantic 1.....	60	125	59.5
Army.....	Fort Clayton.....	Pacific 2.....	200	700-750	153
Canal Zone government.....	Gorgas.....	Pacific.....	682	1,170	332
	Colon.....	Atlantic.....	227	270	86
Total.....			1,269	2,165-2,215	621.5

1 Approximately 3 miles from Colon Hospital.
 2 Approximately 7 miles from Gorgas Hospital.
 3 As of Jan. 16, 1953.

TABLE II.—Patient days, 1952

Navy—Coco Solo.....	17, 778
Army—Fort Clayton.....	65, 246
Canal Zone Government:	
Gorgas.....	132, 224
Colon.....	27, 207
Total.....	232, 455

The General Accounting Office informs the committee that the total of 232,455 patient days in 1952 represents only 55 percent of the total patient days of Gorgas Hospital in the peak year of 1943 and is less than the normal present capacity of Gorgas.

A brief glance at table I will disclose that the normal capacity of Gorgas—682—is more than sufficient to care for the total hospital needs of Canal Zone residents during 1952.

It was evident to all concerned that 2 of the 4 hospitals were sufficient to meet the needs of all in the Canal Zone. Tentative estimates of the General Accounting Office show savings to be derived from such action to be in the neighborhood of \$2 million annually. Despite flat disagreement to this at first even the Department of Defense now agrees with this position. Steps have been taken to close the hospitals at Fort Clayton and Colon. Current needs will be met by proper use of Coco Solo and Gorgas hospitals. Why this was not done before by the Department is not known, especially since the entire matter has been under study since 1947. The committee trusts, however, that now that the decision has been made there will be no hesitation in its implementation. It is also most desirable that the Department take steps to explore the entire matter of duplication of facilities in the Canal Zone.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the issue is very simple, Should the Federal Government pay up to 25 percent as a bonus for employment to a person who lives in Hawaii and Alaska, to work for the Federal Government? This provision as included in the bill says that we will not pay the resident of Hawaii, Alaska, or any other Territory or possession a bonus for working for the Federal Government. The policy was basically set up for the recruitment of personnel from the United States to go to these Territories and possessions. If you want to pay a citizen resident of Hawaii and Alaska and other Territories and possessions a bonus for working in their own home area, then you want to vote for the amendment offered by the

Delegate from Alaska. If you want to pay a straight salary to those people who work for the Federal Government in their own Territories or possessions, then vote for the committee bill.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. What the gentleman is doing is proposing that you pay a bonus to those who come in from the outside.

Mr. FORD. That is right.

Mr. FARRINGTON. But deny it to the people who live there, and that is discriminatory and unfair.

Mr. FORD. When the legislation was originally approved it was based on the necessity of recruiting people from the United States to work in the Territories and possessions. That is not now the case at all and there is no reason why we should pay the citizen residents of these Territories and possessions a bonus.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

The amendment was rejected.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 52, line 14, after "possessions" insert, "except Alaska."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, Alaska is, of course, a Territory with which I am intimately familiar. Is the 25-percent allowance a bonus when the cost of living at Anchorage is 40 percent higher than Seattle, and when the cost of living at Fairbanks is 47 percent above that of Seattle? It is not, and if witnesses could have been brought before the committee from the Civil Service Commission they would have so testified. This is a cost-of-living allowance, and nothing else, and I hope the amendment prevails.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat disturbed by the provision in section 622, on page 43 of the bill providing that as much as \$10 million of the amounts received from sale or salvage of scrap shall be available each to the Department of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force for expenses of transportation, demilitarization, and other preparation. I question the necessity for that allocation of funds.

It is my information that these funds have been used in the past to purchase scrap-processing equipment in a number of instances where it may not have been necessary. There are many persons who feel that there is adequate competitive private small business which is anxious to handle the scrap and in some instances can do so with a greater net return to the Government. They advocate the method followed by most private industry in arranging for more frequent disposal of scrap on a competitive bid, quarterly contract basis. This eliminates much of the storage problem and additional handling costs and gives to the established private small business the chance to do the job. There are those who feel also that the effect of this appropriation is to provide a subsidy to the steel mills.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUTTON: On page 46, line 10, after "violence", insert the following: "or refuses to answer questions before any committee of Congress regarding his or her membership in or affiliation with such organization on the ground that such testimony may incriminate such person."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, although the committee understands the purpose of the amendment and knows the results it might obtain, we nevertheless feel that the amendment is subject to a point of order, and insist on the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a restriction on an appropriation. I talked with the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations about this amendment and also talked to the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill and also the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. I was hopeful they would accept this amendment. To me it is a restriction on an appropriation and is something I believe the entire Congress would be in favor of. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order and let this amendment go into the appropriation bill. I still insist, Mr. Chairman, that it is a restriction.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee adds further legislation to that in the bill, and the amendment is not germane to the section to which it is offered. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee on Appropriations will include this amendment in the next appropriation bill they have. A few years ago we did not have the section in the appropriation bill known as section 625, up until 1932. I believe it was put in at that time. Since that time of necessity we have had to put these restrictions in the appropriation bills. At this time,

April 28
1954

operation that was extended throughout the entire hearings, which were voluminous and, sometimes, frankly, tiring.

I also want to pay my compliments to the clerical staff whom we worked with. They all performed their functions in a very splendid and cooperative manner, and individually I am very grateful to all of them.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take up the Navy section of the bill in sectional detail. As you will find reflected in the bill, the total budget request for the Navy for this fiscal year was \$9,915,000,000. The committee reports for your consideration \$9,705,818,500, which reflects a cut of \$209,181,500. The bill as is being presented reflects an active fleet of 1,080 ships and vessels and a reduction of 46 ships from the 1954 total. The current manning levels are 80 percent officer and 87.5 enlisted but leaves 100 percent for submarine operations which I am sure the Members of the House are conversant with and the reasons therefor.

Under the section "Shipbuilding," the 1955 program calls for the construction of 30 ships of all classes and includes a fourth *Forrestal* carrier and a third nuclear-powered submarine plus 1,040 landing and service craft, also modernization of 17 ships. Provision is also made to continue upkeep on 1,400 ships in mothball status which will leave us, of course, in a very splendid position insofar as the reserve mothball category pertains.

Operating aircraft: The bill provides under this heading for 9,941 operating aircraft. With the unexpended balances considered, this would provide 87 percent of modernization by December of 1956. Presently air operating forces are about 45 percent modernized.

Under the section head of "Marine Corps," this bill provides continuation of 3 combat divisions and 3 combat air wings at full strength.

Under the title "Military Personnel," this bill provides for 1955 end strength of 682,000 Navy and 215,000 Marine Corps. For the Navy this means a reduction during the year of approximately 52,000. This is made possible, of course, by the laying up of 42 vessels in the fleet support area or mothball category to which I have previously referred. The Marine Corps personnel strength will drop by about 10,000 during the year.

Under the title "Military Personnel, Navy," this bill provides appropriations for pay and allowances and related expenses in the amount of \$2,417,000,000, which is a budget reduction submitted to you by your committee of \$10 million.

Under the title "Navy Reserve Personnel, Pay and Allowances, Training Program," the committee approved a budget of \$78.1 million, which is \$11.9 million more than 1954.

Under the paragraph titled "Navy Personnel, General Expenses," this bill carries \$74,970,000, which reflects a reduction from the budget of \$1,030,000.

Under the title "Marine Corps, Military Personnel," for pay and allowances and associated expenses pertaining to active-duty personnel, this bill carries

\$312,180,600, which reflects a committee cut of \$1,819,400.

Under the paragraph titled "Marine Corps, Military Reserve," pay and allowances and related costs are in this bill to the extent of \$16,750,000. This reflects a cut of \$350,000.

Under the title "Marine Corps Troops and Facilities," the committee presents the sum of \$167,994,500, which reflects a committee cut of \$3,705,500.

Under the title "Marine Corps Procurement," we find that in general this is the hardware procurement section of the budget, which was \$143,500,000. There was also an estimated \$95,700,000 in unobligated funds which would carry over, making the total of \$239,200,000 for obligations in 1955. The committee made a reduction in this section of the bill of \$13,526,000.

Under the title "Aircraft and Facilities," this appropriation finances operating costs of naval and marine aviation, including fuel, overhaul, training, air reserves, and maintenance and operating of stations and other facilities.

The committee in this instance cut \$195,204,500 below the budget estimate.

Under the title "Aircraft and Related Procurement," the committee in this case cut \$13,432,000, which comes to a major degree from unobligated funds. The proportion of first-line planes in relation to requirements is now about 45 percent, as those requirements are indicated under the New Look. This should increase to 57 percent by December, 1954, to 64 percent by December 1955; and further to 87 percent by December, 1956.

Under the title "Ships and Facilities," the committee proposes \$818,681,000, which reflects a cut of \$118,319,000 below the budget, which was \$937 million.

Under the title "Construction of Ships," there were two estimates. One was for \$57,600,000 for repricing, and the other \$11 million for liquidation of obligations. The committee presents for your approval an estimate of \$57,600,000, but does not think the \$11 million was necessary under the presentations made to the committee.

Under the title "Shipbuilding and Conversion," the budget for 1955 was \$1,042,400,000. There was no cut in this section. This provides a fourth *Forrestal*-class carrier. Members of the House can see a complete listing of these ships reflected on page 518 of the hearings.

Under the title "Ordnance and Facilities," there is reflected a reduction of \$168,764,000, which left in the bill \$457,436,000 for the fiscal year 1955.

Under the title "Medical Care," the budget was \$70,300,000. The committee reduced this by \$6,700,000.

Under the title "Civil Engineering," the budget was \$116,800,000. The committee reduced this amount by \$13,506,000.

Under the title "Research and Development," the overall budget request was reduced by \$21,758,000, and there was recommended in the bill for the Navy \$419,875. This was consolidated with the other services in order that further savings could be made in this operation.

Under the title "Servicewide Supply and Finance," the budget was \$341 mil-

lion, and the committee reduced that by \$700,000.

Under the title "Servicewide Operations," the budget was \$108,625,000, which was reduced by \$5 million.

If we take the bill as it has been presented by my colleagues who preceded me on the floor of the House, I feel that the bill in general is a very good one. In other words, the whole situation boils itself down to this common denominator or conclusion.

There is undoubtedly a percentage of hazard to national security that is involved, and the degree to which that hazard may prevail of course is undetermined. Anybody's guess can be as good as another's.

There has been a very wide range of changes made in the operations executivewise of the Navy, and administratively speaking, and I think that also applies to the Air Force and to the Army. I think in the majority of instances as these change have been administered it definitely indicates savings can be made.

We are going through a phasing program, militarily speaking. We started out with reciprocal motors in our plane functions. Then we had the jet operation developed, which is not refined to the greatest degree of efficiency as of now. Even with that degree of perfection that we have attained in that field of function, we have right on top of that the guided missile, and right on top of that the possibilities of atomic applications. So it leaves the entire military situation in a very rapid transitional status, to say the least.

If this bill as presently before us is accepted by the House and the Senate and becomes law, had to do only with peaceful operations throughout the world, I would say this bill would be adequate. If, however, by unfortunate happenstance or otherwise we become involved in the Indochina situation, this bill will not meet the requirements that will be reflected in that type of operation.

Like all of my colleagues who preceded me, I am very hopeful that we will find this bill is adequate because of a final understanding between all nations of the world that it is far better to live with each other with a peaceful understanding than to have a continuity of conflict. But the acceptance of this military budget in no manner should be interpreted by any nation as indicating our lack of ability and intent to preserve and protect our form of government and way of living.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 35 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Ford), the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Army.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks in reference to the Army portion of this bill I would feel remiss in my responsibilities if I failed to pay proper and fitting tribute to my colleagues on the Army panel, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MULLER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES). Their wholehearted cooperation, their devotion to their responsibilities, and

April 28
1957

their desire to do the best for the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense, were of the highest order. I personally appreciate all they have done in helping to bring this bill to the floor of the House.

It is also highly appropriate to pay my respects to the Secretary of the Army. It has been my personal experience since January of 1953 to have worked rather closely with him in our dual responsibilities, his in the executive branch and mine in the legislative branch of this Government. I have found the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Robert T. Stevens, a most competent administrator, a most conscientious public servant, and an individual highly dedicated to a tremendous task. He has a big job. He has performed it well. It is very proper to outline some of the things that he, and those associated with him, have accomplished in the period since they have had charge of the Department of the Army. We should recall that the Secretary of the Army took over that responsible position in January of 1953 at a very high point of the fighting in Korea. To the best of their ability he and his associates performed their job extremely well between then and the time that we had an armistice in Korea.

The next period of his stewardship was that of transition from war to an uneasy peace, and I think that the transitional period has been most ably handled. The Army now is engaged in a long-range program for the buildup of our ground forces. Again the Secretary of the Army has done that responsibility most ably.

There is one detail that I think should be mentioned. For many, many years, and I suspect probably from the first days of the Army to about a year and a half ago, the Army never did know what inventories it had of its stocks on hand. Such a condition could be tolerated and understood during a period of war, but there never was any excuse or any justifiable alibi for a failure to know what supplies they had on hand in peacetime. Under the leadership of the present Secretary of the Army, we are now engaged in setting up a financial property-accounting system which will give to the responsible people in the Department of the Army within 30 days after the reports are made an exact and precise figure as to the quantity and the dollar value of the equipment they have on hand. The Secretary of the Army has pushed this program to the maximum. This committee, the Congress, and the public within a year will see important beneficial results from the first program in the history of the Army which will indicate to the Army itself its inventory.

The present Chief of Staff of the Department of the Army, Gen. Matthew Ridgway, is a military leader of the highest quality. He has had wide experience in all phases of combat and administration. This Nation can have the highest faith in the leadership of General Ridgway in the months ahead.

One of the Army officers our panel had before us, not only this year but the previous year, who has been most helpful, is Maj. Gen. George Honnen, Army budget officer. In due course, he will

be leaving his present position of responsibility. I wish to pay my personal respects to Major General Honnen for the wholehearted cooperation and assistance which he has rendered this panel in its long and involved budget hearings.

There are some matters that ought to be mentioned overall in reference to the Army: First, under the budget we have before us we will have a far stronger reserve program. Here are some comparative figures: At the end of fiscal year 1953 the end strength in the National Guard was 256,000. On June 30 of 1954, the anticipated end strength of the National Guard will be 315,000. The tentative figure for the National Guard as of June 30, 1955, is 325,000. It is my impression from recent developments that the National Guard strength figure as of this latter date will be even more than 325,000.

The end result is that in a period of about 2 years or slightly over we will have increased our strength in the National Guard by almost 100,000.

Dollarwise, here are some interesting figures: For fiscal year 1953 the obligations for the National Guard were \$153,300,000; anticipated or estimated figures for the fiscal year 1954, \$210,035,000. The budget request for the fiscal year 1955—incidentally, the committee gave every penny requested for the program—was \$218,530,000.

The Army Reserve program likewise shows an increased emphasis on the Reserve picture. On June 30, 1953, the Reserves had a strength of 117,000. On June 30, 1954, the end strength will be 168,000; and the anticipated figure on June 30, 1955, will be 195,000.

The comparative appropriations are as follows: For the fiscal year 1953, \$73,000,000—actual expenditures; 1954, \$85,500,000; and estimated for 1955, \$90,000,000. The New Look, so to speak, does indicate that we are emphatically placing increased reliance on a strong Reserve program and results are materializing.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. How about the high-school ROTC program; is that being continued and is the appropriation of the same amount?

Mr. FORD. The ROTC program for high schools is proposed at approximately the same level for fiscal 1955 as we had in fiscal 1954. The committee has made a recommendation in its report, as the gentleman may have noted, that it believes the Army would do well to concentrate its high-school ROTC program in those communities where there is a vigorous and aggressive interest in the program and the Army should not attempt to carry along these communities where there is no active interest.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, another aspect of this budget as it pertains to the Army is the continental defense program. In the Army procurement and production program for fiscal 1955 there

is increased emphasis on the program of guided missiles. The Nike as we all know, is our primary guided missile which we are using for the defense of our major industrial communities. The Nike has been in development for a number of years; it is now in production; installations are being installed in and around all of our major industrial communities. All of us have seen in various newspapers throughout the country stories to the effect that the Army has procured Nike sites. Inevitably, when the Army or any other agency goes into a large community, such as Detroit, Chicago, or New York, to acquire land for the installation of these Nike batteries, it must disturb the status quo. It is a prime essentiality, however, that these installations be placed in strategic locations. It does no good for the protection of Detroit to put a Nike installation many miles from that city.

I know it will inconvenience some, I know it will make some unhappy that perhaps well-developed land will have to be appropriated by the Department of Defense for these installations; but in this uneasy era where we are seeking to build up the defense of our homeland, certain inconveniences will have to be tolerated. You have to weigh all of the factors, then decide what is best overall for the greatest percentage of the people.

It might also be mentioned at this point that the Department of the Army is increasing rather drastically its anti-aircraft defense program. For example, in 1950 we only had 48 anti-aircraft battalions, in fiscal year 1954 we had 114, and in the fiscal year 1955 we expect to have 122.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. In connection with these Nike sites, was any consideration given to leasing these sites rather than purchasing them outright? I know in many cases, for example, that the people are perfectly willing to lease them for a period of years at a reasonable fee so that they will be assured they will have an opportunity to take them back when they no longer are necessary. As you and I know, this whole question of the installation of Nike sites is very fluid, the picture may change from time to time, there may be new development of the weapon, and so on. Was that gone into by your committee to any extent?

Mr. FORD. I would say to the gentleman from Maryland that actually the procurement of sites for Nike installations does not fall within the purview of this committee. The Army construction program comes under another subcommittee. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] is the chairman of that subcommittee. I do know that the Army, in every instance, made an effort to go into these areas to find suitable land which some agency of the Federal Government already owned. If such land was unavailable, then the Army, of necessity, had to seek sites from other sources. As to whether or not they have agreed to lease or purchase, I am not qualified to say. I suspect it would be

well to take that point up with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DEVEREUX. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Do I understand then that the discussion of the location of these bases and the priority given the location as to various cities should be discussed when the gentleman from Wisconsin presents his bill?

Mr. FORD. I believe that is correct, because the actual construction on these sites has to be approved through the military construction appropriation bill. We have no funds in here for the acquisition nor the development of the sites themselves. The funds in this bill pertain only to the procurement of the weapons themselves and the manning of the installation after construction.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. The reason I ask the question is that the information I have is that the area which I represent is not scheduled for some time for such defense. Could the gentleman give us any idea as to the length of time this program will take for the first stage of preparedness?

Mr. FORD. I fear, in reply to the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio, that any information I might give as to the Nike installation schedule would be of the highest security information.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. On page 16 of the report, under "Manpower utilization," I note and I commend the committee for taking cognizance of being disturbed at the apparent failure to effect a full measure of reduction of military personnel assigned to routine noncombatant duties. We heard testimony on the floor of the House in connection with some bill—I have forgotten the title of it—that there are 7,500 officers in the United States military services who are on noncombatant duty. Did the committee in any way reduce the appropriation to compel the armed services to reduce this number of officers, 7,500 officers, who are not directly serving the Military Establishment?

Mr. FORD. In answer to the question by the gentleman from Iowa, I would state that we did not reduce any funds for military personnel for the Department of the Army. I would, however, state that we felt the Army could do a better job of utilizing their manpower in uniform to produce a better ratio of fighting men to overall strength, and as the result of that attitude of the committee, we commended the Army for reducing 49,000 spaces in calendar 1953 from their military tables of organization. We directly suggested that the 30,000 spaces they have under consideration now be reduced as rapidly as possible.

Mr. GROSS. But does not the gentleman think that about the only way

we are ever going to reduce the 7,500 officers who are on what amounts to detached duty, not directly serving the Military Establishment, and about the only way we are ever going to accomplish a reduction is to reduce the appropriation therefor?

Mr. FORD. That is one way to do it, but I do not believe it is necessarily the most effective way. The Army, in my judgment, is making a conscientious effort to accomplish what the gentleman from Iowa seeks to achieve, and I know that our committee concurs in his point of view.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad you took cognizance of it, and I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. In the bill this year or in the hearings before your committee, has there been anything concretely done to increase the mobility of transportation of troops to areas? I am referring now to the situation we had directly after the Korean action started, when we were some 8 weeks, as I recall it, getting troops to that particular area. Has there been any effort made to increase the mobile transportation of the armed services generally along those lines?

Mr. FORD. I believe the answer is "yes." In the first place, our divisions which are presently available in the United States are better equipped to move into action immediately. As to transportation from the United States to any other area, I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] could bring us up to date better than I, because that is primarily involved in the Air Force troop carrier program.

Mr. SPRINGER. With the gentleman's permission, may I refer that question to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]?

Mr. FORD. Yes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I would say, in answer to the question, that if the gentleman read last night's or this morning's papers, he would have seen that just yesterday we had troop drops in which 500 C-119 troop carriers were used in maneuvers on the east coast. That is merely a sample of the highly mobile military forces we have today.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am taking it, then, that in this bill, and in the hearings before the committee, without going into details, there are plans for the Army to increase that mobility; am I correct in that?

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. I certainly do want to differ with my distinguished friends, for whom I have the highest regard. But certainly it was brought out clearly in the committee that this new phrase, mobile readiness, is not all that the term might signify. It is planned to have more troops concentrated in this

general area where they can be moved more speedily to a danger spot, wherever it develops. But I am afraid I must insist that we do not yet have air-lift potentialities which will permit us to move large bodies, such as divisions of troops, overseas. For any large troop movement we must still depend upon the conventional ship transportation.

Mr. FORD. Is it not true that our military sea transport service is improving its capabilities?

Mr. SIKES. There is no question about that. I do not want to infer that that is not the case.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If the gentleman will yield further, I did not mean to infer that every bit of our military personnel are equipped so that they could be moved by air, but that capability is daily growing greater and we are becoming more mobile.

If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] will yield further, I am just wondering whether he has pointed out fully and completely exactly what has happened in our Army; in that today, as pointed out in response to a question, General Ridgway gives the information that the manpower of a division compared to World War II is 17 percent greater, plus greater firepower. If the gentleman from Michigan will stress that, I think it will allay some of the apprehensions that some people have.

Mr. FORD. The point raised by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] was the next point I was going to make. I wish to refer to the material which was inserted on pages 67 and 68 of our printed hearings. In general, it points out:

Based upon the point factors set forth in column 1 of the attached table, a theoretical comparison of firepower indicates that the present division (17,509) with 15 percent more personnel is able to generate theoretically 84 percent more firepower than the World War II Army division.

That means, as I understand it, that the Army's present reduced strength of 19 divisions is becoming the equal in combat firepower of 35 divisions of a decade ago.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If the gentleman will yield, I was going to make that observation, also that the 17 divisions today with their present strength are equivalent to 21 or 22 World War divisions.

Mr. FORD. May I point out 1 or 2 additional facts over all?

It is most significant in comparing the strength of the free world with that of the Soviet bloc to know that we have had significant increases in ground strength by some of our allies. In January of 1953 our valiant and heroic allies in South Korea had 14 combat-ready divisions. As of June 30, 1954, approximately 18 months later, the South Korean Army will comprise 20 fully equipped combat divisions.

Throughout the world there have been other significant increases in the strength of our allies. It is a good program where we combine our efforts along this line with the efforts of those who are as dedicated as we are to the defense of freedom.

To turn to the specific problems in the bill, I should like to give you some figures comparing fiscal 1954 with fiscal 1955.

In fiscal 1954 the Congress appropriated \$12,937,406,000 for the Department of the Army. That budget was based on the contemplation that the Korean war would continue throughout the entire fiscal year. As we all know, the truce came in Korea the first month of the fiscal year; consequently, the Army has been overfinanced during this fiscal year.

The initial budget request for the Department of the Army for fiscal 1955 was \$8,211,000,000. During the course of our hearings the Army volunteered reductions in their budget request for fiscal 1955 so that the net budget request which this subcommittee acted upon for fiscal 1955 was \$7,754,296,000. The subcommittee proposed further reductions in the Army appropriations for fiscal 1955. The net reduction by committee action was \$138,773,000. It is a relatively small reduction. I am positive the Army can do its assigned tasks within the budget recommended by the committee. I commend the Army for its attitude in volunteering to the committee the reductions which total \$456,704,000.

The first section in the Army portion of the bill pertains to military personnel, Army. The committee had before it a budget figure of \$4,211,300,000. The committee has recommended \$4,150,479,000. The decrease totals \$60,821,000. The Army in this instance volunteered reductions of \$47,476,000.

The committee action involved one item of \$5 million. The Department of the Army has not made satisfactory progress in reducing the various loss factors in the handling of subsistence. They have not done the best job that they could in cutting down the losses in transit, in storage, and in commissaries. The committee felt that a reduction of \$5 million in this item would be a stimulus to the Department of the Army to do a better job in this area. The \$5 million reduction was out of a total request in this item of \$483,150,000.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Does the gentleman know how many dependents we have in our military personnel overseas at this time? I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services and, frankly, I do not have the exact figure.

Mr. FORD. Offhand I cannot give the precise figure.

Mr. WINSTEAD. The point I want to make is this. A few days ago a sergeant came through Washington on his way to Europe. He has 5 dependents; 4 of them are children. We learned that schoolteachers were paid, I believe, about \$4,500 a year plus \$2,000 extra and no doubt the cost of their transportation overseas. I am not complaining about that. I think we should take care of the dependents of our military personnel, but it certainly seems to me that the Military Establishments, each of them, could select personnel and not have to send a sergeant overseas who has 5 dependents to furnish them with housing, transportation, supplies and whatnot and have to educate 4 children by im-

porting high-priced schoolteachers. I am not finding fault with your committee. I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I think our committee and your committee, or someone, should look into that sort of situation. I just want to point out that this New Look that we hear so much about, and I think some of them are doing a good job, but I do not know but that we have some new people looking through the same old keyhole in many respects. I call attention to the fact that this administration, Secretary Wilson's office, has just issued a directive to close 21 schools or to break down segregation in 21 schools for dependents of military personnel. Even Harry Truman never did go that far. That is the situation where local and State school authorities are operating those schools and bearing the operation of expense, and when they carry out that directive, it will cost the Government, and I have the figures here from the Department of Education, approximately \$3 million to do that. It seems to me that this crowd that is putting on the New Look might look into a few other things and be able to recommend to your committee further savings along that line.

Mr. FORD. Our subcommittee in its hearings made a number of inquiries of the Department of the Army as to why sizable family units were sent overseas. One of the reductions in this part of the budget involved transportation. Our subcommittee felt that the Department of the Army was making too many transfers too often. In order to stimulate a little more reason, logic, and economy in reference to this problem, we reduced the program \$3,345,000 out of a total of \$166,900,000.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I do not find that we have any total figure for all of the Armed Services, but the Army, which presumably has the largest number of dependents under all the circumstances, as compared to the three services—it is estimated that they will have 30,500 children of school age. That, of course, would not take care of all the other dependents. But, it seems to me if the children of school age in the Army only amount to 30,500, it must be far less than the figure estimated.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman in connection with the subject of dependents that Secretary Wilson testified before the subcommittee on the subject of dependents, and he said, "Right now, we have about 300,000 men in the European theater, the NATO setup."

We have 200,000 dependents over there; in other words, according to the Defense Department figures, in the European theater there are about 200,000 dependents. I do not know that we have it on a worldwide basis.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman in making his statement I know wants to round out the picture in connection with the National Guard and include information on National Guard recruiting and give the committee information as to what is intended to be done with regard to National Guard and Reserve armories.

I just wanted to remind the gentleman before he left the subject.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Florida. In the item under the heading Maintenance and operation, 1955, the budget request was \$3,316,600,000. The total cut in this portion of the budget was \$524,421,000.

The figure proposed by the committee is \$2,792,179,000. The Department of the Army volunteered reductions totaling \$409,228,000. The committee made a number of miscellaneous cuts in the maintenance and operations portion of the Army budget. Most of them are set forth in some detail in the committee report. If there are any questions I will be glad to answer them.

The next item is Procurement and production. That is where the Army makes its purchases of heavy military hardware. It should be noted that the Army for fiscal 1955 requested no funds for this program. Do not, however, be deceived; we are not stopping the procurement of guns, tanks, ammunition, and other military hardware. The fact that the Army is not requesting new money for fiscal 1955 results from the fact that the Department was heavily overfinanced in fiscal 1954.

The Army intends to obligate in this area \$1,950,000,000 in fiscal 1954 plus \$550 million in reimbursements from other agencies of the Government. The total of the obligation which they anticipate making in 1955 for procurement and manufacture is \$2,500,000,000.

The committee recommended a rescission of \$500 million from Army production and procurement funds. The rescission, however, relates only to funds that would be available in fiscal 1956.

It was anticipated that the Army out of funds already appropriated would have to begin fiscal 1956 with over \$2,200,000,000 in procurement and production money. The committee felt that such overfinancing was not justified. We asked the responsible officials of the Department of the Army to come up and talk the matter over with us. After this conference the Army and the committee have agreed that we could rescind \$500 million out of the \$2,200,000,000, leaving the Department \$1,700,000,000 in funds that they will have available now for utilization and obligation in fiscal 1956.

It is an unusual policy to let them have that much money that far in advance, but for good reasons given to the committee I think we can justify the existence of that availability.

The next item is one I am sure every Member of this body is interested in. I would doubt that there is a Member who has not been contacted by one of his National Guard enthusiasts throughout the country urging that additional funds be made available for the National Guard armory construction program. Here is what the committee did.

April 29
1954

The President and the Department of the Army have recommended for fiscal 1955 the appropriation of \$15 million for this program. There are three parts to the program: First, the Army National Guard armory construction program which is jointly financed by the States and the Federal Government, the Federal Government paying 75 percent of the construction costs and the States 25 percent. In that program out of the \$15 million there is the amount of \$9 million.

The second part of the overall program involves nonarmory construction fully financed by the Federal Government. It is a National Guard program, but the Federal Government pays the entire cost. Out of the \$15 million \$1 million would go for this part of the program.

The third part of the overall program involves the Army Reserve forces. Out of the \$15 million \$5 million would be allocated for that program. This is again a fully federally financed program.

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

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

Mr. PRIEST. I want to ask the gentleman, who is making a very fine explanation, if he will explain in a little more detail this \$9 million figure. I have heard it mentioned a time or two and I did not get the connection of the \$9 million with the \$15 million overall figure that the gentleman mentioned. Will he clarify that for the record?

Mr. FORD. The \$9 million out of the \$15 million is solely and exclusively for the joint Federal-State armory construction program for the National Guard.

Let us go back a little bit to see what the precise picture is in this program. I am referring now to the joint program only. On June 30, of 1954, this coming June, the joint program will have available out of previous funds made available \$9,598,000 for utilization in fiscal 1955. In other words, the program was overfinanced in the past. The program is now beginning to move forward. But, nevertheless, on June 30, 1954, they will still have available for utilization in fiscal 1955 the sum of over \$9½ million for this program plus the \$9 million which we have given them in the budget we are presenting here. In other words, in fiscal 1955 for the joint program they will have \$18,598,000 available for this program.

The joint armory program, which was presented to us by General Abendroth, head of the Army National Guard Bureau, indicates that out of the \$18½ million on June 30, 1954, they will still have \$2 million which they will not have obligated by June 30, 1955. In other words their program does not call for the full utilization of the \$18½ million in fiscal year 1955. Although I have the highest respect and admiration for the fine people who are interested in the National Guard, may I say that, in my judgment, they are making a serious mistake in trying to get the House of Representatives to approve additional funds when the facts indicate the Department is not planning to obligate all

the money that will be available if this bill is approved.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Is it not a fact that our committee has been very zealous in supplying or attempting to supply all of the funds we possibly could for the Reserve and National Guard components, but that in this instance we were also told that these armories were built on the initiation of Army commanders of the Regular service, who, it turned out, were not asking this year for more than \$9 million in addition to what they already have and that, therefore, if we added money to this program it would be merely to put it in the pocket immediately?

Mr. FORD. I would like to add the point that this committee has recommended the full amount proposed by the President, and the Department of the Army. This amount is \$5 million more than was approved in fiscal 1954.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I realize the thoroughness with which the committee has gone into this, and that is why I rise to my feet, because it is my understanding that the original request from the National Guard Bureau was for \$25 million, of which \$20 million was to go into armory construction. Is that correct, sir?

Mr. FORD. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of that figure. If that information has been given to you by responsible authorities in the Pentagon, I would assume it is correct. However, it is not unusual for certain component parts of the Department of the Army, like any other Federal agency, to request of the Bureau of the Budget for Presidential submission more funds than are actually needed.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I recognize that. The only reason I asked that question is because I am familiar with some of the situations under which many of our National Guard units are now serving and training, and finally, after many years of work in Ohio, we have gotten a construction program of a long-range duration set up, which we are informed, or at least I am informed, by members of the National Guard of Ohio, will be seriously curtailed if the overall request of the National Guard Bureau is greatly reduced.

Mr. FORD. I would say to the gentleman that the responsible officials in the Pentagon who represent the National Guard have indicated to this committee that they support the President's budget.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ASHMORE. The gentleman mentioned \$5 million for the Reserve, if I got the figure correct.

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. ASHMORE. Is that to be used for building purposes, construction, or

the general maintenance and operation of the Reserve program?

Mr. FORD. That \$5 million is solely for armory construction for Army Reserve Forces.

Mr. ASHMORE. Construction?

Mr. FORD. That is correct. That program also has a sizable amount of unobligated funds. Their program has been moving forward even more slowly. That program, however, is likewise now moving forward rapidly and well. We gave them, as we gave the National Guard, all the money that they requested.

Mr. ASHMORE. All that the Reserve requested?

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. ASHMORE. May I ask another question, to digress here? I notice in the table in 1954 it was \$11 billion-plus that was appropriated for the Air Force.

Mr. FORD. May I say that I would appreciate it if you would direct a question with reference to the Air Force to either the gentleman from Kansas or the gentleman from Nebraska. I would like to finish my statement on the Army if I may.

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

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think it should be impressed upon all the Members of Congress and the public as well that this committee, of all committees, has always been more than anxious to comply with the requests for the operation of the National Guard and the Reserve, because we understand and know the value of those components, and we have in almost every instance granted every single solitary dollar that was ever justified or requested.

Mr. FORD. The validity of the gentleman's statement is attested to by the fact that in the budget before us today we gave every penny for the construction program for the Guard and the Reserve; we gave every penny requested for the regular operation of the National Guard, \$218,530,000; we gave every penny that was requested for the Army Reserve program. We did not cut one solitary penny from any of these fine programs.

Mr. SCRIVNER. And if they come in next year and show need for further funds, they will be given further funds.

Mr. FORD. That is correct. That brings up one point which deserves immediate attention. The recruiting program of the National Guard has been moving forward very well, and the committee is in unanimous agreement that we want that program to be pushed to the maximum. It was called to our attention in our hearings that the National Guard officials felt that there was a possibility that they might have to slow down their recruiting at a time when normally the recruiting would be more easily accomplished.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. Within the last few days it has been called to our attention that

peace. We threw the balance of power into the hands of the enemies of freedom. Let us not do it again. Let us not adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, it would be a very disastrous thing, in my opinion, to adopt this amendment at this time. It could only indicate an uncertainty or a weakness here at home at a time when our leaders need to be given as free a hand as possible.

As pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY], every time we have said we were not going to send our boys abroad to fight, usually it turned out the other way.

This is no time for vacillation. We do not know what would happen under this amendment if an attack were made on Formosa, if our ships were fired on at sea.

One thing we have gained over the last few months is to obtain the initiative in this cold-war situation. It would be disastrous if any indication went abroad from this Chamber today that there is vacillation on the part of our American people, that there is any doubt of our intent to back up our leaders in this crucial moment in our history.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Coudert amendment because I think, as others have also said, that it is not practical, it does not make sense and if adopted it would not be in the best interest of the United States. It would give advantage to our enemies and to the master minds of Communist world tyranny.

I am definitely opposed to any action that would involve us with ground troops in the jungle war in Indochina without the cooperation of the United Nations and the full cooperation of the free nations.

I am disturbed that the administration has not kept Congress and the people fully informed about Indochina and the part we are now playing in that conflict. We have technical forces there for the past year and are carrying a major part of the financial burden of the war. Many of us fear that we could be drawn into a full-scale war there without friends or allies.

The remarks of the Vice President a few weeks ago suggesting that we may have to go it alone should caution all of us against such a policy which I believe would be unwise and perhaps disastrous.

However, I cannot accept the theory that the proposed amendment will be a safeguard in keeping us out of war. It could have the opposite effect after the potential enemy has gained many advantages and has strengthened his posi-

tion by gaining ground by numerous aggressive acts and advances on a small scale without danger of involvement in a global war.

It has been said here that commitments and promises to keep the Nation out of war were made in the past but did not prevent our involvement later. We were informed of statements made prior to World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict—promises not to go to war. We might add to that list of statements and promises made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY], the promise of General Eisenhower and others that we shall not fumble into another Korea. He said our sons would stay on the farms, the students in the schools. We were promised that we would not fall into the Communist trap of being nibbled into little wars all over the world. Despite such wild promises that have been made and forgotten, I will not support an amendment which cannot possibly work and which would, in the long run, help only communism and the aggressors.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to close debate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, to my mind this issue has been pretty well discussed. The amendment that has been offered is very dangerous. In the first place, it would prevent the governor of any State from calling out the militia and using them to quell a riot. In the second place, it would prevent our maintaining our position in Okinawa, Formosa, and Germany. In the third place, it would prevent our forces from replying if they were attacked individually. It is not only bad in that respect, that is, that it is badly drawn, but it will, as those have preceded me said, destroy the power of our representatives abroad. The President of the United States has made it plain on occasion after occasion that he does not intend to lead this Nation into war without a declaration by the Congress. There is no occasion for this amendment and it will cover so many things and embarrass us in so many ways that it is absolutely ridiculous for this Congress to vote for it. Furthermore, it will seriously impair the weight that can be given by other peoples to our representatives abroad who are trying to preserve peace and avoid a war with the Communists.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want myself to have the credit for having voted for something or fail to properly and to my full ability oppose something which I believe is dangerous and points the way toward trouble for the United States. I hope and believe that this Congress will meet its responsibility and at this time vote "no" upon this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 37, noes 214.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend the House Subcommittee on Military Appropriations for their elimination and liberalization of many of the restrictive riders that have previously hampered career personnel in one way or another. The elimination of riders that controlled voluntary retirement of Regular officers and promotions of all officers will be well received by the men and women of the services, who have felt the pinch of a progressive series of cutbacks and restrictions over the past 10 years.

The forthright action by this committee is the first major reversal of the unfortunate policy of continued whittling away of recognized benefits. It signifies an awareness to the acute morale problems of the military services today.

Other steps that have been taken in this bill that will be hailed by military people around the world include a liberalization of payment for shipment of household effects, educational benefits, and other privileges.

Additional action will be required of the Congress this session to provide adequate medical treatment of dependents, improvement in housing of military dependents, and a cost-of-living pay increase to bring the military back into line in comparison with other occupations.

We are spending \$28 billion on our military machine in this bill. Our military machine is only as good as the men who run it. Facing a crucial period in our national existence, we must have the assurance that the men and women on whom we must rely for protection of our country and its people are qualified, trained, and competent to defend us. With morale at the lowest ebb in recent times, and reenlistment rates the lowest of all times, we must be prepared to act swiftly to retain career military personnel now. This bill goes part of the way. It is up to Congress to find additional means for rebuilding military morale and esprit to its most effective level.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 738. This act may be cited as the "Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1955."

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

I have a letter from Gen. William Henry Harrison, Jr., adjutant general of the Massachusetts National Guard. I have conferred with members of the committee. Representatives of the National Guard Association appeared before the subcommittee and asked for an increase over the budget. Would the gentleman make an explanation for the record, please?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the Army Subcommittee gave the Army-National Guard joint construction program for armories the full amount requested in the budget, namely, \$9 million. That is an increase of \$900,000 over the amount that appeared in fiscal 1954. The figure that they will have available for obligation in fiscal 1955 totals \$18,598,000. That figure of \$18,598,000 is made up of the \$9 million which the

committee proposed, plus \$9,598,000 of previously appropriated funds which will not be obligated on June 30, 1954, and consequently will be available for obligation in fiscal 1955. At the end of fiscal 1955 out of the \$18,598,000, the Army National Guard Bureau in the Pentagon does not anticipate that it will obligate \$2 million of this fund. In other words, they will obligate only \$16,598,000 out of the \$18,598,000 that they expect to have available.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Is this money available for the 2 categories which the national association was interested in, 1 item of \$15 million and the other \$5 million?

Mr. FORD. No. The total amount, \$15 million, is for 3 parts of the Reserve forces construction program. Nine million dollars is for the joint State and Federal Government armory construction program. It is the Federal portion. The States make their own contribution to go with the Federal funds. One million dollars is the non-armory construction for the National Guard, which is fully Federal financed. Then there is \$5 million of the \$15 million which is for the Army Reserve armory construction program. We gave the full amount requested by the President for all three portions of the program.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that the national association thought they should have \$5 million for the non-Federal program?

Mr. FORD. They came before our committee—representatives from four States—and requested additional funds. They are not Federal officials, but they were State adjutants general, I believe, and they naturally and properly requested more money. Although I think we must treat their requests certainly with high respect, after all, they are speaking like any other interested party, asking more funds for a program in which they happen to be particularly interested. Inasmuch as we gave the full amount the budget requested, more than we gave them last year, and \$2 million more than they expect to obligate in fiscal 1955, the committee could not see the justification for more money.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I read the minds of the members of the subcommittee when I say they are very favorably disposed toward the National Guard?

Mr. FORD. I think that is very true. We gave them all the money requested for construction; every penny requested for the regular National Guard program, \$218,502,000, which is about \$8 million more than was given in fiscal 1954.

Mr. McCORMACK. And if, through regular processes, a supplemental budget comes up, the subcommittee would view it favorably?

Mr. FORD. We would.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word

merely to ask a question which relates to a minor matter. It is in two parts and relates to a provision on page 39, section 717, dealing with commissary operation, if someone on the committee is familiar with it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that that is the same provision we carried in the bill for the current year.

Mr. HAGEN of California. This language for reimbursement is identical with the previous provision; is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. It is identical language.

Mr. HAGEN of California. And the language establishing criteria for operation in the United States; it would be the same as it was last year; is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, during the reading of the Defense appropriations bill, when the clerk came to pages 17 and 18, as the members of the committee will remember, he read so fast that he passed over the paragraphs on construction of ships at the bottom of page 17 and the one on shipbuilding and conversion on the top of page 18 before I was recognized, although I was on my feet. Therefore, I have waited until this time to seek recognition to compliment the committee on these particular provisions for construction and conversion of ships.

The policy of the Department of the Navy, as I understand it, was to decommission a great many older combat ships, to put them in mothballs, and to place them in readiness should their services be required in the future. Meanwhile, the funds that would be needed to maintain those older vessels were to go into construction of modern vessels and in particular a fourth *Forrestal* class carrier.

I wish to commend the committee on their recognition of the wisdom of this policy through reporting out the appropriation bill, which provides the funds for this program.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], during the reading of the earlier section of the bill, mentioned the need of private merchant ships as an adjunct to defense. The Department of the Navy has been in the position of maintaining public and private shipyards for defense and, since we have little or no private merchant ships being built, the Navy has sought to allocate naval construction and repair to private and public yards and, of course, this has been spreading the butter on the bread pretty thin. There just was not enough work to sustain all our shipyards that are necessary for mobilization. In this connection, I think that the Bureau of Ships has been doing an excellent job. However, I think the members of this committee should recognize that the

bulk of ship construction has been going to eastern shipyards. I do not criticize the Navy for this and I realize, of course, that any provision in an appropriation bill which would direct where ships should be built would be ruled out on a point of order.

Nevertheless, I think that Congress should recognize that the new *Forrestal* carriers cannot go through the Panama Canal. I feel that the members of the appropriate committees of Congress, particularly the Armed Services Committee, should bear in mind that on the west coast there must be the necessary skills and facilities to construct modern combat vessels. Moreover, we should disperse on a geographical basis in case of enemy air attack. Accordingly, in complimenting the appropriations committee, I, at the same time, want to urge that every possible consideration be given to allocating naval construction to the Pacific coast. The last figure that I saw was that 28.9 percent of naval construction was on the west coast as against 51.3 percent on the east coast, the balance being on the Great Lakes and the gulf coast. Since then, substantial contracts have been given to yards in these two latter areas. In conclusion, I urge that full consideration be given to allocating the fourth *Forrestal* class carrier for construction on the west coast.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McCULLOCH, 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. 8573) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, 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. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments 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.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WHEELER. I am.

Those were the sentiments of Davy Crockett. I want to join in the remarks of my friend from Texas in appreciation of the great life of Davy Crockett.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND

For the transfer by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any appropriation for military functions under the Department of Defense available for research and development, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred, \$25 million.

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

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] for taking a very courageous position. It seems to me clear that considering the respect in which this Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations is held, it takes real conviction and courage to oppose its recommendation, particularly when it is in line with the recommendation of our soldier President.

However, I rise to remind the House of the fact that in another day under another President with a different Secretary of Defense, the House went along, as did the Senate, with defense appropriation cuts which later proved to be unwise. Personally, I am convinced that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is precisely correct when he says that the reason for these cuts is an overriding desire to balance the budget. I am convinced and have been convinced since the advent of this administration to power that many substantive decisions have been made not with a regard to the substance of the decision, but with a regard to the question of whether or not a balanced budget would be brought closer.

It is my conviction, Mr. Chairman, that if we are to survive in this world today, when we face the threat of war, and we will for a generation or more, we must be prepared to fight, not only a cataclysmic atomic world war III, prepared to fight it so that it will never come, prepared to fight so that we can maintain the peace, but also we must be prepared to fight those wars which people who have had no experience with them call the little wars, the brush-fire wars. The people who die in the little wars, the brush-fire wars, are just as dead as would be the millions who would die in an atomic conflict. If we are fully prepared to fight them they need not come either. It is my conviction that when we fall into the trap of putting a balanced budget first and fail to see the error of our ways, not only before World War II and World War I, but also post-World War II, when we fail to recognize that our demobilization after V-J Day and our failure to recognize that force was the only thing that was understood by the Communist powers, we are, no matter how good our intentions, endangering our country, our future, and the future of our children.

I submit that today, as in the twenties and the thirties, strength is the only road to peace, and I am profoundly disturbed by the fact that our strength in the

Marines and in the Army is being reduced by recommendation of this administration, which there is every indication that the Congress will support.

Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to support the Flood amendments which seek to maintain the level of the Army and the Marine Corps at that at which they are today. If I thought there were hope that such amendments might be passed, I would be in favor of amendments to increase our strength so that it would be at a level equal to our commitments and so that it could not be said around the world, as it is being said today, that America is bluffing.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I share and share fully with the gentleman from Missouri the high regard and respect which he has expressed for the members of this fine committee. I have read to the limit of my ability, in the brief time they have been available to me, the hearings conducted before the Subcommittee on Appropriations which has dealt with this vital problem, and I have been impressed and impressed deeply by the thoroughness with which the committee has explored the many puzzling and challenging questions associated with our defense in this time of peril.

Like the gentleman from Missouri, I am compelled to make up my mind in regard to these proposed cuts largely upon the basis of what is in the record, and I find reading these hearings time and time again—and I can understand it; I realize it is necessarily so—time and time again you find the expert witnesses on defense going off the record to answer vital questions. I do not think any Member of this House can read these hearings and read what is in the record and what has been expressed and is there in print to read without having a profound sense of disquiet, discomfort, and apprehension at the thought of reducing our conventional forces, our conventional weapons, and our orthodox forces. You cannot read the report of the committee; you cannot turn to page 19 and read what Matthew Ridgway said; you cannot turn to page 30 and read what Secretary Thomas of the Navy said; you cannot read what General Shepherd of the United States Marine Corps said without feeling that apprehension at the thought of reducing our conventional weapons. Each and every one of these men, experts in their line, is authority for the fact that we reduce our effectiveness in time of emergency if we cut these ground forces and cut the conventional weapons as it is proposed that they be cut. Yet, we see Secretary Wilson saying in connection with these hearings that it is proposed we set up a Defense Establishment which is adequate to fight a nonatomic war as well as an atomic war. How can we fight a nonatomic war and yet reduce our conventional strength, our conventional fighting forces? I say the Senator from Missouri, Mr. SYMINGTON, is right when he says if we go through with these proposed cuts, we commit ourselves irrevocably to the use of atomic weapons in the event of disaster somewhere across the world front today. If we want to keep the strength

of America strong and adequate to meet what the gentleman from Missouri has described as small wars or brush fire wars, I insist that this Nation can afford to go along with the recommendations of General Ridgway, Secretary Thomas, and General Shepherd. I have deep affection for the members of this committee, but I have been impressed that several of them in private conversation have said, "We have to take a calculated risk. We have to gamble in this day and hour."

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this Nation can afford to take a risk. I do not believe this Nation can afford to gamble when we have the resources, we have the power to keep these conventional forces strong enough to deter aggression throughout the world and to assure American victory if we do have fighting.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman remembers the name of a famous war-time play.

In this situation, if there is to be a calculated risk taken, we must be sure, for the safety of America, that there is no margin for error.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am afraid there is no margin for error in this day and time. Personally I see no reason for taking the calculated risk, and I hope this House will vote for the amendments which will shortly be offered which will assure adequate strength in conventional fighting forces as well as in the atomic weapons.

May I say at this point that I heartily approve of many of the actions of this committee. I approve what they are doing with regard to the Reserve forces, the buildup of the Reserve strength. I approve what they are doing with regard to the National Guard and the Air National Guard. These are wise things and good things. But why not go the full route? Why not buy as much insurance as the Nation is capable of buying? Why not make it certain that as far as the Marine Corps and as far as the divisional strength on the ground are concerned to meet the threats which confront the world today in this hour of peril, that we have those necessary forces?

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be granted 1 additional minute.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman was a Member of this body last year at the time when the military budget for the fiscal year 1955 was approved. The record shows that on April 29, 1954, the House of Representatives by a vote of 378 to 0 approved the budget for the so-called New Look. I do not know whether the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] was here and voted on

that day or not, but I assume he was. Therefore, any person who voted that day—and there were 378 for the bill and none against it—voted to approve the New Look, voted to put into operation the strength figures for this year and next year for the Department of the Army.

We have taken that step by a unanimous vote of the House of Representatives, and included in the recommendations last year was a strength figure of 17 divisions for the Army, as of June 30, 1955. The picture today is even better. We have, I think, 19 and we expect to have 18 a year hence.

I call that to the attention of the Members of this body, that 378 voted for this program last year and none voted against it. The New Look is part of this program for fiscal year 1956.

Mr. EDMONDSON. But it is my understanding, if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] will recognize it, that this proposal cuts beneath the Eisenhower recommendation.

Mr. FORD. No; that is not entirely accurate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended an additional 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Oklahoma is not quite correct in that regard. In the case of the Army, there is a \$20 million total cut out of a military budget for the Army of \$7.3 billion. The minor dollar cut has nothing to do with manpower strength figures.

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] is subject to justifiable criticism.

Mr. FORD. I should be glad to listen to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Take this bill today. There may be parts of this bill that many Members may not favor, but when it comes to final passage on rollcall we will vote for it. It does not necessarily follow that because 378 Members voted for the appropriation bill last year that they favored every provision in the bill. The gentleman knows that himself.

Mr. FORD. Certainly, it is a fair assumption that one more or less approves legislation by voting for it. I do not see how anyone can defend his position that he is against the bill when he is on record for it.

Mr. McCORMACK. If a Member voted against the appropriation bill last year he would have voted against appropriating anything for defense.

The gentleman knows that when a bill comes to final passage the situation is entirely different than when it is before the committee in the amendment stage. Many Members vote for amendments to a bill, and even if those amendments are voted down they vote for the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New York. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it is hard to break with the past. We cling to the old ways, the old times, the old weapons, and the old strategy. Always there are those who want to fight the next war like they fought the last war. And invariably it has ended in disaster.

The French won the first war with their famous 75's. They wanted to fight the second war with the same 75's. But the Central Powers had long since outdistanced the 75's and only the timely intervention of American troops with modern weapons and strategy saved the French Empire.

In every branch of industry modern machinery has reduced the need for personnel. We now do with machinery what formerly required many hands. Recently I heard an aged farmer say that when he first started farming it required 15 men to harvest his wheat and he sat on the fence and watched them. Now, thanks to his combine, he harvests the wheat himself—and the 15 men sat on the fence and watched him.

In war the same principles apply. Machinery supplants men and dispenses with the need for soldiers. In the first war it would have required many divisions to take Hiroshima. But 1 plane and 1 bomb did the work more effectively than a hundred thousand infantrymen. Today we are still further advanced in mechanism and require still fewer men.

Heaven help us if we ever have to depend on foot soldiers to win a war. Russia has incomparably the greatest army ever mobilized. Through sheer numbers and with modern armament the Soviets can overrun Europe and Asia within 30 to 60 days.

My good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania says the next war will be of short duration. We are told by those best qualified to judge that it will be determined in the first 10 days or 2 weeks at most. That does not mean that the war will be over in that time but it will have been definitely decided within that time.

Evidence was submitted in the committee to the effect that it would be 10 days to 2 weeks before the Navy could get into the fight and it would take a year for the Army to get in. Any opportunity for participation by the additional troops proposed by the pending amendment would be long past before they could get into the fight—even if the Russians sat down and waited for them.

Members of the committee have been informed by the highest military authority that no further divisions are needed—or could be used even if available.

We were also told at the same time that even the reserves would not be needed for combat duty. The only occasion for providing reserves would be in event of the bombing of our cities by the enemy. If our cities are bombed—as they are certain to be if war is declared—chaos would follow. We could not bury our dead. All semblance of law and

order would disappear. With food and water and other supplies contaminated and all communication and transportation facilities wrecked, with survivors fleeing defenseless and hopeless in every direction, martial law would be the only recourse. The 60 years' supply of canned hamburgers if still accessible would prove a boon but it would require reserve troops to control the riots and carry out the orders of the Commander in Chief—or whoever succeeded him. Combat troops to meet and engage the enemy would long since have been bypassed. The decisive stage of the war would be over before they could fire a shot.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, here in the press and heat of debate, late in the afternoon of this long and trying day, let us pause long enough to take our bearings. The supreme executive authority recommends this reduction. And incidentally it is in keeping with our policy of international peace. While Russia is talking peace, but feverishly increasing its armies, we are not only urging peace but reducing our troops. The Executive recommends this reduction. Here in the House the committee, which has spent months in intensive study and exhaustive hearings, likewise recommends the reduction. And may I emphasize the fact that this subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], with panels headed by Vice Chairman SHEPPARD of California, and SIKES of Florida, is composed of some of the ablest and most experienced men in the House. Both the subcommittee and the committee voted—not quite unanimously but almost unanimously—to report the bill in its present form.

And I do not have to remind you that important testimony, submitted in executive session, is not on the record. They have been briefed on confidential matters and have information which they cannot pass on.

I trust the Members of the House will consider carefully the recommendation of these belabored men, from both the executive and legislative branches of the Government, before they vote to change this paragraph of the bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, let us see. I think of a story I heard once. There was a boy in my hometown who was drinking a little too much good Pennsylvania rye whisky. His father took him up on the side of a hill looking over our valley. There were a lot of distilleries down in the valley. He said, "Now, look, son." That was after supper, at night. He said, "Look, son, you cannot drink all that whisky. You cannot drink all the whisky that all these great distilleries can turn out down there, can you?" And

the boy, looking at them, said, "Well, I guess you are right, pop, but I certainly got them working night shifts, haven't I?" Well, they are certainly bringing up the varsity on this one, when the distinguished chairman comes here to scare you to death. It sounded like a hallow'en speech. He had skeletons rattling all over the floor. A-bombs! Let me tell you that the way this A-bomb and the H-bomb are developing, and the way nuclear and fissionable material is being utilized for war by a potential enemy and by our friends, you are going to have a stalemate. You are rapidly reaching the point that before you push the button, before you get as far as pushbutton warfare, there is not going to be any pushbutton warfare. Everybody has scared everybody else to death.

I was out there at a couple of these firecrackers, with my friend from Florida and my friend from Maryland. We were not back in these dens of sin and iniquity in Las Vegas. We were in the trenches with the troops. That is the last time I will try that one. The next time it is Las Vegas for me, too.

Now, do not worry about this A-bomb war. Let me tell you this. Indeed, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] says, there are 3,500 pages of testimony that are not printed. Secret. Cloak and dagger stuff. Even this mustache of mine should have been in that act. Very, very secret indeed. Very theatrical. But let me tell you this, the gentleman from Missouri did not tell you what that secret evidence was, and I cannot tell you either, but I will settle with him if he will go 50-50 with me. Remember I have already got two votes from the Joint Chiefs of Staff for you. There are only four. I have Sheppard and Ridgway. He has got Kearney and Radford. He has got two sailors. I have got two soldiers. I have to go out and fight this war, with soldiers and marines on the ground.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] wants to abolish the Army, abolish the Navy, and just have an Air Force. Now that is all right, provided they talk this over with a potential enemy, but that has not been done. This might be a conventional war, and the Russians have the biggest army in the world. They are building the biggest Navy in the world. They have more snorkel submarines today than the Germans had when they nearly destroyed England and the United States at the beginning of the last war. The Russians have the biggest army. They are building the biggest navy. They are building the biggest marine corps. They are building the biggest air corps. Why? Peace. Prepare for peace. You are going to cut the Marines. You are going to cut the Army. People ask you, Why do you want this done? Why do you want to cut this budget? I do not want to raise anything. I do not want another man. I do not want another gun. All I want you to do, because of the circumstances as they exist today, is for God's sake leave this alone for 1 more year. That is all.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this is not an attempt on the part of the committee to cut the budget, because the figures for personnel and all the major activities of the whole Department of Defense are carried at the budgetary figure. The cuts that are made come as a result of the combing of things that were absolutely unnecessary.

Now what is this story about personnel in this picture? The Army, according to this estimate, will be \$9,000 less men in the regular Army on the 30th of June 1956, than on the 30th of June 1955, but the National Guard and Reserves will be increased in that same period 91,000. Those men in the National Guard are just as good as regulars, and they can be drawn in and in 3 weeks they can be used in any way that they are needed. We know what happened before. We know what happened in Korea. We know that those people were the best troops at the time and the ones that carried the load until the Army could be prepared.

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

Mr. TABER. I refuse to yield because I want the people to understand what the facts are. I do not want them to be fooled.

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

Mr. TABER. I will not yield to the gentleman and I ask for order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman obviously declines to yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, are we going to have an Army that we can afford to have in accordance with the recommendations of the greatest military leader in the world, the President of the United States, or are we going to run out on him? Are we going to provide the defenses that we need to meet our situation by building up our airplane power, both in the Air Force and Navy, or are we going to mess the whole thing up and get into line with some program that is not in the best interests of the defense of the United States?

Let me give you the Navy picture. There is a cut of 8,400 in the personnel of the Navy, but an increase of 20,000 in the Reserves of the Navy. There is a cut—and just see how small this is—of 12,000 in the personnel of the Marine Corps and an increase of 10,500 men in the Reserves, or a net decrease of only 1,500 in the Marine Corps. Those fellows in the Marine Corps Reserve can be brought right up to full usefulness in a very few weeks because that Reserve with the modern method of handling it is going to be a lot better than any Reserve that we ever had.

Are we going along and try to put our defense on a forward-looking, up-to-date basis, or are we going to tear to pieces the thoughtfulness and the ideas of the folks who really know what we are up against? Are we going to have an effective fighting force or, are we going to let it go and drift along and try to keep up with a lot of things we do not need more of at this time?

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

Mr. Chairman, I supported the gentleman from Pennsylvania in committee when he offered his amendments to maintain the size of the Armed Forces; I shall support the amendments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania when he offers them on the floor again.

I dislike very much to disagree with the chairman of my committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], for whom I have the greatest affection, but I cannot share the confidence which he has stated he possesses in the Secretary of Defense.

I think that the Secretary of Defense has been changing his mind each year, too. Decisions made one year are reversed the next. There is no steady, stable defense policy.

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

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

Mr. CANNON. I did not, as I recall it, at any time refer to the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. YATES. That is correct. The gentleman spoke about the wishes of the greatest soldier in the world. I assumed, however, he was including the chain of command and that his reference to the greatest soldier in the world included the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CANNON. I assure the gentleman, I referred to a much higher and more experienced authority than the Secretary of Defense—eminent both in war and in peace.

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

Mr. YATES. In just a moment.

Is there any statement in this Record that the President of the United States favors these cuts?

There is a statement by the Secretary of Defense and by other Secretaries, but I have not seen a strong statement by the President of the United States saying that he favors these reductions. Until the President of the United States says so specifically I am not willing to take the word of those who say that they are speaking for him, because I have listened to representatives of the President of the United States who have come to the Congress with what they said were his recommendations. The President of the United States later took another viewpoint.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will permit, the President of the United States signed this estimate before it came to the Congress.

Mr. YATES. I should like to point out to the gentleman from Missouri that on the subcommittee on which I am privileged to serve, the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, the President of the United States signed the budget estimates for various agencies. After the Congress had acted differently than the President had recommended the President did not voice any objection. He recommended a public-housing program, for example. When the program was stricken from the bill he voiced no objection. And frequently, some who were assumed to be speaking for the President were later shown not to have spoken with his approval.

Mr. CANNON. The President has sent this estimate down to us and he has given an indication that he supports it in every respect.

Mr. YATES. Let me say that I have not seen such a firm statement made by the President of the United States. Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct my remarks, if I may, to the statement made by my very good friend from Michigan (Mr. FORD) the statement that he made that by voting for last year's appropriation bill I was thereby agreeing with the administration's New Look philosophy. I certainly had no such interpretation—and I am certainly not willing to accept the argument.

Does this same argument hold for the Secretary of Defense?

I call attention to the action of the Secretary in 1953 when he discontinued as a military necessity the construction of a nuclear reactor for an aircraft carrier. Yet, this year, he sent to the Hill a request for a nuclear reactor for an aircraft carrier. I say to the gentleman from Michigan, Why is he not bound by the decision he made 2 years ago? I objected at the time. A few days later an item appeared in the newspaper, the Washington Post and Times Herald, which read:

Construction of an atomic-powered aircraft carrier will be speeded rather than delayed by the Defense Department's cancellation of its carrier project, high officials at the Pentagon said yesterday.

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

Mr. YATES. Of course I yield.

Mr. FORD. I think the situation is quite different. In 1954 when we were considering the budget for fiscal 1955 we had quite a discussion on the floor, in the committee and in the press and all over the country about the so-called New Look. It was well understood that in the budget for fiscal 1955 we were approving the New Look. It was a general philosophy. It was the first time that I have ever heard the idea expressed that by voting "yes," you mean "no," or by voting "no" you mean "yes." I do not understand such an interpretation.

Mr. YATES. Let me tell the gentleman that if I had voted "No" on that appropriation bill I would have been voting for no defense for the United States of America, and I did not want to do that. If I knew that I was supposed to be voting for the New Look principle I would have certainly prepared a motion to recommit, for I oppose that principle, or what I think is that principle, but I do not think that anybody knows what the administration means, yet this is the only alternative the gentleman chooses to give me. But I say I had more choices than the gentleman gave me.

Now may I continue with my own argument for a while and not yield for a few moments?

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. YATES was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I think the actions of the Department of Defense under the new administration have

been marked more by pat statements, like the one I cited on the cancellation of the carrier reactor; by public relations phrases rather than by preparation for defense. Suddenly, we find now that we voted for the New Look last year. I did not vote for the New Look, because I do not believe in the New Look. Last year there was developed the new concept of massive retaliation. Now we find a new phrase, the posture of readiness. I assume we will be charged with accepting this idea if we vote for this appropriation bill. I do not accept that argument. I will take the word of those in whom I have confidence, and I respectfully refer you to the statement of General Ridgway, which appears in the report at the bottom of page 19. I respectfully refer the attention of my friend from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to the statement of General Ridgway which appears at the bottom of the page:

The foregoing likewise gives you an idea of why we continue to predict that future war with new weapons may well require more, rather than fewer men, in ground operations.

And that is why I say I am going to support the amendments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because in this world in which we find ourselves it is necessary today that we maintain our Nation's strength. We must try to find peace, and I commend the President of the United States in agreeing to a conference at the summit. But, until we know where we are going, until we can see world tensions really dissipated, we must maintain our strength.

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

Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised to listen to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and hear him be so reckless of the truth and having paid so little heed to the testimony that took place before our committee. I tried to get him to yield so I could correct him several times when he insisted time after time telling you that a division in the Army had 15,000 men. Now, if he had listened to or had read the hearings, he would know that 1 of today's divisions has 17,500 men. And, I am quoting his authority, General Ridgway.

Mr. Chairman, there are three top military men for whom I have great respect, General Ridgway, Admiral Radford, and President Eisenhower. While it gives me no satisfaction to find myself differing with General Ridgway, I feel that the decision reached by the President—and the National Security Council—is a proper decision.

After spending hundreds of millions—yes, billions of dollars—for new and modern weapons, better and faster transportation, and advanced communications, if we cannot now reduce the number of men in the Army a modest amount, we have wasted a lot of money.

As has been pointed out, today's division is nearly one-fifth greater in numbers than in World War II. It is more than 80 percent greater in firepower. In other words, fewer men can deliver more death and destruction than a few short years ago. And that increase does

not include any nuclear weapons, which according to General Ridgway would increase the firepower 500 to 10,000 percent—page 81, Army.

Another fact to be remembered when making comparison is that before and during World War II, the Air Corps and the Army was one. Today—to compare, we must take the Army and the Air Force—a total of over 2 million fighting Americans, the biggest military force we ever had without a shooting war going on.

The modest cut will not materially affect our military strength.

Let us see what Admiral Radford said in response to a question I asked. Here are his words, as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

We have today the strongest military forces we have ever maintained in peacetime, and from a purely military standpoint I feel that we are ready to take care of those foreseeable actions which might come short of a general emergency, and we are very well prepared to take care of the initial stages of a general emergency.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said—much will be said—about the massive army Russia has. This is nothing new. They have had that strength since 1945, long before we had any recovery or military buildup in Europe. They could have, almost at will, marched to the English Channel in a few weeks. They did not. With stronger western forces now, they still could—with a little more difficulty—taking a little more time.

The forces the United States has there now is not enough to stop a Russian drive.

Mr. Chairman, we presently have right at 250,000 American civilians in Europe, employees and dependents.

As I pointed out during the Defense Department hearings—page 91—it is just this simple:

If there is danger in Europe and our troops are needed to be immediately available as fighting men, we have no business keeping that many civilians there. If it is safe enough to have a quarter of a million dependents, then we can safely cut down the number of military personnel.

The Austrian Treaty will release 15,000 troops.

Mr. Chairman, it is high time the nations of Europe furnish their proper share of the manpower, and let us bring our young Americans home where they should—and want to—be.

Furthermore, with the ratification of the German Treaty, we are now guests in West Germany. Let us not overtax the hospitality of our host.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, the Army is our only military force depending on selective service for manpower. With the increased pay and the reduction to a reasonable size, there is every reason to believe that our Army can be manned, as is the Navy and Air Force, by volunteers.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that facts, logic, and reason support President Eisenhower's recommended reduction in the Army.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, interest on deposits, and permanent change-of-station travel, for members of the Army on active duty (except those undergoing reserve training); expenses incident to movement of troop detachments, including rental of camp sites and procurement of utility and other services; expenses of apprehension and delivery of deserters, prisoners, and soldiers absent without leave, including payment of rewards (not to exceed \$25 in any one case), and costs of confinement of military prisoners in nonmilitary facilities; donations of not to exceed \$25 to each prisoner upon each release from confinement in an Army prison (other than a disciplinary barracks) and to each person discharged for fraudulent enlistment; authorized issues of articles to prisoners, other than those in disciplinary barracks; subsistence of enlisted personnel, selective-service registrants called for induction and applicants for enlistment while held under observation, and prisoners (except those at disciplinary barracks), or reimbursement therefor while such personnel are sick in hospitals; and subsistence of supernumeraries necessitated by emergent military circumstances; \$3,679,095,000: *Provided*, That section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (5 U. S. C. 59a), shall not apply to retired military personnel on duty at the United States Soldiers' Home; *Provided further*, That the duties of the librarian at the United States Military Academy may be performed by a retired officer detailed on active duty.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Flood: On page 5, line 24, strike out "\$3,679,095,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,823,669,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk.

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

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

Mr. FORD. May I suggest that the gentleman offer his amendments for the Army en bloc?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, with the gentleman's usual keenness and perception, he knows exactly what I am going to do.

Mr. Chairman, I have at the desk a second amendment dealing with the Army, and since it is a question of budgetary structure, I ask unanimous consent that both these amendments be considered together.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Flood: On page 8, line 11, strike out "\$2,831,019,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,936,019,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, as you may gather from the two amendments, the first deals with military personnel, the second deals with what we in the committee call M. and O., which is maintenance and operation; hence the joint and total figure.

I should like to say this to my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] who at one time, many, many years ago, was I believe a captain in the Kansas National Guard and brings us great distinction and military acumen to this bill.

Let me assure you of this. I know how many men there are in a division and I was quoting from the testimony. These interrogations were made by me.

There are two concepts of a division, one 15,000 and one 17,500. And I will settle for the 17,500 because in 5 divisions I would then be short 10,000 men. In the Far East you have 4½ divisions today, and in Europe 5, in the Army; and that is all.

Let me say a word about the atom war, and read to you what the Russians say about atom warfare and the army. I now read to you an article from the New York Times dated April 23. The writer here, Mr. Baldwin, is quoting from Col. F. Gavrikov, who in 1954 wrote in *Sovetskaya Armiya*, the Russian Army paper, about the army and atom war and the numbers of men necessary. That is what the Russian said:

Atom weapons pose certain problems but they are not to be overestimated. Soviet military art assumes that this new means of combat not only does not reduce but on the contrary enhances the part played by the foot soldier and raises his role to a new level.

That is what the Russians think and that is what General Ridgway thinks. In the testimony of General Ridgway there is a new concept of training for the foot soldier. You must deploy him in depth and in breadth over a front 10 times the size of the front in conventional war, and you will need, believe me and believe General Ridgway, and believe the Russian general staff, many times the number of foot soldiers.

Let us talk about the atom weapon in the field, firepower. Much has been made of firepower. Firepower will take the place of the foot soldier. Well, will it? Let me give you the best atomic cannon operation for tactical purposes that you can put in the field. Suppose I agree with you that 1 tactical atomic cannon will take the place of 1 division of 15,000 or 17,000 men. Let us agree to that for this purpose only—1 atomic cannon, 17,000 men.

Now, suppose without consulting you or the gentleman from Kansas the enemy knocks out your atom cannon. Suppose he knocks out your one atom cannon. Then he has knocked out the equivalent of 17,000 foot soldiers. Is that the way you want it? That reminds me of the meat stew of the horse and the rabbit. That makes a great "horsenpfeffer," 1 rabbit, 1 horse. One cannon is knocked out. In 20 seconds you have lost a division. Is that atomic warfare? That is what General Ridgway does not want, and the Russians do not want it that way.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Chairman, and I serve notice that I will object to every extension until we vote for this bill.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have the deep conviction that we are doing the wrong thing if we make the defense cuts contemplated in this bill. I feel that way because of studying the matter and from the testimony that I have heard on this subject.

I do not think there is any foundation for thinking there are grounds for diminishing the size of the Army. I feel the Army cut which is recommended in this bill is not a cut coming from the Joint Chiefs of Staff or from the Chief of Staff of the Army. I think the cut comes purely and simply as a budgetary matter.

As we sit and stand here today, we have some very heavy responsibilities on our shoulders. In the last 6 or 7 years, we have cut taxes to the extent that if they had not been cut we could balance the budget today and also pay for eliminating this defense cut. That is exactly the situation. It is not that the budget can or cannot be balanced—it is simply that we want to cut taxes. We want to live soft, if you please. We want to have the pleasure of cutting taxes in our time.

I do not think we should have made the tax cuts. We should balance the budget; but more important than that we should have the military strength that this country requires. I think there are few, if any, citizens, throughout the country, who fail to take this philosophy on this bill. They want adequate military strength even if our taxes are high or the budget unbalanced.

There is no such thing in 1955 as a pushbutton war. It was not a pushbutton war in Korea. If it had been possible, President Eisenhower or President Truman would have pushed the button. They both had the opportunity if it had been possible. There was not any evidence before our Committee on Armed Services which would indicate that the foot soldier will not be a man who will play an important and decisive part in any future war, if we do have another in the future.

There, I have laid my heart before you. Please do not make this cut in the Army or in the Marine Corps. The citizens of America do not want these cuts. I do not see how we can face the citizens back home if we tell them we made billions of dollars of cuts in taxes, and at the same time cannot afford the military strength that this country requires.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to deal with two impressions, which I believe could be very dangerous if they were relied upon as the basis for a final conclusion in voting on this amendment for additional Armed Forces. The first impression is one that may have been created by my very able and distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. TABER], for whom I have the greatest respect and greatest admiration. When he told the House that these losses in regular fighting

shall be paid upon the presentation of vouchers approved by the Secretary of the Commission subject to the availability of funds included for this purpose in the appropriation for the operation of the United States Military Academy.

Sec. 4. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for actual expenses incurred in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

Mr. LANE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with, that it be printed in the Record and that it be open for amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ford: On page 5, line 24, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$95,000" and insert "\$5,000."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be approved, but first, I would like to make several general comments. A number of speakers have tried to justify this expenditure of \$95,000 on the basis that the Military Academy should be honored at its sesquicentennial. In justification they have stated a number of State institutions of higher learning, have had sesquicentennial and centennial celebrations, therefore the Military Academy should do likewise.

There are several reasons why that argument is not valid. In the first place, you will find that most State institutions when they have had these various celebrations, either centennial or sesquicentennial, the respective State treasuries have been solvent. There has been no comparable deficit like Uncle Sam is operating under at the present time. Those States had no deficit or debt such as the Federal Government has at the present time.

Someone has mentioned that we had a centennial celebration for the Military Academy, which is true, but in 1901 and 1902 we were not at war. The Federal budget at that time, I think, was in balance and we certainly did not have a debt of \$257,000,000,000.

Let us take the figures and be specific as to why this particular amendment should be approved. The justification says that the sesquicentennial exhibition and static display will cost \$30,000. Just where can they spend \$30,000 on a static display at West Point? They have already all kinds of military equipment up there. How much more equipment do they have to lug in at a cost of \$30,000?

They want a conference on the history of West Point at Hudson Highlands, N. Y. And I can see where they might want to have a conference on the history of West Point, but why do they have to bring in \$2,000 for Hudson Highlands?

They have an item of \$6,000 for a conference on education; then they want \$5,000 for a conference on military education; they want \$4,000 for a visit of the Boy Scouts. Then they want, and this is the most unjustifiable item of all, \$2,000

for a conference on athletics and I notice here they have an athletic event and conference to be held at West Point, N. Y., in the spring of 1952. It is anticipated that the heptagonal track meet at West Point, N. Y., will be designated as the athletic event. I suspect that track meet has been scheduled for a number of years, at least for 12 months. I am sure they will have that track meet regardless and that the cost will be paid by the West Point Athletic Association whether or not this appropriation and authorization are made. That is the most ridiculous justification I ever heard of. How stupid do they think Members of Congress are? They are insulting the intelligence of Members of Congress when they say they are not going to have that track meet up there unless we authorize \$2,000 of the \$95,000 for it.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman did not include in his figures the amount which they propose to use to hire six civilian employees.

Mr. FORD. I am coming to that.

Mr. KEATING. Before the gentleman comes to that, there is one figure in there I think I am in hearty accord with. That is a provision for bringing the Boy Scouts of America to West Point. I think that is a commendable purpose and it will do a lot of good; it is a great organization. But your amendment would still permit them to do that and have a little left over.

Mr. FORD. It should be brought out, and the gentleman from New York has done so, that they want to hire six civilian employees, I presume for half a year, because it certainly will not take any more than that, at a cost of \$16,035. That is not bad pay for the kind of work that is visualized.

I want to make this point: I happen to know how much it costs to put on a track meet, and I know the Military Academy officials will have this heptagonal athletic event whether this authorization goes through or not. The funds for that track meet can and should come from the athletic association. Those funds will be there and the track meet will go on whether we do anything or not. The proceeds from the various football games will take care of that.

I say to you that if the other items of this \$95,000 proposal are no more justifiable than the \$2,000 for the track meet, it is not worth the paper it is written on.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wonder if there is an item in that list that you have seen which would provide a memorial service to honor the memory of those boys who gave their lives in that undeclared war in Korea.

Mr. FORD. In response to the gentleman from Wisconsin, as I look over the letter from Mr. Daniel K. Edwards to the Speaker, they do say they are going to have a convocation, and so forth and so on. I certainly hope that appropriate

services will be held at the Academy for those who have lost their lives in this war.

I repeat again in conclusion, I certainly believe that this amendment, which cuts it from \$95,000 down to \$5,000, if approved, will permit the Academy officials to do certain things which will be worth while and desirable. I am sure this \$95,000 is just another example of the Pentagon coming in here asking for about 10 times what they actually need and what they can spend judiciously.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GAMBLE. From my experience I happen to know that each college pays its own expenses. They had a heptagonal athletic meet at West Point 3 years ago, and there was not any Federal appropriation at that time. Each college pays its own expenses, and whatever expense there is for the university the meet is paid out of the association funds.

Mr. FORD. It is my recollection that the gentleman from New York is a former member of the Olympic team, and he knows something about track meets. He is absolutely right. The track meet will go on as it did 3 years ago and the schools that participate this year will pay their own expenses. I cannot, under any circumstances, visualize what they will spend \$2,000 for. It just does not make sense.

Mr. GAMBLE. A meet was held at Annapolis 2 years ago and there was no appropriation. The respective universities paid their own expenses. I know, because I was there.

Mr. FORD. And the gentleman probably donated his time as an official.

Mr. GAMBLE. I did not get my expenses, I know that.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It should be noted at this point in the Record that the gentleman from New York who just spoke was one of the greatest figures that ever hit the cinder paths of this country.

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

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment prevails it would destroy utterly the efficiency of the resolution. It is an attempt to sabotage this resolution under the guise of so-called economy.

In a matter of this sort, particularly because of its importance, I do not think we must be pinch-penny or parsimonious. There is a proper time to be pinch-penny, but I do not think that in the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this great institution which has done so much for America, we should attempt to strike down the appropriations from \$95,000 to \$5,000. It is ridiculous to do that. We have already cut down the original appropriation from \$140,000 to \$95,000 at the behest of the Bureau of the Budget.

Something has been mentioned about Hudson Highlands. I should like to take the gentleman from Michigan to Hudson Highlands and show him the scenes of

bloody conflict during the Revolutionary War along the Hudson Highlands. I do not think he knows anything about the Hudson Highlands. One of the very purposes of this celebration, of this convocation of educators, is to make known to the people something of what happened around and about West Point. I should like to take the gentleman up there and show him exactly what happened at Hudson Highlands. He speaks from a lack of knowledge of what happened up there. I do not want to leave the Nation in the same ignorance in which the gentleman from Michigan finds himself on this subject. I want the Nation to be enlightened on these facts.

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

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

Mr. FORD. I appreciate the comments made by the distinguished chairman of the committee, but I should like to sit down some time with him and total up the number of hours he has spent at West Point and the total number of hours I have spent there. I would say to the gentleman from New York that I have been at West Point more times individually and spent more hours there than he has.

Mr. CELLER. I question that. I would like the gentleman to have some knowledge of what happened around and about West Point. That is one of the purposes of this celebration, to make known to the people of this Nation something of what happened during the Revolutionary War which emphasized what the war of the Revolution stood for, and also, as I said before, to rededicate the Nation within the purview of those great principles expressed in the motto prominently displayed at West Point "Duty, honor, country." That is another reason for this celebration.

To cut down the appropriation to \$5,000 would utterly destroy the resolution. Anybody who supports the amendment is voting to destroy the very purpose of the resolution.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, it certainly had not been my intention to speak on this resolution but I have become very much interested in the course of the debate. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, so far from sabotaging the purpose of the resolution, will assure the Military Academy at West Point a more dignified and more appropriate kind of sesquicentennial observance than is contemplated by the \$95,000 appropriation.

I may say that if the motto of the United States Military Academy is, as I understand it is, "Duty, honor, country," an appropriate method of displaying its loyalty to that motto would be not to raid the Treasury of the United States.

I happen to have graduated from a college in my State, Bowdoin College, which is not as big as the United States Military Academy at West Point but still I think it is a very good college. In 1944 we had a sesquicentennial celebration that was a very dignified and fine

sesquicentennial celebration. I remember Lord Halifax came down from Washington. There were people from all over the world who attended that celebration. I just called the president of the college on the telephone and he tells me that the college appropriated for that celebration two or three thousand dollars, he was not sure of the exact figure. I wonder whether the gentleman from New York can inform me whether the committee, in approving this resolution, got any figures for the tercentenary celebration, for example, of Harvard or the two hundred and fiftieth celebration of Yale or Princeton, or whatever those celebrations were.

Mr. CELLER. I was not on the subcommittee that made the investigation, but I can assure you it would be utterly and woefully impossible for Harvard or any of these institutions adequately to conduct a worthwhile celebration with only \$5,000.

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

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. GAMBLE. I introduced a resolution for the two hundredth celebration at Princeton University. We did not ask for any money. Similar resolutions have been passed for Yale, Harvard, and the University of Pennsylvania here in Congress. Resolutions have been passed for several other colleges. This is the first time any Federal funds have ever been requested to my knowledge.

Mr. CELLER. Princeton, Yale, and Harvard are not national institutions supported by the Government. This happens to be a Federal institution.

Mr. HALE. I quite appreciate that, but what I am talking about is the scale on which those famous institutions spend money to celebrate important anniversaries in their own history. I am sure it is on a much more modest scale.

For example, look at the statement in this report:

A conference on education to be held at West Point for 3 days during January 1952, to be attended by approximately 125 representatives of educational institutions.

That should not cost a great deal of money. The representatives of these educational institutions will come to West Point on appropriations made by the institutions which they represent. Then there is to be a conference on military education and training to be held at West Point. The professional military men who attend this conference will already be on the Government payroll. You can hold conferences pretty cheaply. You do not have to spend very large sums of money on a conference. The track meet has been pretty well covered by other gentlemen who have spoken. Then there is the jubilee to be held at West Point during one day in May, including a luncheon, an academic procession, convocation and a dinner. Well, you can have a luncheon and a dinner, and, of course, it will cost some money to be sure. But, you can do it with much less money than the amount that has been suggested.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] suggested that \$95,000 would not mean very much to the boys in Korea. I readily admit that it would

not build an aircraft carrier but it would carry quite a few letters to the boys in Korea. It might be well to apply that money to the purchase of some K rations, which I am sure the boys would enjoy. The money could be used to buy quite a few pints of ice cream. I do not see any occasion for an extravagant celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of West Point. I think the celebration would be a great deal more dignified if it were a great deal less extravagant.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that the amendment is not proper for the purpose for which it is offered. The pending matter is a perfecting amendment and the gentlemen's amendment seeks to strike the paragraph.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will it be in order after the pending amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. SUTTON. I will not offer the amendment at this time then.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Does the gentleman from Tennessee withdraw his amendment?

Mr. SUTTON. That is for the time being.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Ford amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I might say for the information of the gentleman from New York that my amendment, which is not in order at this time, provides for the striking out of section 3 and section 4. It does away with the entire \$95,000. Personally, I believe in commemorating the sesquicentennial of West Point, Princeton, the University of Tennessee, Vanderbilt, the University of Texas, SMU, and other schools throughout the country when they have their anniversaries. But why come in here and ask for \$95,000 to do it?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] says that \$95,000 would not amount to much to the boys in Korea. I can say to him as a combat veteran, and my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], and my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], will join me in saying that \$95,000 would mean a lot to them. K rations? Yes. They mean a lot to the boys over there. It will buy a lot of K rations. It is true it would buy but half a tank, but sometimes that half a tank will save the lives of a lot of boys. That gun still may be in action.

Let us look through this \$95,000, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] did, and see what it is for.

Thirty thousand dollars for exhibition and display. Have you ever been to West Point or Annapolis? You see there every type of gun, every type of missile that is used in the Army or the Navy on display there. Why they want to spend \$30,000 to put more weapons there I cannot understand.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 63, line 10, insert the following:

"SEC. 628. No appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any direct expense (including commercial transportation in the United States to the place of sale but excluding all transportation outside the United States) in connection with the maintenance, conduct, operation, or management of sales commissaries, or commissary stores, of agencies of the Department of Defense, except where reimbursement for such expenses is to be made to the appropriations concerned from the proceeds of sales therein."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, what is done here is simply to exclude on page 63 the objectionable language that was in this paragraph in the first place and to which a point of order was raised. As the amendment now reads, there is no objectionable language, and no point of order can be raised against it because it is purely a limitation on the expenditure of funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 65, after line 10, insert the following:

"SEC. 630. No part of any money appropriated in this act or included under any contract authority granted in this act shall be used in making payments under any construction contract or any contract for supplies, materials, equipment, or services, exceeding \$10,000 in amount, unless the person to whom such contract is awarded shall have furnished to the United States a performance bond with a surety or sureties satisfactory to the officer awarding such contract and in such amount as he may deem adequate, for the protection of the United States; except that the Secretary of Defense may waive the requirement of a performance bond in the case of any of the contracts referred to in this section if he determines that the waiver of such requirement is in the interest of the national security and defense."

On page 65, line 11, strike out "630" and insert in lieu thereof "631."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for reserving his point of order to this very important amendment. Actually I am constrained to concede that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. The basic need for such a provision in the law is so vital, however, it was my hope the point of order would be waived. Needless to say I can and do appreciate the position and the responsibility of the chairman of this subcommittee. I believe the gentleman from Texas agrees wholeheartedly with the purpose of this amendment but at the same time feels such legislation should be handled by the Committee on Armed Services. With that point of view I agree but the matter is so serious I have offered the amendment today in order that the

Members would see what is taking place under the present contracting methods used by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the Whole for the last several days has been considering a military-appropriation bill totaling over \$58,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year. When this bill is approved by the Congress the Department of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force will be in the next 12 months spending this gigantic sum all over the United States with many contractors. Previous experience shows that in many, many instances the Department of Defense has been extremely lax in the expenditure of the funds the Congress has appropriated. The best evidence of this laxity is found in a recent report submitted to the House by the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services under the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERL]. At this time I would like to compliment the gentleman from Louisiana, his subcommittee, and his staff for the excellent manner in which this investigation was conducted. The subcommittee report on this case vividly points out basic weaknesses in the procurement methods of the Department of Defense. It is entitled "The Case of Consolidated Industries, Inc." The report shows without any question of a doubt that the Department of Defense should require performance bonds when all or most military or defense contracts are awarded.

For the information of the Members I would like to read this report, including the recommendations of the subcommittee:

The Procurement Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the House has held extensive hearings on the procurement procedures of the Armed Services. Several reports have been issued and more are to follow. The purpose of these reports (and of this report in particular) is to set out by specific example procedures which in our opinion require correction.

The instance cited here in detail does not involve a critical item. It was, however, a necessary item for classroom use. The handling of these bids will be set out in some detail to show by specific instance, where the subcommittee finds in many contracts that millions of dollars are being wasted in defaulted and delinquent contracts, to say nothing of frittering away of the time of Government employees, both uniformed and civilian, who are spending their time in doing the work which contractors are paid to perform. It is this leakage which increases the already heavy burden of the taxpayer, and which can be and ought to be stopped.

Every contract begins with a preaward survey. The Government finds out for itself the capacity and ability of the contractor to perform the work. Upon the accuracy of these reports depends the action of the contracting officer. Once a contract is let the Government is bound to the contractor. It will be demonstrated by the following report wherein the Government loses by incompetent preaward inspection.

CONSOLIDATED INDUSTRIES, INC., MEMPHIS, TENN.
(Contract DA-11-009-QM6508, Contract DA-11-009-QM-6512, Contract NOM-55929)

This company was formed about 1947. Its moving spirit was Jacob W. P. Fleming, who owned 80 percent of the stock. Fleming through another company had done some subcontracting in World War II. He had never been in a company which held a prime

contract. But he had been in a company (in fact in several companies) engaged in the veterans' training program; and at the times hereinafter recited these companies and Fleming were having difficulties with the Veterans' Administration, which this subcommittee will not go into.

In any event, Consolidated Industries had not turned out a thing for nearly 18 months preceding the award of these contracts. Before that it claims to have sold several hundred thousand dollars worth of furniture. Fleming went to Chicago in December 1950 where he says he found that the Quartermaster was inviting bids on metal folding chairs. Two invitations were posted with specifications for 118,000 metal folding chairs. We take up the story with this beginning. Some of the incidents relating to what followed have been detailed by Hon. GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, both in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 22, 1951, page 5656 et seq., and additional details were presented by him to the subcommittee. Thereafter, the subcommittee took testimony and made a further investigation. Here is what happened:

Fleming stated under oath to the subcommittee that his company was organized in 1947. It occupied a building in Memphis, had sold some furniture in the early years, but for nearly 18 months prior to these awards it had done only a negligible amount of business. Fleming wanted to get into defense work. He got the invitations for bids on folding steel chairs at Chicago.

Here is what was on hand when he prepared the company's bids: The company had no steel on hand. It had no commitment from any supplier for steel either as to quantity, kind, or the time of delivery. It did not even have a commitment on price. Fleming testified that he just took some warehouse prices which he knew about and other prices which he had heard mentioned in Memphis and guessed at a price which he used in making up the bids. He did not have the necessary tools, dies, jigs or machinery; moreover, he told the subcommittee that the company did not have the money to buy them; but he knew he would have to get money somewhere to buy these things or would have to subcontract part of the work. He had no commitment from any prospective subcontractor in preparing his bid. The company had a couple thousand dollars on hand. He knew the company would require financing; and he figured on an RFC loan for that purpose.

He testified that the margin of profit was figured at from 10 percent to 15 percent, or something over \$45,000.

The company was the low bidder on both invitations by some \$55,000.

Then followed the preaward inspection. Quartermaster Supplement to the Joint Procurement Regulations, section VI, Bonds and Insurance, part I, paragraph 6-100.3 reads as follows:

"Except under unusual circumstances bid and performance bonds are not to be required in connection with supply contracts. Instead, maximum reliance will be placed on preaward surveys and ascertainment of finance responsibility of bidders in making the award of contracts."

We summarized the report of inspector No. 1: William K. Brown, area supervisor, made his inspection on January 10, 1951. He found the plant was "cluttered up with old broken-down refrigerators, desks, benches, and a lot of torn-up scrap lumber where they had started to dismantle the benches and so forth that they had used for the vocational training school." He found that there was "no activity in the plant whatsoever . . . that this plant had not been in operation for the past 18 months. . . ." In his report he states that he found the contractor "did not have

the necessary equipment to perform the contract; that he lacked painting equipment, drying oven, spot welders, cleaning tanks, dies, jigs, fixtures, and heavy presses necessary to fabricate metal for folding chairs."

He did not report on the financial condition of the company. He did an excellent job and faithfully reported exactly what there was to report as confirmed by the admissions of Fleming, the president of the concern, heretofore recited.

Mr. Brown, Inspector No. 1, advised that the contractor was not able to perform the contract for the reasons given in his report and advised against award.

We continue with activities of Consolidated Industries, Inc., after the bids were opened:

After the bids were opened, Fleming was ready for the role of the small-business man. His company was low bidder and stood to make upward of \$45,000. If everything went well and he could get these contracts, then he could go out and start looking for materials, machinery and the financing; and then Consolidated would be in business and Fleming would be a small-business man. His testimony was that at the letting in Chicago he learned that some of his competitors questioned his ability to perform the contracts, so he informed the subcommittee that "being a small-business man and unaccustomed to such threats or pressure" he betook himself to Washington. There he visited the offices of several Senators and Congressmen and spent most of his time with their aides. Apparently, the mantle of the small-business man showed gracefully on him for these aides rose to his cause. Somehow the news of his Washington visit was discreetly imparted to the Chicago quartermaster office. There a succession of three other inspectors, were dispatched to Memphis at regular intervals. Each dutifully reported that Consolidated could perform these contracts if an award were made to it. As these inspectors warmed to their tasks we summarize their reports:

Inspector No. 2: On January 24, 1951, a new survey was ordered by the Chicago Procurement Office "to give this contractor an opportunity to prove that our initial survey was wrong and to prove that he could perform." Time was of the essence. The chairs were urgently needed. Inspector No. 2 who was on an assignment at Clarksville, Tenn., was directed by phone to proceed immediately to Memphis, Tenn., to Consolidated Industries, Inc. He knew only the identification number of the contract and the quantity of chairs called for.

By this time Fleming and his associates knew that another inspection was to be made in the Consolidated Industries, Inc., so the stage was set for the visit from Government men. Inspector No. 2 reported that the plant was clean and that in fact some men were there at the time welding and making chair frames. It developed from subsequent testimony by Mr. Fleming that the men were actually engaged in applying the plastic back and seats to certain steel-frame chairs that he had purchased.

While sitting there talking, inspector No. 2 reports two calls came in to Fleming. The man on the other end of the line talked in such a loud voice it was possible for the inspector to overhear: "We have a carload of steel ready for delivery now." Thus, inspector No. 2 had the answer to his questions on the steel necessary to manufacture the chairs.

He determined the capacity of the plant on the capacity of the bending machines. Each machine could make about 400 bends per hour. He multiplied that number by 16 hours per day (two shifts) and came to the conclusion that the plant could manufacture 100,000 chairs per month. This in-

spector was told that the seats and backs were going to be subcontracted.

He reported, "The facility is engaged in production of metal furniture and their normal capacity on an 8-hour shift is approximately 100,000 folding chairs per month; however, at the moment due to lack of steel this production had to be curtailed." That was wholly false—the plant had not been in operation for 18 months and had never in its existence made a folding chair. This inspector's downfall came when he accepted the misleading statements made by Fleming and his associates.

Inspector No. 3: Inspector No. 3 visited the plant on January 31, just 7 days after inspector No. 2. He found no evidence that this plant had recently manufactured any furniture. He did see some men experimenting with dinette furniture including table and chairs with tubular legs. He noticed that the plant had recently been thoroughly cleaned out and that certain machine tools had been rearranged. He also saw some experimental work being done on refrigeration units. Fleming who conducted the inspector on a tour of the plant conveyed the impression that he was going to manufacture or assemble these units in his plant. Fleming pointed out some radio technicians to the inspector who were doing development work on a travel type of film that could be used in television. The inspector was impressed with these men as being high-type personnel.

Fleming testified that these men were not working for Consolidated Industries, but that he permitted them to use his shop for the experimental work that they were conducting. They served as window dressing for the benefit of the inspector.

Inspector No. 3 was very thorough in taking an inventory of the equipment located in the plant; however, very little of the equipment could be used for the manufacture of the steel folding chairs. The majority of it was left over from the training school activities for the Veterans' Administration. This inspector did not check with the VA because he did not feel that it was in his jurisdiction. Neither did he look into the financial ability of the contractor because he did not receive directions to do so.

This inspector like the one that preceded him determined the capacity of the plant by the capacity of the bending machines. He reported that this facility could produce 75,000 chairs per month, beginning the first month, 60 days after the contract was awarded.

However, the contract required that 75,000 chairs be delivered 60 days after the contract was awarded with the balance of 43,000 chairs due 90 days after the date of the contract. An evaluation of this inspector's report alone shows that the contract could not possibly have been fulfilled, within the time limits called for.

Inspector No. 4: Inspector No. 4 was called upon by the Quartermaster to give his opinion of the three (3) earlier precaward surveys of inspectors Nos. 1, 2, and 3. He visited the plant on February 5 and 6. Inspector No. 4 succumbed to the resourceful imagination and optimism of Fleming. He testified that he was not required to look into the financial background of the company because he was appearing in the role of a consultant and was not directed to look into the "details" that the other inspectors should have covered. He did not check into the contracts with the Veterans' Administration, because he was not directed to go into that. His tour conductor was Fleming.

Inspector No. 4 reported, "The company has previously and is at the present time producing dinette sets consisting of dinette

tables with tubular metal legs and chairs fabricated from steel tubing."

Fleming's testimony is contrary to that.

He has testified that his company was manufacturing dinette sets with the tubular metal legs. He had, however, bought the chairs and tables and was assembling them. He testified that Consolidated was making the seats and backs of leatherette, plywood and cotton liners. He had nothing to do with the steel fabrication or the bending of the tubular legs for the furniture.

This inspector was also duped.

His report states that this company, "required a minimum of 60 days lead time on deliveries * * * to enable them to rearrange some of the equipment in their plant and set up an assembly line, spray booth, baking oven and packaging and packing facilities before they could get into actual production of producing end items."

As previously reported, the contract required delivery of 75,000 chairs in 60 days and the balance in 90 days.

Similar to the report filed by inspector No. 3, a proper evaluation of this report would have shown that the contractor could not possibly have complied with the delivery dates set forth in the invitation to bid, to say nothing of other glaring oversights and naïveté, while evaluating the work of his predecessors.

After these latter three reports had been received, the matter was up to the quartermaster at Chicago.

The commanding general of the Quartermaster Depot at Chicago appeared before the subcommittee. He occupies the unique position of being in charge of the depot, but without authority to bind the Government on contracts. He stated that he participated in the decision to make this award. Undoubtedly, he did it in the conscientious performance of his duty; and the subcommittee is impressed with his circumspect conduct and meticulous handling of the matter. But the general had to rely on inspection reports. There was nothing to help him from those sources. He had before him two low bids. He wanted to save money for the Government. He wanted to be entirely proper and correct in dealing with Consolidated. So he cast his vote for Consolidated on the evidence before him.

A contracting officer awarded the contract to Consolidated Industries, Inc. for 118,000 chairs to be delivered—75,000 on April 7 and 43,000 on May 3, 1951.

Consolidated's travail had begun. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation withdrew its hoped-for commitment. The search for steel was frantically on with the Government taking that job over for the most part as will be detailed later. There was no machinery and no money to buy it. An RFC audit of the company showed that on December 30, 1950, just before the awards, the company had on hand \$410.41.

April and May came and no chairs were produced. The contracts were hopelessly in default. As the situation grew more gloomy, Fleming got in touch with a salesman he met in Chicago at the bid opening. The salesman represented International Rolling Mills. He wanted to sell some steel, Fleming told the subcommittee. Out of that arrangement, these contracts of the small-business man were assigned to Rabar Finance Co., a subsidiary of International Rolling Mills; and the finance company is the 100-percent owner of the contracts. Fleming ruefully stated to the subcommittee that he didn't think his company, would have any profit left.

The chairs are now being produced, months in default of the due date. On July 25, 1951, only 7,000 chairs had been delivered and 12,000 chairs were awaiting inspection.

There are nearly 100,000 yet to be delivered. The Army has been standing a long time.

This is the saga of an attempt to balloon a cash balance of \$410 into a profit of more than \$45,000, with Government contracts used as a hunting license for plant, machinery, materials and financing. A competent inspection service would have discovered it.

MARINE CORPS AND NAVAL INSPECTOR

In April 1951 while Consolidated's contracts with the Army were in default, the Marine Corps advertised for 12,000 chairs. Consolidated submitted the low bid.

A naval inspector was sent on April 17, 1951, to report on the qualification of the contractor. His report was this:

He contacted the vice president, asked to be shown the property and these various machines. He saw that there was little operation going on at the time, which he didn't question, because "it wasn't included in my survey."

He said his mission was to make a survey "to determine if the bidder is capable of performing in the event of an award for the 12,000 chairs." He says he wasn't asked to make a statement that the chairs could be produced in 30 days, although that was required by the invitation to bid. It was his understanding "from the company officials that their production was from 1,800 to 2,000 chairs per day." They indicated to him that they had made chairs before, he says, but he had no way of knowing whether they had or not.

The company, he said, did not volunteer the information that they had Army contracts. He says he didn't ask them about that because "he hadn't been instructed to ask that question." He said that the company didn't volunteer any information that was not asked for. The only information he could get from them on their financing he says was that they were 100 percent financed by Rabar Finance Co.

He made no investigation of the company's experience because "he was not instructed to do so." He says, simply enough, that he was to "look into the manufacturing ability of the company as to whether they could produce the chairs they were bidding on."

So the Naval inspector reported favorably. The Marine Corps awarded it a contract for 12,000 chairs to be delivered in 30 days. And that contract has not been performed as yet.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS—EXPEDITER SERVICE

What this type of procurement cost the Government over and above the delay in receiving its products, in performing services with Government employees which the contractor should have performed was this:

A lieutenant colonel and staff were put to work searching for steel to commence the contract. He and his staff scoured the country by personal search and telephone, requesting, pleading, and probably becoming more emphatic than that, in helping perform this critical "defense order."

Of course, the requests of the Government are honored in times of emergency. Whenever the Government "expeditors" thought they had located some steel they called Fleming and he placed orders. The Government found a load of steel coming from Belgium and advised Fleming to place an order for it. The ship arrived a month after it was promised. It was misrouted. The Government "expeditors" went to work by telephone and other means tracing it. They finally located it.

Later Consolidated was in trouble over the chair tips to be used. It couldn't obtain them. Government expeditors went to work. NPA regulations prohibited the use of natural rubber. The Government expeditors searched the industry for a supplier. Finally, that search was abandoned and their exer-

gles were expended in locating, testing, and developing a plastic cap, which was finally used.

It would be impossible to determine by a cost survey the time, salaries, and personal expenses of these Government employees who were actually performing work which the contractor had been engaged to perform.

The supposed saving of \$53,000 evaporated very quickly over these months of delay and trouble—all because of incompetent, inadequate preaward inspection.

In the many cases which the subcommittee has examined of incompetent preaward inspection the stock excuses have been either:

- 1. The regulations did not require the inspector to make the inquiry which would have ascertained the facts bearing upon the contractor's qualifications; or
- 2. That question wasn't on the form; or
- 3. I wasn't instructed to ask that.

It is high time that someone in authority took a look at the regulations and abolished them as a sanctuary for failures; and it is also time that some departmental procedures be worked out to educate inspectors, on the questions that ought to be asked in a preaward inspection.

If, in the absence of a performance bond, maximum reliance is placed on preaward inspection, then that inspection should be adequate.

Price is not the only criteria for a contracting officer. Performance is equally important in determining a sound economical, businesslike contract. The overbalance of one or the other produces losses of the type such as these shown in this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The subcommittee recommends that the services take immediate steps to improve and correct procurement regulations to assure competent preaward inspections; and that immediate steps be taken to educate inspectors upon the need of a full and adequate inquiry when making their examinations. Forms and regulations which leave them hide-bound, if in fact that is the case, should be scrapped in favor of a realistic and competent approach.

2. The subcommittee will continue its study and investigation into the need for performance bonds, if necessary recommending legislation, should our further inquiries prove the desirability of them. But unless the preaward inspections can be improved that step may become necessary.

F. EDWARD HEBERT, Subcommittee Chairman; O. C. FISHER; EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED; L. GARY CLEMENTE; WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.; CLYDE DOYLE; CHARLES H. ELSTON; JACK Z. ANDERSON; HARRY L. TOWE; WILLIAM E. HESS; W. STERLING COLE.

Approved:

CARL VINSON, Chairman.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan upon his industry with respect to the problem which he has discussed. I think it is a very serious problem and I think some kind of legislation which will meet the problem adequately should be enacted by Congress. But I do feel that his amendment is subject to a point of order; that it should be further screened and studied by the appropriate committee. I think the gentleman is taking a step in the right direction in calling this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman. I am confident from my investigation of this case, and I called this case to the attention of the Committee on Armed Services in May of this year, that the Department of Defense could literally save many millions of dollars if the Department would only put the responsibility for the performance of most military contracts directly on the contractors and their bonding companies. I sincerely hope that the legislative committee—the Committee on Armed Forces—will come forth promptly with the necessary legislation to correct the current situation which is presently wasting the valuable and priceless time and money of the Federal Government.

In closing, I wish to assure my colleagues that I intend to introduce a bill similar to my amendment. The Committee on Armed Services, based on its investigation of the Consolidated, Inc., case, and others should take immediate action to end the deplorable procurement policies of the Department of Defense.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman withdraw his amendment?

Mr. FORD. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PRIEST] having assumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, 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. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

committee that is dignified by the title or subtitle, committee or subcommittee for peace. I feel this is a serious defect and I hope this body will take steps to remedy this situation.

Consequently in fairness to our national conscience and in consideration of the aims of our Government and the sacrifices of our people for peace, and that we may be able more properly and effectively to deal with that vast body of important subject matter that pertinently affects our future and the peace, I propose the creation of a standing Committee on Peace in the House of Representatives. It is proper and sound that we do this and I have every confidence that the Members of this body will take a similar view of this matter.

GUY GABRIELSON AND THE RFC

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in what my good friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] said about Mr. Gabrielson.

The Sunday's Washington Post carried a story about Mr. Gabrielson's having made a speech at Elgin, Ill., to the fifty-seventh annual banquet of the John Ericson Republican Club in which he said, "Throw the rascals out," referring to the RFC.

Mr. Gabrielson was president of the company that borrowed \$18,500,000 for which he charged a \$100,000 fee. That was in 1946. It seems to me we should have some investigation of influence by members of the Republican National Committee as well as influence by Democrats.

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

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I wanted to say, but time did not permit, that there was some influence exerted by a couple of Members of the other body in this loan. While the rules of the House do not permit me to mention their names on the floor of the House, yet I am going to mention their names tonight in a broadcast over 275 stations of the Mutual network.

Mr. SUTTON. There is no question about influence being used. The whole thing should be exposed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In fairness it might be said also that Mr. Gabrielson was not chairman of the National Republican Committee in 1946. Any loan he secured at that time was secured as an individual. But I agree with the gentleman that if there was any misconduct in that instance bring it out.

Mr. SUTTON. That is right, throw all the rascals out.

PROVISION OF HOUSING FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report (H. Res. 166, Rept. No. 226) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately 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 bill (H. R. 2988) to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the special order that I have for today to address the House for one-half hour and that I be permitted to address the House for 1 hour tomorrow afternoon and also for 1 hour on Thursday following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this fussing around here this morning about Mr. Gabrielson is terribly disturbing. An old man and old woman can live together in comparative peace and harmony for 50 years, as I have done. I have a mighty fine wife and we never get our names or pictures in the paper under a big headline, but if you are down here in the White House as is Major General Vaughan and get a woman to come in from Australia under a special bill why they say something about that. It is because the Republicans perhaps, have not been getting any money from the RFC that these gentlemen today are so exercised when they learn that two Republicans were granted loans.

If you want to abolish the RFC because it made a loan or two, to a couple of Republicans, and I understand they did to two of them, including a radio manufacturer, that is all right with me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am at a complete loss to understand or interpret the purpose of my good friend from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] in the remarks they have made here today. Are they trying to completely exonerate the RFC due to the fact that organization did make a loan to a Republican? Does that excuse the RFC for the corruptness, for the deplorable mess that the RFC is in today, simply because some Republican was able to get a loan? A ripe apple in a barrel of rotten apples does not make the whole barrel of rotten apples good.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

THE HIGH COST OF OUR MILITARY DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the high cost of our military defense program should make us realize that inflation as well as Communist aggression is damaging our national security. In January of this year President Truman in his budget message told the country the United States could get along with forty-one billion for military outlays in the next fiscal year. From recent statements by the Pentagon and other official sources it appears that the President will now ask for even a larger military budget in fiscal 1952.

Defense planners contend that the cost of weapons and defense equipment is rising far faster than was anticipated. The Pentagon budget experts point out that every time raw material prices and wages increase the cost of weapons rises. For example, the Army is now paying \$250,000 for a heavy antiaircraft gun that cost \$160,000 before the Korean war began.

A recent Navy directive to "all hands" illustrates the problem more vividly. The clothing costs for one enlisted man have jumped from \$118 to \$254.75. Blankets have zoomed from \$6 to \$20.

At the end of World War II a fighter plane cost \$53,000. Now our fighter planes cost \$218,000. A medium bomber cost has risen from \$135,000 to \$2,500,000.

The effect of this inflationary price increase is devastating both on our military plans and our domestic economy. The military appropriations approved just before the Korean war, those approved by Congress since July of 1950, and those now proposed, will buy far less than was originally contemplated. In effect, inflation by increasing the cost of guns, planes, and ships, has decreased

our military strength just as the Chinese Communists have done in the Korean stalemate.

It is obvious the United States must overcome the dangers of inflation if we are to win the long pull against the Kremlin. Militarily the Nation is stronger now than it was when the Korean war started, even though we have 50,000 casualties and losses in equipment, but domestically, because of inflation, we are in bad shape. Our fighting men in Korea have valiantly met the Communists on the field of battle and have been successful despite the restrictions imposed on General MacArthur by the Department of State and the White House. At the same time the top administration bureaucrats and policy makers do little to stem the tide of inflation.

The President's outrageous \$98,000,000,000 budget is one of several basic causes of inflation. His budget does not call for any tightening of the Government's belt. The Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, must assume the job of reducing Government expenses in an all-out effort to stave off further inflation.

In addition, the President must make full and effective use of the Defense Production Act which Congress enacted in September of 1950. The White House has had the necessary authority to hold the line for the last 6 months without results. This delay has already cost the taxpayers many millions and if the bungling continues conditions are bound to be worse. For the defense of America strong and effective action on the home front is long overdue. The tools are and have been available. When can the public expect action?

TAXES GO UP, UP, UP

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this week when most Americans are paying their income taxes is a good time to reflect upon the growing cost of the Federal Government.

In George Washington's time the Federal Government cost the taxpayers less than \$1,500,000 a year. In 1950, it cost them about \$50,000,000,000.

In Washington's time the Federal Government cost the citizens 37 cents per capita or an average of \$1.48 for a family of four. Last year Federal taxes were about \$325 per capita or \$1,300 for an average family of four. In 1951, these taxes will be even higher.

In the first year of the Lincoln administration taxes averaged \$6.78 per capita and in 1930, only 20 years ago, taxes were a mere \$29.54 as compared to today's about \$325, according to figures supplied by the Library of Congress.

The per capita taxes to be collected from the American people for 1950 are almost 1,000 times those collected in Washington's time; 200 times the rate of Lincoln's administration; 47 times

the taxes collected in 1910; and 10 times the per capita rates of 20 years ago.

Under such an increase in taxation, it is not surprising that the goods the citizens could buy in 1900 for \$1 today costs about \$3.30.

It has been well said that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." Taxes can undermine the incentive motive for agriculture, labor, and industry which has given us the greatest productive system in the world. If we do not remain financially and economically strong at home we cannot be militarily strong overseas. If we do not fight high taxes and inflation at home, we never can successfully fight communism abroad. Unless greater efficiency and economy is achieved in government, the American people will face even higher taxes, higher prices, more inflation, and ultimate national bankruptcy.

EXCISE TAX ON WINE

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the economic welfare of 26,000 grape-growing families in the State of California is at stake over a proposed imposition of excise taxes on wine which was made public on February 5, 1951, by the Treasury Department.

As proposed, the increased excise taxes would raise the levy on table-wine grapes from the present \$24 a ton to \$30; and on dessert-wine grapes from \$48 to \$120 per ton.

This reflects increases of 150 percent and 233 1/3 percent far in excess of that proposed for any agricultural food product or alcoholic beverage.

This tax is unfair and discriminatory in that it imposes hardships on grape farmers whose major outlet is the wine industry. Already paying \$61,600,000 in Federal taxes, the grape and wine industry would suffer considerably.

California, and particularly the First Congressional District, are primarily dependent upon agriculture to form the basis of a sound economy. In the entire State there are 500,000 acres of vineyards, 383 bonded wineries and relative investments which are computed as having a capital value of \$500,000,000.

If enacted, this tax proposal would divest thousands of farm families of their livelihood, as 167,000 acres of bearing vineyards produce only those varieties of grapes suitable to the production of wine.

Principal outlet for wine, considered mainly as an agricultural food product rather than an alcoholic beverage, are people in the low- and middle-income brackets. They comprise 80 percent of the wine-consuming market.

To meet increased tax demands, cost of retail wines would climb; thus making the product a luxury.

This will result in considerable decline in consumption—estimated to be a minimum of 20,000,000 gallons annually—great loss to grape farmers and place the economy of California in jeopardy.

Grape farmers and vintners are willing to carry their share of the tax load. That share should be a fair one, not an excessive and discriminatory rate.

In fairness to grape farmers and the wine industry of California and the First Congressional District, this unreasonable tax should not be imposed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 5 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION SHOULD BE LIQUIDATED

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to provide for the orderly liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The bill provides that the Corporation shall have succession through June 30, 1953, unless sooner dissolved by Congress. It also provides for the termination of loan powers after June 1, 1951.

The RFC was organized for a good and laudable purpose during the administration of President Hoover. It has rendered outstanding service and has contributed greatly to the welfare of our country.

Unfortunately, this agency, charged with the responsibility of lending millions and billions of dollars belonging to the people of this country, has permitted itself to be influenced by individuals who would use it to line their own pocketbooks and to secure questionable loans by the millions for purposes never intended by the RFC Act. It has become a place of corruption and a sorry mess. It has become a magnet for favor seekers, influence users, and fee-hungry lawyers who have lost respect for their Government and are using the Government lending agency to their own selfish advantage.

Reorganization will not cure what is wrong with the RFC. It should be abolished now. If there should be need for an agency to carry on the work intended by the RFC, a new organization can be established, but this agency has fallen into such disrepute it should be liquidated before the situation becomes even worse.

THE LATE O. S. WARDEN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this means to inform the House

actually for too much cold neutrality in respect to many of Mr. Truman's policies.

Mr. COX. The gentleman finds it pleasing to defend Mr. Nehru.

Mr. FULTON. Not to defend him, but to stand up and explain his views. He needs no defense.

Mr. COX. The gentleman does not concede that he is a pro-Communist.

Mr. FULTON. Not in the least; no. A man who has stood so long for freedom is not for any totalitarian concept. Nehru has represented determinedly his effort for a free India, with his compatriots, Mahatma Gandhi, and his good sister, Madame Pandit, even at the expense of his own and their personal liberty. A man jailed for advocating a free India knows well the penalties exacted by arbitrary authority from the individual citizen.

How can we criticize Nehru for inaction when President Truman said the issue of communism in the United States was merely a red herring drawn by the Republican Party across the American scene for political purposes?

Mr. COX. Of course I did not agree with him.

Mr. FULTON. Then we also must conclude that everybody does not agree with all Mr. Nehru's statements, either, at home or abroad.

Mr. COX. I took exception to the statement made then and I take exception now. I have opposed this policy of appeasing everything Russian, as has been done by our country for a long time. Therefore, I oppose this additional step in that same direction.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman favor the adoption of this bill on humanitarian grounds alone, or is he interested in reclaiming India from communism?

Mr. FULTON. I am very interested in being what might be called by the gentleman's President, his former President, President Roosevelt, a good neighbor, first. Secondly, I am trying by this effort to obtain the conditions in a free world so that peoples of a free world can live and can progress among themselves without pushing down any group or any class or forcing any person into a totalitarian state of any kind. Included in this policy is the purpose, to build up and to make strong this country. And I may say as a Republican on this side of the House that in respect to this India assistance legislation it stands me in good stead to be standing on this question with our former Republican President, Herbert Hoover, who was known as a humanitarian. We are preventing starvation by this bill, and promoting also a strong free world of the kind we would all like to see come soon.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. FULTON. Let us go a little bit further into the attitude of the Government of India, and examine the Home Minister's statement in the Parliament on this question.

Home Minister C. Rajagopalachari laid on the table in Parliament March 10, 1951, a statement explaining the

government's policy and attitude toward the Communist Party of India and the Hindu Mahasabha.

The Home Minister was asked whether the attention of the government had been drawn to certain statements in the press by the Communist Party and the Hindu Mahasabha challenging certain statements made by the honorable minister in the course of a debate in Parliament.

The following is the text of the Home Minister's statement:

The attention of the government was drawn to a press item dated February 17, 1951, to the effect that the Communist Party challenged the Home Minister to withdraw the Preventive Detention Act and do certain other things and then, it was stated that they would act as a regular political party in the open; presumably, dropping their present violent and secret activities.

If the men who grouped themselves and practice terrorism and sabotage in the name of communism will not merely issue a challenge and make conditional offers of adopting a peaceful and open political life, but will back their profession with practice, we could take the risk involved in trusting them. Past conduct cannot just be wiped out by a single press statement. Such declarations should be backed by practical behavior. The honorable members have read Ignazio Silone's narrative of the meeting of the Communist Party at which, when British Communists were asked on their return home to make a public declaration in a certain sense, but actually to do the contrary, and one of the British Communists exclaimed "But that would be a lie," loud laughter greeted this simplicity and filled the hall. The Communists could not understand the Englishman's stupid objection to making a misleading or false declaration. The fact of the matter is that the Communist Party's discipline involves a psychological mechanism whereby each single member becomes progressively identified with the collective organization until his sense of scruple or moral hesitation is totally wiped out. Ethical objections become just ancient wrongs worthy of scorn and derision.

Three leading Indian Communists have issued a statement to their comrade on September 23, 1950, explaining the Communist Party's policy: It is categorically stated herein that the policy should put the peasant movement progressively on the rails of armed struggle and that in agrarian relations they should by mass mobilization and direct action, as in Telengana, create armed forces in rural areas and strong bases for their operations. It is further categorically stated therein that there is no question of liquidating Telengana but that on the contrary, it is the question of raising the movement in the rest of the country to the level of Telengana.

The Politburo of the Communist Party in India issued the policy statement on November 15, 1950, in the following terms: "Finally it is necessary to clearly grasp the truth that armed struggle has become the principal form of struggle in the present agrarian revolutionary stage that our national liberation movement has grown to."

It was added that simultaneously they should adopt and coordinate all other conceivable forms of struggle such as economic and political strikes, demonstrations, agricultural labor and tenant struggle, signature collections for peace-pledge election contests, and so on. The following is from the special circular of the central committee of the party:

"Central committee notes that certain statements are being made demanding the

withdrawal of the heroic struggle of the Telengana people led by the Communist Party against their age-long oppressors with arms in hand for land and liberty. The central committee wishes the ranks of the party to note that such acts will be disruptive of the Telengana struggle, the harbinger of the people's democratic revolution in India which the enemy is trying to drown in blood. The central committee lays stress upon all party members and people to defend Telengana by all the means at their disposal."

An important foreign Communist who was invited to advise the Indian Communist Party gave the following opinion in December 1950: "It is the task of the Communist Party to skillfully utilize the stand of the Nehru Government on questions like Korea, the atom bomb, and so forth. Regarding armed struggle as we have stated in our letter, we do not deny that ultimately a revolution in India will and must take the form of armed struggle. It is hardly to be debated."

It is thus clear that we cannot accept declarations and challenges but we must await the facts and whether the crime reported from Telengana, Madras, Assam, and elsewhere shows a substantial decrease.

The attention of the government was also drawn to the statement on behalf of the Hindu Mahasabha dated February 18, 1951. It is gratifying to read in it that its policy of communism does not include violence. But there is the basic fact that their policies have an inherent tendency to rouse strong passion between communities and to generate violence. Their line of thought and propaganda, therefore, of action, is inconsistent with the basic principle of our Constitution. What is communism to us is nationalism to them. All the same we can tolerate anything if deception and violence be truly shed. The Hindu Mahasabha claims that it is a battle of culture. There would be no difficulty if the Hindu code of conduct were truly respected and followed. In the pattern of behaviour known as Hindu culture there is no room for violence or hatred. If Hindu Mahasabhaites preached and practiced Hinduism as our sages understood and taught it, they would indeed be ideal citizens and the most honored places in the state, including parliament, would undoubtedly be filled by them.

Mr. CARNAHAN. 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. THOMAS, 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. 3791) to furnish emergency food relief assistance to India, had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

UNECONOMICAL AND INEFFICIENT PROCUREMENT METHODS AND PROCEDURES

• Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, postwar history shows that during World War II the Federal Government literally lost billions of dollars as the result of uneconomical and inefficient procurement methods and procedures. In some instances conditions were so bad criminal prosecutions and convictions resulted. At the present time, during the current

mobilization effort, is the executive branch of the Federal Government making the same sad errors?

Several months ago a specific case was called to my attention which on the record indicates beyond any doubt that the Army procurement program is again "snafued" beyond comprehension. Evidence in my possession which I will include in my remarks shows a callous disregard by the Chicago quartermaster depot of sound business practices and the most economical and efficient use of the Nation's production facilities. Furthermore, QM officials in the instant case have utterly disregarded their own warnings to businessmen who bid on Government contracts. The conduct of the officials of the Chicago QM depot in this case is unbelievably bad. A careful and comprehensive review of the whole case with its many ramifications indicates how fouled up and costly in dollars and time a simple business transaction can get when a number of Government agencies are involved.

Before giving the details of this sordid mess I predict the following unfortunate results from the numerous blunders in the handling of this relatively simple business transaction.

First. The Army will not have delivery on the contract pursuant to the terms of the agreement. This is already a fact so I am no prophet in this regard. It should be stated, however, that this was predicted months ago by many persons familiar with the situation.

Second. If the folding chairs are ever delivered, they will be of inferior quality and not up to specifications.

Third. If Consolidated Industries does ever produce and deliver the folding chairs, an attempt will be made subsequently by the company to obtain a better price for the chairs from the Government. The basis for such a spurious claim will be hardship. The only hardship in this case, past, present, or future, is to the American taxpayer and the mobilization effort.

The net result generally of this entire transaction will be an additional load on the already overburdened American taxpayer plus the lack of delivery of an item which the QM depot described as important to our national security.

Here are the documented facts. You can draw your own conclusions. About the 1st of February of 1951 responsible representatives of the American Seating Co., of Grand Rapids, Mich., informed me that some weeks beforehand the quartermaster depot in Chicago had requested two bids on 120,000 folding chairs for delivery within 90 days after the bids had been accepted by the Government. For identification purposes this or these invitations to bid were numbered as follows: QM-11-009-51-1383 and QM-11-009-51-1384. Attached to the invitations to bid was the following:

CAUTION—IMPORTANT NOTICE TO BIDDERS

This is an Armed Forces procurement. It is important to our national security.

Be sure that you can manufacture, produce, and deliver item or items bid upon on time. Delivery schedules have been carefully computed and coordinated. Promptness is vital. Do not bid unless you can meet the

delivery schedule. Note paragraph 11, Default. The Government has the right to terminate contract and charge excess costs against contractor in case of failure to make delivery within the time specified.

Before bidding be certain your material suppliers can deliver promptly if you are awarded a contract. Shortages of materials and labor failure of subcontractors to meet your production schedule may force you into default. The Government does not agree to furnish you with materials unless specified in the invitation.

You must meet specification requirements. Before bidding be sure you can produce an article that will be acceptable under specification requirements.

Do not violate covenant against contingent fees article in the enclosed invitation and bid forms. If you do—

(1) Your contract may be canceled as therein provided, or

(2) The amount of the contingent fee may be deducted from the contract price paid you.

Quantity bid on: You may bid on the full quantity or any part thereof. If bidding on less than full quantity, be sure to indicate exact quantity bid on. (See pars. 1 and 14 of terms and conditions of invitation re increase or decrease option of Government.)

To not make changes in provisions of invitation and bid forms: If a change is made by bidder, and as a result the bid is not responsive, it cannot be considered for award.

Be certain that you understand all of the terms and conditions of this invitation. If in doubt, communicate with this office for clarification prior to submitting bid.

Bids cannot be modified or withdrawn after time of opening.

I call your particular attention to the warning that—

This is an Armed Forces procurement. It is important to our national security. Be sure that you can manufacture, produce and deliver item or items bid upon on time. Delivery schedules have been carefully computed and coordinated. Promptness is vital. Do not bid unless you can meet the delivery schedule. Note paragraph 11, "default." The Government has the right to terminate contract and charge excess costs against contractor in case of failure to make delivery within time specified.

According to information presented to me by various sources there were 14 concerns which submitted bids on one or both of the aforementioned invitations to bid. On the two contracts Consolidated Industries of Memphis, Tenn., was low on 118,004 folding chairs with bids of \$380,337.76. The next lowest bidder was a concern by the name of Acme Seating Co. with a bid of \$435,000. It is my understanding the American Seating Co. was the next lowest bidder.

On the surface it would seem that the Chicago Quartermaster Depot should have awarded the contract to Consolidated Industries inasmuch as it was the low bidder. A careful, objective and honest appraisal of all the facts, however, should have convinced the Army procurement officials that the signing of the contract with Consolidated Industries would lead to the present deplorable situation. The Quartermaster officials have contended and undoubtedly will continue to contend that such a thorough investigation was made. The record speaks for itself. If an investigation was made it was either insufficient to protect the Government's interest or those making the investigation were incompetent to do the job.

All of the bidders on these two bids except Consolidated Industries were established chair manufacturers. Consolidated Industries had never made a folding chair. The company had no established plant for the production of the required folding chairs. It was not tooled up for the job.

At the time the award was made the Munitions Board had already issued Manual No. 90-1, Production Planning for Emergency Procurement. I quote from page 3, paragraph 1.3.5:

Plans for thorough utilization of existing manufacturing facilities will be developed, thereby minimizing the need for new construction.

Page 25, paragraph 2.3.54:

Additional machine tools and industrial equipment required: An important function of the production allocation program is to minimize the need for additional machine tools and industrial equipment in time of war. This objective can be accomplished in part by planning thorough utilization of existing tools and equipment. Management and Procurement Planning Officers are urged to bear this in mind in developing production plans.

There existed at the time this award was made, and still exists, more than sufficient manufacturing capacity to manufacture more than the number of chairs required for both military and civilian use as evidenced by the number of responsible bidders who attempted to secure this contract. Why then did the Chicago Quartermaster Depot disregard entirely—

First. That Consolidated did not have an established plant?

Second. That Consolidated had never made a chair?

Third. That Consolidated would have to tool up as previously stated?

The invitations to bid specifically required that the awards be made to a financially responsible party. The record again speaks for itself. Consolidated Industries, in order to finance the production of the chairs, made application to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a loan of \$75,000.

At this point I ask this question: Should a Government loaning agency, the RFC for example, loan the taxpayers' money so that a new company can be set up to compete with the already existing manufacturers who have sufficient plant and production facilities to handle the entire military and civilian needs in the folding-chair industry? Of course, the answer is "No." In this instance established chair manufacturers and their thousands of employees have paid their taxes to Uncle Sam, and now these established manufacturers and their skilled and trained employees find their tax dollars being used to set up competing and totally unneeded facilities to handle military and civilian needs. In my judgment, it is not morally right to the established companies or their employees for the Federal Government to use their hard-earned tax moneys for such a purpose.

At the time I first learned of this scheme to set up a new company with Uncle Sam's tax money so Consolidated could enter an already adequate business

field, it seemed to me, in light of the fact that Consolidated could not possibly produce on its contract, that the Government was putting itself in a very unenviable position. Again these fears, predictions, and warnings have unfortunately come true.

Let us look at the situation. The quartermaster officials awarded the contract to the lowest bidder, Consolidated, even though the Army was repeatedly warned ahead of time that the company could not possibly perform. To finance the company, RFC authorized a \$75,000 loan of your tax dollars. Now what happens if Consolidated cannot perform on its contract, and it obviously cannot. If the quartermaster officials cancel Consolidated's contract, RFC is left holding the bag. RFC, if the funds have been disbursed in order to prevent a loss to the Government, quite likely will pressure the quartermaster to go easy on Consolidated. This means Consolidated will not be held to its contract as to delivery date, quality specifications on the chairs, and possibly some relief as to price. Already Consolidated has failed to produce the folding chairs within the 90-day period required by the contract. In fact, not one single chair of acceptable quality has been delivered. The samples supplied to the quartermaster officials are not up to standard and likely will never be. It will be interesting to see what is done by the Army if and when Consolidated says it needs a better price to do the job.

At the time this entire matter came to my attention I conferred with a number of Federal agencies who might have some information concerning Consolidated Industries and those individuals connected with the company. Inasmuch as this company or those behind it had done business with the Veterans' Administration, I wrote the Veterans' Administration on February 5 for certain information. My letter of that date reads as follows:

Gen. CARL R. GRAY, Jr.,
Administrations of Veterans' Affairs,
Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Mr. A. K. Maiers.)

DEAR GENERAL GRAY: I write at this time for a full and complete report on any and all contracts and business dealings the Veterans' Administration has had with Consolidated Industries, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn. It is my understanding that the Veterans' Administration has canceled one or more contracts with this company and is now seeking to recover certain funds on behalf of the Federal Government.

I thank you in advance for a prompt reply and a full disclosure of all available evidence.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

The Veterans' Administration on February 8 answered with the following very illuminating letter:

Hon. GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORD: This will confirm the conversation with a representative of this service in response to your letter of February 5, 1951, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in which you requested a full and complete re-

port regarding the Consolidated Industries, Inc., Memphis, Tenn.

As stated, this Administration has had no contractual or business dealings with the Consolidated Industries, Inc., and therefore no contracts have been either executed or canceled.

For your confidential information, an investigation of the National Vocational and Technical College, Memphis and Chattanooga, Tenn., revealed that it was owned by Mr. J. W. P. Fleming, who is also the owner of the Consolidated Industries, as well as several other business ventures in the State of Tennessee and the State of Mississippi. A contract was executed between this Administration and the National Vocational and Technical College for the purpose of providing educational training for veterans under the provisions of Public Laws 16 and 316; however, in October 1950 the officials of the school advised the veterans and the Veterans' Administration that the school was being closed and as of this date is still closed.

It was also established that tools, supplies, and equipment were being purchased at a discount through the Consolidated Industries, Inc., for the use of the veterans in training at the National Vocational and Technical College and in turn such items were increased as high as 25 percent in price at the time the school billed the Veterans' Administration for services rendered. In view of this, together with information to the effect that the school was not rendering all services to the veterans for which they had billed the Veterans' Administration, a full and complete audit was requested in an effort to establish the extent of overpayment. Officials of the National Vocational and Technical College refused the Veterans' Administration permission to audit the books of the school and in October 1950 a subpoena was served upon the school in an effort to secure the books and records. Again the school refused and employed legal counsel in defending their position. The office of the United States attorney, Memphis, Tenn., has been requested to enforce the provisions of the subpoena and it is understood that the matter is to be placed before the court in the near future.

I believe the above information, together with that given to you by the representative of this service, will assist you in your inquiry, and in the event this office can be of further service to you, do not hesitate to advise.

Very truly yours,

JOHN R. GALBRAITH,
Director, Inspection-Investigation
Service.

The quartermaster officials in Chicago were warned in advance that Veterans' Administration was not pleased with its dealings with this organization and the individuals involved in its organization. A thorough investigation by the Army with the help of Veterans' Administration might well have prevented the predicament now facing the quartermaster officials.

The RFC was also contacted by me on February 5 as shown by the following letter:

Mr. W. ALMA HARBER,
Chairman, Reconstruction
Finance Corporation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HARBER: I have been informed that the RFC has on January 22, 1951, consummated a \$109,000 loan to Consolidated Industries, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn. Will you kindly give me a report on the basis or justification for this loan?

In addition to the above, will you kindly reply to the following specific questions?

1. Did the RFC officials handling this loan know of the cancellation of a Consolidated Industries, Inc., contract by the Veterans' Administration?

2. If there was no knowledge of this contract cancellation, was an adequate examination made of the background, past history, and financial resources and reliability of Consolidated Industries, Inc.?

3. Does RFC seek financial reports on prospective borrowers from Dun and Bradstreet?

4. Was such a report sought by RFC in this case?

I thank you in advance for a full and prompt reply to the above.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

RFC replied on February 13 by the following letter:

Hon. GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FORD: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 5, 1951, requesting certain information in connection with Consolidated Industries, Inc., Memphis, Tenn.

As our Mr. Dodds advised you by telephone a few days ago, our Nashville Loan Agency authorized a loan to this company in the amount of \$75,000 on January 22, 1951, but the loan has not been consummated since no disbursement has been made.

We have requested Mr. Lee Davis, acting manager of the Nashville Loan Agency, to make a complete investigation and submit a report on this case, meanwhile withholding disbursement until further advice from this office. As soon as we have Mr. Davis' report we will be able to answer the questions contained in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

W. E. HARBER,
Chairman.

This letter indicates that RFC, as of that date at least, was using some caution in the matter. You will note, however, that my questions were not answered in full.

Because of the information given me by the Veterans' Administration, I wrote the following letter on February 5 to the Department of Justice:

Hon. J. HOWARD McGRATH,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: During the past few days I have been investigating the transactions of a company known as the Consolidated Industries, Inc., located in Memphis, Tenn.

I have been informed that the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have made an investigation of this company. The Veterans' Administration informs me that the Justice Department is now considering taking action against the above corporation. I write at this time requesting any information you have available on what the Department of Justice intends to do against this corporation. A full and detailed report on this case will be appreciated.

I will appreciate a speedy reply. Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

On February 6 the Attorney General acknowledged my previous letter and indicated a full report would follow. On February 27 I received the following communication from Peyton Ford,

Deputy Attorney General of the Department of Justice:

HON. GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This will refer to your letter of February 5, 1951, addressed to the Attorney General in which you request to be advised as to what action this Department intends to take against the Consolidated Industries, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn. Your inquiry is predicated upon information received by you that this company has been investigated by the Veterans' Administration and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The records of this Department show that the investigation being conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation is based upon several complaints received by the Bureau in which the complainants alleged that the Consolidated Industries, Inc., has defrauded the Government in connection with several contracts for training veterans pursuant to the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Allowance Act of 1944. These contracts are between the Veterans' Administration and the National Vocational and Technical College, Colored Division, of Chattanooga, Tenn. (formerly Chattanooga Vocational School). According to the complainants, the Consolidated Industries, Inc., and the National Vocational and Technical College are owned and operated by the same individual.

Since the investigation of this matter is still in a pending status, we are unable, at the present time, to determine what, if any, action should be taken against the Consolidated Industries, Inc.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
Deputy Attorney General.

One can draw his own conclusions as to whether or not the Justice Department is proceeding adequately in light of the information given by the Veterans' Administration.

The American Seating Co. and its several thousand employees have a natural interest in seeing that the Federal Government is operated properly and economically. The responsible officials of this company have made every effort to see that Army officials had the full facts in this case before the contracts were awarded. I am told the QM officials in Chicago and Washington were repeatedly warned and cautioned by representatives of America Seating Co., all to no avail. The record shows these representatives knew from long experience something about folding chairs. The following letter dated February 6 from the QM depot is most illuminating in light of recent developments:

AMERICAN SEATING CO.,
New York, N. Y.

(Attention: Mr. Martin E. Kornbluth.)
Re Invitations Nos. QM-11-009-51-1383,
QM-11-009-51-1384.

GENTLEMEN: Reference is made to your telegram of February 1, 1951, wherein you protest a proposed award of chairs, folding, metal, covered by the captioned invitations for bids to Consolidated Industries, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn., and allege as your reasons therefor that the said proposed award would be improper inasmuch as Consolidated Industries, Inc., lacks tools, dies, jigs, fixtures, or other requirements necessary to the manufacture of the supplies involved by the required delivery date and in order to acquire the same would have to duplicate already existing facilities.

This office has carefully considered the allegations set forth in your wire of protest

and has determined that such allegations are without merit in view of the fact that the procurement contemplated under the said invitations for bids was undertaken pursuant to formal advertising. Under the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 and of the regulations promulgated pursuant thereto, this depot has no alternative other than to make an award to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder submitting quotations in accordance with the advertised requirements set forth in the said invitations for bids. In the instant case, this depot has carefully investigated financial responsibility, plant facilities, and background of experience enjoyed by Consolidated Industries, Inc., and is convinced that such bidder is well financed, has adequate plant facilities, and on the basis of previous experience is well qualified to manufacture and deliver the supplies covered by the captioned invitations in strict accordance with the specifications and delivery schedule cited therein.

It is believed that a possible misunderstanding exists with respect to the obligations of the interested contracting officer in connection with making awards pursuant to formal advertising as opposed to negotiations. In the former case, this depot is without authority to inquire into the matter of duplication of existing facilities; in the latter case, this depot is restricted to policy established by the Department of the Army, which policy by reason of the national emergency is currently opposed to the duplication of existing facilities where existing facilities appear to be adequate to effect necessary procurement. Consequently, different criteria may be applicable to the same commodity dependent upon whether procurement is effected by formal advertising or by means of negotiation and, as a result thereof, this depot is currently procuring under both sets of rules. While any misunderstanding which may have resulted from the coexistence of both methods of procurement is regrettable, it is not believed that the best interests of the Government would be served by the cancellation of formally advertised procurements previously in effect for the sole purpose of effectuating a policy which was adopted subsequent thereto and intended to apply to procurement by negotiation only.

Consideration having been given to the foregoing, it is believed that your company will now agree that Consolidated Industries, Inc. were in fact the lowest responsive and responsible bidder under the captioned invitations and as such are entitled to an award consistent with its bid. Accordingly, your protest is denied and your are advised that award is being made this date to the Consolidated Industries, Inc. in accordance with its bids.

Very truly yours,

W. B. BRADLEY, Jr.,
Captain, Quartermaster Corps,
Contracting Officer.

Please note how far wrong the Quartermaster officials were. The record speaks for itself. There is either incompetency or a lack of good business practice and judgment in this branch of the Department of Defense. Particular notice should be paid to the second paragraph of Captain Bradley's letter.

On February 5, I wrote the following letter to General Everett Busch at Fifth Army Headquarters. His reply of February 12 is also included in the record.

Gen. EVERETT BUSCH,
Fifth Army Headquarters,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR GENERAL BUSCH: I am writing in reference to the following:
Invitations to Bid Nos. QM 11-009-51-1383,
QM 11-009-51-1384.

Would you kindly furnish me with the following data:

1. Have the awards on the above Invitations to Bid been made and if so on what dates?
2. If the awards have been made when must performance on the contract be completed? I would like the exact date.
3. What is the contract price for Consolidated Industries, Inc.?
4. If the award is made to Consolidated Industries, Inc. on the basis of their bid or bids, is this contract subject to subsequent renegotiation to a higher figure under any War Powers legislation?

I thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

HON. GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORD: Reference is made to your letter dated 5 February 1951 concerning Invitations for Bid Numbers QM 11-009-51-1383 and QM 11-009-51-1384. Your inquiries are answered as follows:

1. Contract No. DA 11-009 qm-6508 (OI No. 8127-GS-51) and Contract Nos. DA 11-009 qm-6512 (OI No. 8131-GS-51) were awarded under Invitations for Bids Numbers QM 11-009-51-1383 and QM 11-009-51-1384, respectively, to Consolidated Industries, Inc., under date of 6 February 1951.

2. The completion date for 27,970 units covered by the first cited Contract is 7 April 1951. 43,030 units covered thereunder are for delivery from 8 April 1951 through 8 May 1951. 47,004 units covered by the second mentioned Contract are for delivery by 7 April 1951.

3. The unit prices set forth in contract No. DA 11-009 qm 6508 are \$3.19 each for domestic pack items and \$3.44 each for the export pack item. The total contract price is \$230,395. The unit prices set forth in contract No. DA 11-009 qm-6512 are \$3.19 each for items 1a through 1f, all of which are domestic pack. The total contract price is \$149,942.76.

4. The contracts hereinabove referred to contain no provision under which any upward renegotiation in price may be made.

Sincerely,

E. BUSCH,
Brigadier General, United States
Army, Commanding.

On April 25 I again contacted General Busch as shown by the following:

Gen. EVERETT BUSCH,
Fifth Army Headquarters,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR GENERAL BUSCH: This is in further reply to your letter of February 12 in reference to Consolidated Industries, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn. I will appreciate your giving me a status report on the progress of the contracts with this corporation. If possible, a speedy reply will be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am,

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.

The reply from General Busch is most illuminating and it is quoted in its entirety:

HON. GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Re: Consolidated Industries, Inc., Memphis, Tenn.

DEAR MR. FORD: This will reply to your inquiry under date of April 25 concerning the status and progress of our contracts with Consolidated Industries, Inc., of Memphis, Tenn.

We have two contracts with this small-business firm, both awarded on February 6, 1951.

1. Contract DA 11-009-QM-6512 (OI 8131-GS-51):

Item: 47,004 chairs, folding, metal.
Delivery schedule: March 1-31, 1951.
Deliveries to date: None.

2. Contract DA 11-009-QM-6508 (OI 8127-GS-51):

Item: 71,000 chairs, folding, metal.
Delivery schedule: 27,970 by April 7, 1951;
43,030 April 8 to May 8, 1951.
Deliveries to date: None.

The president of Consolidated Industries called at this depot on April 27 and brought with him sample chairs from his first production. It is our earnest hope that shipments will be forthcoming in the near future.

The administration of these two contracts has required a considerable expenditure of time and effort on the part of my hard-pressed purchasing people; however, in view of the policy of the Congress in regard to small business, we have been reluctant to take any action which might be interpreted as either discriminatory or punitive.

For your information, this data has been furnished the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, United States Senate, who also is interested in these contracts.

Sincerely yours,

E. BUSCH,
Brigadier General, United States
Army, Commanding.

General Busch's letter admits everything that was predicted months ago by responsible parties has now taken place. The contracts have not been performed as required and, unquestionably, never will be. The excuses given by the Army are weak and inadequate. General Busch's staff would not have been hard pressed in handling this procurement if the original warnings had been heeded. Congress is interested in small business during the mobilization effort, but the comment by General Busch in this case is simply an ineffectual alibi. The quartermaster officials should have shown better judgment. Certainly some of the other 13 bidders on these two contracts fall in the category of small business and they, being established folding-chair manufacturers, could have produced on time and in line with contract specifications.

The last paragraph of General Busch's letter seems unusual. I have no way of knowing what was intended by this reference to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Some months ago when this case was first called to my attention I was informed by the Army officials that Consolidated had a DO priority for the necessary steel for this contract and that as a result the material was on hand. This scarce material was obtained on the basis of these contracts for the defense effort. It has languished in storage for too long a time without being put to proper use. In the meantime, other manufacturers of defense and civilian products are without their share of steel. Will it ever be used on the contract? Probably not. Certainly not if the quartermaster officials take the long-overdue action to cancel Consolidated's contract. If canceled, what happens to the steel obtained by Consolidated?

On April 25 I wrote the NPA in reference to this problem generally as shown by the following letter:

Mr. JOHN PECKHAM,
Director of Compliance,
National Production Authority,
Commerce Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PECKHAM: John Milanowski on my staff discussed with you the policy of the use of DO ratings for steel and other allocated materials.

I will appreciate an official opinion from you regarding the fact that under existing regulations there is no way to check or stop the indiscriminate use of a DO rating with more than one seller. As a matter of fact, I will appreciate a complete analysis of the DO ratings system with your own comments and suggestions on how best we can tighten up the loopholes.

As time is of the essence in this request, a speedy reply will be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation, I am
Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD, Jr.

The reply from NPA indicates there is little hope of recapturing the steel from consolidated if the Army officials cancel the contracts. In my judgment this is a deplorable situation in that it means there is further pressure on the quartermaster depot to continue its contracts with a company that cannot perform on its legal obligations. Furthermore, Consolidated by hoarding this steel for the past 3 or 4 months has crippled other concerns that are badly in need of this critical material.

Within the last several weeks the American Seating Co. in writing has informed the quartermaster depot officials it could and would supply the required folding chairs at the rate of 5,000 per day and at the price set forth in its original bid or bids. Other original bidders undoubtedly would do likewise.

Consolidated Industries obviously is in default at considerable expense and inconvenience to the Federal Government. General Busch's letter of April 28 is definite proof of this statement. A few days ago a presumably responsible Army official in the Quartermaster Depot in Chicago when asked what the Army procurement officials would do about this delinquent contract, allegedly said:

We have 900 delinquent contractors now, and 1 more would only make it 901.

With such an attitude prevalent, how can the Government's interest be properly protected. Such an indefensible attitude means the mobilization effort will inevitably cost more tax dollars. In addition, the necessary supplies and materials for the war effort will never be acquired. I only hope there is not the same callous disregard for efficiency when it comes to the procurement of tanks, guns, and planes.

In closing, this should be said. The Quartermaster officials themselves and no one else are responsible for the mess. Here is a summary of the case. A financial report received by the commanding general of the Chicago Quartermaster Depot most certainly showed that this contractor did not have the resources to handle a contract of this type. A properly conducted survey of the facili-

ties of Consolidated Industries should have shown that this company had never made a folding chair. They were not manufacturers but had attempted to run a Veterans' Vocational and Technical College. They had no machinery, tools, dies, and jigs. They had not even made a sample chair, prepared a detailed drawing, or even submitted a catalog illustration or photograph of any kind of what they intended to furnish. They certainly did not have any testing or research department as required by the specifications.

There existed at the time this award was made, and still exists, more than sufficient manufacturing capacity to manufacture more than the number of chairs required for both military and civilian use as evidenced by the number of responsible bidders who attempted to secure this contract. I repeat, why then did the Chicago Quartermaster Depot disregard entirely—

First. That the manufacturer did not have financial responsibility.

Second. That he did not have the necessary plant facility for such an operation.

Third. That he had never made a chair.

Fourth. That he would have to tool up as previously stated.

Why was this company given special privileges? Why now are they still being given special privileges when they have defaulted on their contract? If the Armed Forces need the chairs, the Defense Department should exercise their rights of buying against this manufacturer's contract. There are established manufacturers ready and willing to manufacture these chairs within a few days time who can give the Armed Forces what they need.

Right now the Chicago Quartermaster Depot is still listening to alibis and all kinds of excuses as to why this contractor cannot deliver. The sample chair submitted, supposedly from their first production, does not comply with the specifications and up to the time of the preparation of these remarks the Chicago Quartermaster Depot has not accepted a chair as complying with the specifications and, therefore, no chairs have been produced on this contract. An earnest hope that shipments will be forthcoming, as stated in the commanding general's letter, is wishful thinking. This manufacturer at his best, even if he could make a chair to comply with the specifications, with his present facility could not produce over 600 acceptable chairs per day or would require about 200 additional days to complete the contracts. As previously stated, there are reputable manufacturers willing at this time to produce as many as 5,000 chairs per day in just one facility. It would take about 25 days of such production to complete the contracts by the use of established manufacturers.

In closing, let me say it is regrettable that it is necessary for the legislative branch of the Government to investigate the work of the executive branch of the Federal Government, however, when such a case comes to the attention of a Member of the Congress it is his duty

1949 APR 13, 1949

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. It seems to me we must maintain a balanced program, and when I favor that point of view I am for a truly balanced program for all elements of air power.

Air power as we know it has two component parts in our Military Establishment. We have the Air Force, which has done in the past and, I am sure, will continue in the future to do an outstanding job. However, we must remember the Navy air arm has a different function than that performed by the Air Force.

It so happens that I had some experience during the last war on active duty with the third and fifth fleets in the Pacific. I can assure each and every one of you in this body that most of the job that was done by the Navy Air Corps then, and I think in the future, cannot be done by the Air Force. The Air Force with its land-based planes can and will perform important functions, but the ship-based planes must be available for the special jobs they will be called upon to perform.

I was interested in the statement made earlier in the afternoon by my colleague from South Dakota in which he quoted General LeMay as saying that the B-29 gave protection to our Pacific carrier task groups. With all due deference to the statement made by General LeMay, I cannot under any circumstances see how a group of B-29's could protect a task group of carriers or any group of Navy ships. It is just not practicable. The only way you can protect carriers is by fighter escort and torpedo bombers, the F-6's and the TBM's, or other comparable planes. For B-29's to protect carriers is absolutely absurd.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It is possible the B-29 could have been given a target to keep enemy planes grounded while the operation from the carrier was being conducted.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct. They may have had a mission to cover the airfields and keep the planes from taking off, but for B-29's to stay at 30,000 feet and in that way give protection to a group of carriers is, I repeat, absolutely absurd.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I did not intend to say that it was a practical thing. I was only pointing out that it was a rather impractical thing to tie up some B-29's to drop 2,000 tons of bombs on a secondary target so that our Navy planes could drop 600 on a primary target. It would have been much more practical, it seems to me, to let the B-29's go on to the primary target.

Mr. FORD. I agree with that statement.

In the operation of carriers off the coast of Japan, off the coast of the Philippines, and off the coast of Okinawa our bombing planes got ample protection from the carrier fighter planes. Carrier bombing planes got very little protection

from the Air Force escorting planes while operating in the Pacific.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. It was impossible for the Air Force to afford coverage either at Okinawa or at Leyte. The Navy had to furnish their own coverage, the gentleman knows that.

Mr. FORD. I certainly do.

Mr. RIVERS. It was not possible for the Air Force to do that.

Mr. FORD. The Air Force did not have the bases or the planes and the Air Force in the future in such operations would be similarly handicapped.

Mr. RIVERS. There was no way for them to do it.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I should like to endorse the statement the gentleman has just made, for I, too, had the privilege of serving in the Naval Air Corps; and I might observe that the Navy air arm did 75 percent of the work in the Pacific.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, may I make this plain at the beginning. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] restores the \$576,000,000 that was stricken out by the point of order made by the gentleman from New York and adds thereto \$300,000,000 to keep the Navy in the air business and not abolish naval aviation. The sum and substance of this amendment is to retain to the Navy the naval aviation.

We have signed the Atlantic Pact. If we do not give the Navy \$300,000,000 for naval aviation and research, we will have signed the death warrant of naval aviation, make no mistake about that.

I think there is enough glory in the United States and in the world for all of our services to get along in absolute harmony. There is plenty of glory for the Air Force, for the Army, and for the Navy in their primary and allocated missions. I was terribly disturbed a little while ago when the chairman of this great Committee on Appropriations made some statements on the floor which I trust and fervently pray he will correct, because they are without foundation in fact. He made the statement, and I hope he will correct it, that the Navy did not have planes which could fly over 500 miles. I tell you—and I know whereof I speak—that we have planes that can fly 2,500 miles and return; and we have planes that can do even better than that.

In addition I state as a fact that they can carry atomic bombs. I state as another fact that they can return to carriers. To get up on the floor and make a statement of that kind is doing a disservice to the great record of the Navy and belying the things that the Navy can do, things that no other branch of the service dare attempt to do. Say, for instance, that we did not have carrier-based planes. What I am about to say is in all deference to the Air Force.

I want you to remember that the Navy and the Air Force are getting along all right. We are going to give \$800,000,000 to the Air Force because they are entitled to it, but it does not follow that the Navy is not entitled to their glory, which they have earned. Say, for instance, that we do not have carriers to patrol the coast of Europe when that war with Russia comes—which I hope is long delayed. Our carrier-based planes will keep the forces of the enemy strewn all over Europe, because they will not know where the carrier-based planes are going to strike. But land-based planes will be attacked, because they will know where they are coming from. The chairman of the committee said another thing. He said that we have to win the war in 3 weeks. If we do not win the war in 3 weeks, take it from me that there will be no bases in continental Europe, because the Russian Army can kick any army off of continental Europe in 6 weeks. I know. London and Great Britain will be a shambles. If you do not have carrier-based planes, you will not carry on, and your Navy will have been wiped out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is really a pity that we hear on the floor of the House today talk apparently from those who are experts in the field of aviation—both Army and Naval Air. But I want to speak a word for that branch of the service, namely, Naval Air only because for a period of 10 years I served on the Committee on Naval Affairs up to the time of the consolidation of the Military Affairs Committee with the Committee on Naval Affairs 2 years ago. Down through the period of years we followed with a great deal of interest the magnificent job, not only that the Navy as a whole has done, but the naval air arm in those most dangerous days in the Pacific area when they had so little and so few things to fight with; in those days when they were using torpedo boats as destroyers. They were making the best of the situation that they were dealing with. Only a brief word can be said about this amendment to put it clearly before the Members of the House, and that is whether or not we want to maintain the efficiency of the authorized strength of the air arm of the Navy or whether, because we refuse by the adoption of this amendment offered by the gentleman from California, to provide enough planes to maintain the naval air arm on an efficient basis. If this amendment is defeated, I say to you men and women, Members of the House, that in relatively few years, because of the lack of replacements in the Navy program, the efficiency of the naval air arm will be cut just in half. That is the thought we want to keep in mind as we vote today on this amendment, which I am wholeheartedly in favor of. We must also keep in mind that 80 percent of the planes the Navy now has were purchased in 1945 or in the years before. It is important, it seems to me, in this unsettled world we are now living in, that we maintain the efficiency of the armed

now, you are going on a hazardous journey, there is some peril attached to this, so we are going to give you a bonus because you may lose your life," you say to the lieutenant commander. "We are going to give you \$150 bonus," but to the enlisted man we say, "We are going to give you a \$30 bonus." In other words, this Congress is putting its stamp of approval on the fact that in the eyes of Congress and the military, the life of an enlisted man is not worth as much as the life of an officer. I say, whether you put the hazardous bonus at \$30 or \$50 or \$100, whatever it may be, it should be the same for all. Under the system as it is now, if a major and several enlisted men go up in an airplane, you do the same thing. You say to all those men when they start out, "You have a hazardous duty here. If you go, we are going to give you a bonus," and you give the major \$150 and you give the enlisted man \$30. I do not think that is a fair and just system. I do not think anything is worse for the morale of the service than that particular system. I think in Congress here we should say, if all of these men are going to risk their lives on hazardous duty which has nothing to do with qualifications or basic pay schedule, that "We are going to treat you all alike as far as hazardous, perilous duty is concerned, so that an enlisted man who takes that risk gets the very same thing as the officer does."

I might add, without any criticism of the officers, that it is probable that the enlisted man will be subjected to more risks than the officer. A little later on I have the same amendment with reference to subsection (c), changing that the same way.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the words, "hazardous-duty pay" are a misnomer. It happens to be that we have carried that language in the law for quite some period of time, and it is understood that it relates to this type of duty. The proper term is "incentive pay"; that it is for the purpose of attracting men to perform this type of duty. It might be that we should never have gone to a percentage-wise basis for hazardous pay. But, it so happens that back at the beginning of the First World War, when few of us were here except our illustrious chairman, they did adopt the provision for 50 percent of base or longevity pay as the proper basis for incentive pay, and it has continued down through the years.

Many of us have wanted to do something about the readjustment of this for a long time. The Hook Commission finally gave us a formula which seems workable, one that we think can begin the revision and finally settle the matter entirely.

No longer will a major general get \$4,400 a year for flight duty. He will get only \$1,200 a year under this bill. We have reduced him that much. We permit the second lieutenant to get a little bit more flying pay than he got before. He goes from about \$93 to \$100 a month on his flight pay.

Of course every man's life is as dear to himself and his loved ones as any other man's life. I am surely not going to contend that any ratio should be justified on the basis of the hazard to his life that is assumed. But I also realize that to a man in the higher pay brackets the amount of money to constitute an incentive must vary because the matter is relative. It depends on the amount of money you are receiving, the equation which a little bit more would make as compared to what you are receiving. We submit it to you on the basis that it is incentive pay rather than hazardous-duty pay. We feel that the differential must exist in order to attract the men in the higher pay brackets.

It is also true that most of the casualties occur among the pilots of the planes, and most of those are the commissioned officers. A \$30-a-month hazardous-duty pay in the case of a colonel would be very little incentive, in my opinion. It depends upon the ratio it bears to his other income. I trust that this amendment will be defeated and that we will be sustained in the first revision of this type of pay that has been undertaken since 1917, the first time we have found a formula under which we can do something about the present hazardous-duty pay.

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

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

Mr. FURCOLO. I should like to point out to the gentleman, if I may, first of all, that I said as far as I was concerned the figure of \$30 was not governing with me. I am satisfied to take the gentleman's opinion on it. Secondly, on page 2224 of the hearings, with reference now to the morale of the armed services, may I point out that one of the very few enlisted men who testified said:

Sir, I believe that whenever eight men are in an airplane each one of them holds his own life as dear to himself as any other man in that airplane.

That has a great deal to do with the morale of the services, and there is nothing that would help them more than that amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. We agree that the hazard is the same, but when you regard it in its proper light, as an incentive pay, then I do not believe you are justified in that position.

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

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I cannot speak for the other branches, but as a former pilot in the Air Force I found that after flying for 6 or 8 months the novelty wears off, it begins to become monotonous, and it becomes routine. You do not exactly look forward to flying as you did when you first started. I dare say that if it were not for flying pay, for this added incentive, we would not have enough men in the Air Force to fly our airplanes.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman. I think that is true. The larger your income, of course, the more the incentive must be.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the Furcolo amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ford as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Furcolo: On page 19, after line 12, strike out of the chart the following:

"O-8----- \$100
O-7----- 100"

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this particular section of the bill pertains to hazardous-duty pay. The committee has made some excellent changes in the present law on this problem. Under the category of hazardous-duty pay the bill includes flying and submarine duty, glider duty, parachute duty, diving duty, submarine escape, deep-sea diving, and leprosy duty.

Under my amendment we would remove only the hazardous-duty pay or the incentive pay as far as the categories of O-8 and O-7 are concerned. Who does this affect? It affects the following members of the armed services: Generals, lieutenant generals, and major generals, and in the Navy, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey, admirals, vice admirals, and rear admirals in the upper half; and I might add, under O-7, brigadier generals and rear admirals in the lower half, and some people in the Public Health Service.

It appears that the committee in its judgment, and I think wisely so, has completely revised the hazardous-duty-pay system in their bill compared to the way it exists at the present time. If you will turn to page 50 of the committee report, you will find that men who are in the category of major general receive under the present law \$363.66. Under the proposed bill they will receive simply \$100. In other words, in effect, this \$100 is a token payment for something that existed in the past. Under the category of brigadier general or the category of rear admiral in the lower half they presently get \$275 a month. This bill would give them \$100 a month. I say again it is merely a token payment to continue a system which the committee itself considers improper.

It seems to me the best illustration of the present situation is the case of General Eisenhower. I have figures which show that when he was in the service he received around \$15,000 a year. Under the present law a general of comparable rank who was an Air Force officer receives \$15,000 plus 50 percent of a part of that amount. There is no question that during the last war General Eisenhower probably flew as much as the Air Force general who was getting the 50 percent extra in the same rank.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has his figures somewhat confused. It is 50 percent of the base pay, and the highest base pay in the Army is \$8,300. Therefore, that is what the flight pay would amount to. What we are trying to do here is to get away from that 50 percent of the base pay. We are trying to cut it down and make provision here so that a major general and a brigadier general

lieve they would ever pursue such a course.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

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

Mr. FORD. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman if it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. MAHON. In view of the fact we have so many items and that this hospital matter has already been resolved, it would seem to me that we ought to move along to the reading of the bill and the consideration of other amendments as soon as we can. It is early in the day and I realize everybody is fresh and wants to make a speech, but I think it would be well if we could go on to other issues. I am sure the gentleman from Michigan will agree.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this hospital problem has been brought up I think it essential to say a word or two.

It is true that the language directing the Department of the Army to operate this hospital, which has the effect of law, is no longer in the bills. If the bill continues in this form when finally enacted there will be no legal requirement that the Department of the Army continue the operation of the hospitals.

In other words, if the law remains as it is in the bill today the Department of the Army has full legal authority, and in fact, the responsibility to exercise its own good judgment as to the further operation of these two hospitals.

The record shows that the President, the Secretary of the Army and the Surgeon-General of the Army all concur in the desirability on the ground of efficiency and on the ground of economy in the closing of these two hospitals. I hope the proper authorities take the necessary steps to save this \$1 million annually.

Mr. Chairman, it has been brought up that the Army wants to build 25 new hospitals. They would like to build a lot of new things including hospitals. But the Department of the Army did not request of the Armed Services Committee authority to build a new hospital in the fiscal year 1953 at Fort Devens. It is on the eligibility list but it is not in the program for authorization in the fiscal year 1958.

I would like to present 1 or 2 facts to show why the Army feels we should not operate these hospitals. In 1952 we had a strength in the Army of 1,596,000 men. In 1957 we had 1,073,000. In 1952 we had 5,514 doctors. In the fiscal year 1957 we have 3,908 doctors. In 1952 we had 61 hospitals. Today the Army is operating 60 hospitals. In 1952 the Army had a bed capacity of 41,421. Today in their hospitals they have a bed capacity of 40,921. In 1952 they had 26,972 beds occupied. Today they have 11,545 beds occupied.

The Army's bed occupancy has dropped 65 percent, their troop strength has dropped 33 percent, their doctors' strength has dropped 22 percent and they closed only one hospital in this 5-year period.

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

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

Mr. JOHANSEN. I thank the gentleman. The one hospital that the Army closed is the Percy Jones Army General Hospital at Battle Creek, the closing of which in 1953 was consented to by my distinguished predecessor, Mr. Shafer, because he practiced what he preached about economy. May I ask the gentleman from South Carolina whether there are some new hospitals projected in the area in which the Percy Jones Hospital was located?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the House has not directed the Army to keep these hospitals open and, although I respect the opinions and judgments of my very close personal friend, the gentleman from Florida, I hope and trust that the Department of the Army exercises its own judgement.

I might mention one other point. The money for the operation of these hospitals was in the \$3,400,000,000 for operation and maintenance of the Army. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations cut that figure \$150 million. It would seem to me that the Army would be using good sense and sound judgment to save a million dollars by closing these two hospitals, thereby making the monetary pressure against other needed programs less in the fiscal year 1958.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that any Member of the House may extend his remarks at this point in the Record or at other points in the proceedings of today in regard to the military defense appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I speak in behalf of retaining the committee's decision for continuing the Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs, Ark. I speak from a study I have made of this subject; and inspired by my own personal experiences as a patient in this hospital for about a year and a half at the close of World War II. My experiences there led me to believe that there is no better hospital in the Armed Services of the United States.

From page 886 of the Committee hearings we read from the Army report on this hospital as follows:

The Army and Navy Hospital is a multi-story hospital of permanent construction and is one of the best physical plants in the Army Hospital system.

Unique features are included in this hospital. A \$100,000 therapeutic pool equipped with elevators and lowering devices for seriously crippled patients is a facility available in no other service hospital. Devices for the use of radiation as a method of cure are available in this hospital to a degree realized in few, if any, other military hospitals. In a single year more than 11,000 patients were treated with radium or X-ray for cancer, tumors, or spinal arthritis in this hospital.

Hot Springs, Ark., is a study center for crippling diseases, and this hospital and a civilian hospital in this community are focal points for such studies.

Specialists in private practice and therapeutic bathhouses broaden the picture of this type of study in this area.

The city of Hot Springs, Ark., has geared itself for assisting those who are seriously crippled. Ramps take the place of curbs at street intersections and take the place of steps in churches, theatres, and amusement locations. There is a resort atmosphere in this town of great aid to the rehabilitation of convalescents. This atmosphere is enhanced by the presence of the national park, which extends to the downtown streets in some locations.

The hospital is capable of expansion in wartime because of the availability of fine, large, nearby hotels which cater to resort patronage in peacetime.

There are special equities urging the maintenance of this hospital in Hot Springs which arise from the large number of seriously crippled former military personnel who have established homes near this hospital in order to be available to the excellent services rendered there.

The only real argument made against the maintaining of this hospital is the financial argument. Some of the things I have said show that I feel that economics should not necessarily control this decision: because of the need for this special type of therapeutic center and because of the special facilities available in this hospital and because of the establishment of homes of crippled, retired service personnel in the area, as well as the other things which I have mentioned.

Actually, the only reason I can see why this hospital can be considered as a financial burden is that the Army has not kept this hospital up by assigning enough doctors and patients to it. Naturally, they can make a showing that it is expensive to maintain a large institution of this type when they do not assign adequate patients to it and keep a staff there which would justify the patients assigned. So, as far as I can see, the argument that this is an uneconomic matter really arises from the fact that the Army is not doing what it should in assigning an adequate patientload to the facility, commensurate with its capabilities.

The Army urges post hospitals, ones established at Army posts, as an alternative for this outpost hospital. In fact, there are millions of dollars in authorizations for military hospitals in the public-works bill which the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, is considering. I looked through some of this material this morning and I believe my calculation is accurate in saying that there is in excess of \$10 million for new military hospital construction in this new public-works bill for the armed services, including millions for hospitals at several Army installations. Further, there is testimony before our committee that many millions more will be brought to us in successive years, starting in the next fiscal year. While we are doing all this new construction at Army posts, it would seem to me to be good commonsense to maintain in active status this fine Army and Navy general hospital at Hot

patriotic attention they did last year when you approved the funds for the continuing operation of the Murphy Army General Hospital.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the last of the seven volumes of these committee hearings was released recently, press articles appeared quoting certain parts of the Record in which I had made suggestions regarding the merging of the Veterinary Corps with the Army and Air Force Medical Corps. Headlines and quotations, some of them out of context, gave some readers the impression that I was casting aspersions on the very fine traditions and upon the officers and men of the Veterinary Corps with the result that many communications, some of them rather hot, were received. So let me hasten to make the record clear. I have a high regard for the officers and men of the Veterinary Corps both past and present. They have performed gallant service for our Nation over the years. Through my own experience in two wars, I have observed some of them. I remember in World War I, in the regiment in which I served, the veterinary surgeon not only cared for our animals but he gave heroic and skillful attention to the human casualties at the battalion front line aid stations. In World War II, I well remember a veterinary colonel who served not only in his professional capacity, but also as G-2 in an important headquarters out in CBI. The devotion of these officers and men and their capabilities has always been great. However, I do feel the time has come when this service should be merged with the Medical Corps of the Army and Air Force. You can read these figures in the hearings. The Defense Department has in all nearly 2 veterinary officers and some 5 enlisted men for each horse or mule which is owned by the Department of Defense. The figures are rather interesting. In the present Veterinary Corps in the 2 branches mentioned, there are 2 generals, 34 colonels, 738 other officers, and 2,200 enlisted men. On the other hand, the Department of Defense has 187 horses, 43 of them in the Navy, and 314 mules. We do not have the figures for the very fine dogs who are also in the armed services, and they are among our most gallant defenders, but I doubt if they amount to more than 100 or 200 in the Department of Defense. Be that as it may, it seems ridiculous that we would maintain in these days and times of the atomic age a Veterinary Corps as such. The meat inspecting responsibility is a very essential one, but no one, I think, would say that it could not be performed just as well in the Medical Corps and that the fine personnel of the Veterinary Corps could be merged with the overall medical group. Incidentally, there it would probably be in better focus and better opportunities for advancement and promotion would be provided for the personnel.

The suggestion that our committee was considering had no reflection on the personnel involved, it was just a question of regrouping. I think it might well be looked into to see if the Medical Corps

should absorb in both the Army and the Air Force the fine men and officers who are serving in the veterinary establishments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express the gratitude of my community to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIXES) and his Army panel for the very effective manner in which they handled a problem that was giving much concern to Springfield, Mass.

The devastating floods of August 1975 weakened a dam owned by the Department of Defense resulting in a decision by the Department to declare surplus the dam and pond backed up by the dam. The area covered by the pond and known as Watershops Pond is some 220 acres. This pond had been in use for over 100 years and was widely known for its beauty and recreational value. Hundreds of homes had been built along the water's edge. Real estate developments had sprung up in the immediate area. The pond has always been a real asset to Springfield College.

This committee extended the courtesy of a hearing to Senators Seltonstall, Kennedy, Mayor Brunton, Dr. Stone, of Springfield College, and myself. It was impressed with the equity of our request. As a result of that hearing and the evolved testimony, the committee requested the Secretary of the Army to restore the dam and preserve the lake. Secretary Brucker cooperated wholeheartedly and work is now underway to effect the necessary repairs.

Mr. Chairman, this action by this congressional committee and the Department of the Army clearly demonstrates that this, indeed, is a Government with a sense of its moral obligations.

For the way in which it met and solved a purely local matter, I again express the thanks of my community.

The Clerk read as follows:

REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATION
Army Industrial Fund

The amount available in the Army Industrial Fund is hereby reduced by \$110 million. Such sum to be covered into the Treasury immediately upon approval of this act.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 11, after line 22, add a new section, to read as follows:

"No part of any appropriation in this act shall be used to pay rent on space to be used for recruiting purposes; and no part of any appropriation in this act may be used for pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to recruiting duty in excess of 50 percent of the amount expended for such purposes during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as I said previously, this is not offered for the purpose of cutting out recruiting activity. It is offered for the purpose of saving several million dollars both in the rent paid on facilities in towns and cities where free facilities are available and could be used.

Also repeating, I will say that this amendment has been adopted twice in

the House. I think that this is an operation that all of us would be acquainted with and know something about by seeing the number of recruiting offices that are kept open over the country.

After this amendment had been knocked out last year—and to me it was in direct defiance of what the House had indicated was its desire—the Defense Department on July 1 last year made further commitments, and where they had been operating recruiting offices that were occupied by both the Army and the Air Force they instead rented two buildings in the same town. In many towns you will find four services operating recruiting, with each one of them maintaining a vehicle. Last year, at the request of our colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), the Department of Defense did furnish this information which purported to show the number of people engaged in recruiting, and by adding that up we come to the figure of 9,216. That has since been increased.

We also find in those same figures there were 271 locations which were supposed to be used for recruiting. I wish to read from this letter to Mr. MAHON:

It is noted for your information that the list of facilities noted in the above paragraph does not include the Armed Forces examination and induction stations, as these facilities handle all types of inductees and would be necessary regardless of the status of the recruiting program. The list of personnel and vehicles includes those persons whose primary duty is recruiting, but, of course, does not include those persons who perform minor recruiting functions which are incidental to their other duties.

So we have no way of knowing how many installations there are on which the Government is paying rent. We have no way of knowing the total number of personnel who are engaged. I have secured from the committee these figures which show, according to the hearings conducted this year, that they propose to spend \$62,577,000 for recruiting; but the clerk of the committee told me it was his understanding that that was for operations only. That being the case, that is an increase of \$18 million over the \$44 million which was in the bill last year. So instead of trying to cut this down they are raising it instead. We also know that with the selective service there is ample opportunity to get all of the manpower necessary.

Last year before the committee General Hershey made a statement in which he said that he could supply all the men and could save at least \$40 million in recruiting expense.

I think this amendment will have a good effect on showing the Department of Defense that we want to provide all of the money that is necessary for carrying on the defenses of this Nation, but that we are unalterably opposed to wasting money and not utilizing the free locations which could be used for recruiting and without paying all of that money.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a favorable vote on this amendment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 7 or 8 years ago when I first came to the House I had views

that coincided with those expressed by the gentleman from Missouri. Since serving on this particular subcommittee I have had an opportunity to see a different point of view, and as a result I rise to oppose his recommendations. It is true that you could cut down the number of personnel, the number of recruiting offices and seemingly save money, but when you add up the financial benefits which accrue to all three branches of the service and specifically to the Army through longer term enlistments, you find that you save substantial money by having recruiting programs.

It is true that General HERSHEY if we stopped all recruiting, through Selective Service could get for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force all of the 2-year men that are required. But if you will analyze the situation you will find that that 2-year enlistment program is a very expensive operation, referring to General LeMay's testimony over in the other body just a few days ago. His big problem today in keeping his Air Force efficient is the fact that he is losing people who have been trained over the years.

A man in the military is relatively useless from a combat point of view or a maintenance point of view until he has had almost a year's training. The net result is that under a 2-year enlistment or a 2-year induction he has only 1 year of productive service. Consequently, it seems to me that if we can get people into the service on a 4-year hitch, a 6-year hitch, or longer, we can save tremendous sums of money and we can increase the combat effectiveness of our Army, Navy, and Air Force infinitely.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. In addition to that will the gentleman not agree with me that it is far better to build up our military strength through a recruiting program than through the Selective Service? Every man the recruiting service gets into the establishment is one less man who has to be drafted. Is that not true?

Mr. FORD. That is absolutely correct. The figures presented to our subcommittee for the Army indicate that the reenlistment rate among 2-year inductees is very low; something like 3 or 4 percent. This means that hardly any of your inductees intend to make the Army a career. So we have a very considerable turnover among those who serve just 2 years by compulsion.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FORD. In just a minute, please.

Among those who in the first instance have been recruited you find a much better reenlistment rate, and as a result we not only save money but we also increase our combat effectiveness.

One further point: This Congress passed last year the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. That program is almost entirely dependent upon the job that is done through your recruiting offices. There is no compulsion in that act. In fact, the Congress specifically said there should be no compulsion. The only way you can make that legislation work is to have good recruiters out selling our young

men between 17 and 18½ years of age on the program. If you want to sabotage, if you want to ruin your Reserve Forces Act of 1955, you should approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. If you want to make that legislation effective and give us for the first time a high-class Reserve program, you should vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

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

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Maryland), the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Is it not a fact the testimony has shown that the anticipated inductions in the Army for fiscal 1957 are only 153,000, whereas, for instance, in 1955 there were 215,000 and in 1953 there were 563,000? Does that not show the recruiting, however it may be handled at the moment, is getting results and it would be unwise to alter it while it is making good progress?

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Maryland has made an excellent point. Let me remind you that in fiscal 1957 they will induct 153,000. In fiscal 1955 they inducted 215,000. In other words, our recruiting program has substantially reduced the burden under Selective Service. When you sign up somebody by recruiting they intend to make the service a career. That is where we save dollars and increase our combat effectiveness.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would like the gentleman to tell me how many people he thinks they are recruiting who would not be drafted, who are not coming in there before they come in from Selective Service? The gentleman has not touched on the point why it is necessary to have 3 separate buildings in a town for 1 man to occupy and each 1 of those men have an automobile.

Mr. FORD. Let me answer the first question first. I think it is immaterial how many are recruited who otherwise would have been inducted. The point is, we get people for longer terms of service, and they are the kind who reenlist. So we get people with previous training and we end up with a far more effective military service.

Secondly, I do not condone the three separate or duplicating offices.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman does not condone it, let us adopt my amendment and we will cut it out.

Mr. FORD. I do not think the gentleman's amendment necessarily ends that kind of expense and operation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It would end renting buildings everywhere and make them use the courthouses, the Federal buildings, the post offices, and other buildings that are available without paying that rent of over a million dollars a year.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman's amendment does not necessarily end the situation. What the amendment does, in my opinion, is this: It restricts, it hinders, a recruiting program which, according to the statistics we have seen, saves dollars and increases the military effectiveness of our personnel in the Army, Air Force, the Navy, and Marine Corps.

For the reasons stated I most emphatically urge disapproval of the pending amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, recruiting is a selling activity. It is selling the American people on the advantages of military service; it is advertising; something that has to go on and on. The big companies do not stop advertising and say, when sales are good, "We can ride through next year on the advertising we have done this year." They keep on advertising. That is what the services are doing in their recruiting programs. They are selling the advantage of military service to the American people, some of whom are already in the service, admittedly. The program is directed primarily at getting long-term recruits and reenlistments. They are the nucleus, the hard core of any well-organized military force that must be able to move out tomorrow and do a job for defense.

The Navy and the Marine Corps expect to obtain in the next fiscal year, under the terms of this bill, 145,000 recruits and reenlistments through its recruiting program. The Army expects to obtain 144,000, and the Air Force 142,000. Now, if these people are not obtained by voluntary enlistment, what do you fall back on? The only people you can possibly fall back on, if we are to fill the gaps so that we can have personnel necessary for a functioning military establishment, are the 2-year inductees. And the 2-year inductees are the most costly kind of trainees. They spend the greater part of the first 6 months in basic training. Most of the time he is in the service, the chances are, he wants out. Certainly that is true if he did not want to be inducted into the service in the first place. In that case he wants to get out as soon as he can. That man gets little if any advanced training. There simply isn't time. Yet detailed and intricate training is essential for the personnel of our military services today. It costs considerably more to train and maintain a 2-year inductee, than a career man.

Under the terms of this amendment, no money could be used for rental. You could have no recruiting offices unless you could have free space. Where are you going to get free space? We have had no public building construction for years in this country. Most of the post offices and the Federal buildings are crammed full of activities and space cannot be relinquished. There would be little likelihood of obtaining free space. Under general law, many of the facilities now in use are paid for by GSA. This amendment would not touch that situation at all. Fifty percent of the current expenditures for recruiting would also have to be eliminated under the terms of the amendment before you.

copy

step toward unification over the original unification bill. It does point in the direction of clothing the Secretary with power to at least partly match his responsibility. If we are going to have unification we must face the fact that the Secretary must be clothed with sufficient power to carry out his duties, or he may become merely the presiding head of warring factions in our defense organization.

Many of the powers he now has are phrased in such general terms that every step the Secretary may take toward unification can be challenged by someone on the ground that the language on which the Secretary relies to support his action can be interpreted more strictly and as not being specific enough to permit the action of the Secretary.

Why do I believe that we should clothe the Secretary with more power? Because I think we should make unification more realistic and more workable. Think of this: In the great war when our national safety and national life was at stake we had unification in every theater of combat. The stark necessity of protecting ourselves and doing every thing possible to insure success brought that about. Pearl Harbor dramatized the futility of dual control. Every great leader during the war supported unification publicly and openly. They knew it was the only way to get the maximum protection and results with our men and equipment.

That being so, why should we not learn from that lesson. What are our armed services for, but to give us a maximum of protection in times of strife and war. We cannot expect effective unification in war unless we perfect it in peace. Next time we may not have allies holding the enemy back and time in which to build the unification that we need for certain victory.

I do not believe that the economy talked about so much is the major or principal object of this legislation. The major objective, in my book, of this legislation is to get the best possible defense system to stop aggression and to win a war if it should come. I cannot make myself believe that welding our defense forces more closely together so they will make a more perfect team will result in a dangerous centralization of power. The President is essentially a civil officer. Not a day passes but he is impressed with the fact that he represents a great population of civilians. Going through the ordeal of a national campaign makes him feel the influence of the people—the civilian voters—very vividly. He will be a check on any Secretary who grabs for too much power, either by law or through administration. Congress will keep an eagle and a suspicious eye on any Secretary who acts like he wants to be or is a military dictator and curb him very quickly. The House is very close to the people and they certainly by nature and the force of election circumstances are daily impressed with the primacy of the civil over the military. We would never let any Secretary get very far on the road to military dictatorship without finding a way to place road blocks in his way and curb his power and his efforts.

But giving him power, by statute, to weld our defense elements into a strong cable of national defense through an effective fighting team is not moving in the direction of military dictatorship.

If we are ever going to curb some of the duplications, the abuses, and the tendency to build and overemphasize small "defense empires" I believe logic drives us to the view that we must give the Secretary more power than he has now. He must be given sufficient tools to develop the fighting team to the highest degree of effectiveness during peace so it will be a winning team when it goes into action.

This bill as agreed to by the conferees is a step in that direction. Of course, the Secretary is going to do many things that those who have the fears they have expressed today will not approve. On the other hand, those who believe in more effective unification will probably applaud his conduct, but think it does not go far enough.

I have no criticism of anyone and their views on this problem. The results of this bill are problematical. But I think it is moving toward more security for our people and its institutions. To me, this step is merely a part of the evolution toward more effective unification and better national security. The better it is; the more efficient and effective it is, the less likely we are to have to use it. Barring unnecessary provocation—and we must be very careful not to give provocation—a well-knit fighting force, well trained and well equipped with the most modern weapons is the best antidote to aggression.

Those are some of the thoughts that pass through my mind as I look on this bill with favor.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, this bill has many fundamental faults, and as a result I must make several comments. I was in favor of the bill that originally passed the House several weeks ago, but at the same time I must admit I have always disapproved of S. 1269, better known as the Tydings bill. As was inevitable, the House and Senate conferees compromised the differences between the two proposals and as a result, we now have a bill before us containing some of the undesirable features in the original Tydings proposal.

I fully concur with the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] who stated that the word "unification" is beginning to have a holy meaning, just like the word "mother." In other words, anyone who speaks out against unification of the armed forces is committing an unforgivable sin. Further, the American press has seized upon, magnified, and made capital of many of the superficial antagonisms and manifestations of disagreement between the armed services of the United States without presenting to the American people the true and basic reason for interservice differences. I submit that the real basis for this bickering is a deep-seated conflict between those, both in the military and in civilian life, who favor a republican form of government and those who apparently believe in an extreme concentration of authority and power of decision in a very

small and carefully selected cadre of officers known as the general staff. Apparently, we are being committed slowly but surely to the general-staff point of view, but I wish to go on record in opposition to those who believe in a general-staff theory and demand that those who favor that policy should be held accountable for any irresponsible or unfortunate results that may accrue. The general staff in Germany prior to the last war made a good impression in an unsavory political atmosphere. But when war and the true test came, the general-staff concept fell by the wayside. It would be most unfortunate if we should have a similar experience in the United States, and those who are driving us toward that end should be fully cognizant of the dangers that are ahead.

The idea of the Army General Staff Corps evidently germinated at about the same time as that for the establishment of the Army War College, which was founded under Secretary of War Elihu Root, by General Order No. 155 of November 17, 1901. However, little was done until the first War College Board met on July 10, 1902, under the supervision of Maj. Gen. S. B. M. Young, United States Army. One of the most important duties of the War College Board and General Young was planning the organization of the General Staff Corps. The General Staff of the United States Army began to function on August 15, 1903, and on November 1, 1903, the Army War College, immediately merged with this corps, began its first year of systematic operation under the general staff. This organization, neither American nor democratic in its scope or intent, was originally quite similar to and patterned after the Prussian General Staff. However, with the perfection attained by years of operation and by the distortion and perversion of opportunists it now assumes a role approaching that of military autocracy.

The official reorganization of the General Staff by General Order No. 14 on February 9, 1918, is a good illustration of how power has been continuously concentrated in the General Staff. In this shake-up the War Plans Division formerly associated with the War College at Fort McNair was established in the War Department with particular duties as follows:

- First. Plan for organization of the Army.
- Second. Study and determine types and quantities of equipment.
- Third. Consider projects for national defense.
- Fourth. Provide for training of the Army.
- Fifth. Translate and compile foreign documents relating to military affairs.
- Sixth. Compile, collect, and maintain complete military records.
- Seventh. Propose military legislation for the Military Establishment.

Note particularly paragraph 7. There is reason to believe that most of this legislation in the past few years has emanated from certain groups within the Military Establishment. In my estimation the military should restrict themselves to proposing military legislation

July 25

I would like to also make a statement regarding several other comments made by the gentleman from Indiana. He said that 70 percent of our appropriations for the last few years were for military expenses. That is not accurate. What he meant to say, and I am sure he will correct it in the Record, is that 70 percent of our appropriations are for past wars, including military appropriations for future wars, appropriations for veterans' benefits and other miscellaneous items. But, he definitely said they were for military expenses and such a statement was inaccurate.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, my remarks must have been misunderstood by a few here in the House today. My remarks, following those of my distinguished friend from Missouri, were meant as an appeal for understanding and cooperation. Perhaps I was not as restrained as I should be because I disagreed somewhat with his remarks.

It is very apparent that we should get some of these things out of our system, and apparently we are doing so today. I agree with the distinguished gentleman that preceded me that my remarks should be that 70 percent of our budget is going for wars past and present and in preparation for possible future conflicts. I have at times disagreed with my distinguished chairman [Mr. VINSON]. Anyone that sits in the Committee on Armed Services recognizes his worth and his leadership. But sometimes Mr. Vinson, if he will pardon me, is not the most patient individual. He has a tendency toward running the committee in a style that is not inimitable.

As a freshman member of the Committee on Armed Services I became disturbed in the hearings on the B-36 investigation. As I felt that the younger members were not being given a chance to participate in the same, and I walked out in a huff. I saw a newspaperman friend of mine, and he asked me what had occurred. I thought I was talking largely off the record, but much to my sorrow the next day the headlines said that I accused the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] of being a Navy stooge. I later corrected this, because I had not used those words. However, the newspaperman apparently had, and I had acquiesced. I have often been sorry for those remarks. I recognize the worth of the gentleman from Georgia, but I still say that the manner in which the investigation was being held at that time did not please me. I did feel that we in the backfield, the younger members, were not given the opportunity to express ourselves fully. However, I have noticed since then that our chairman has been most considerate of the younger members of the committee. I am positive that he does not hold that against me, and I certainly do not against him, because I think the gentleman from Georgia knows more about the military needs of this country than any other man in the Nation.

I want to say something about the B-36 investigation. I signed the minority report. I am proud of that fact, and I would have signed it again. I am a lawyer. I told the House yesterday that I had practiced law for 16 years. I do not believe in hearsay evidence. I believe any man accused should be allowed to face his accuser. I think it is an outrage when any man in this body, or the other one, who has congressional immunity accuses a person of something and the individual that is accused, even though he is later vindicated, has no right of redress.

I attended practically every one of the hearings in the B-36 investigation. They were concluded only a few days after my outburst. I want to say that Secretary Matthews was unjustly accused, as was Secretary Johnson, and largely upon hearsay evidence. I felt then that the criticism leveled at Secretary Matthews was unjust, that we had heard only one side of the issue. I agree with my good friend from Illinois [Mr. ARENS] when he says that good resulted from the B-36 investigation. But I am making no apology for the B-36 bomber. It is the greatest plane now in existence, and our investigation proved this fact. I heard the late General Arnold tell us what it could do.

Mr. Chairman, where would we be today without the atomic bomb. Where would we be? Russia would be at our doorstep. The atomic bomb is a deterrent against all-out Soviet aggression. Who is going to carry the atomic bomb in case of a world conflict? Today there is only one airplane, in my opinion, that can carry it to Europe and return, and that is not giving any secrets away. It is the B-36 bomber.

Unjustly and unfairly the B-36 bomber was attacked in our committee. It was attacked upon the floor of the House and in the newspapers. After the investigation was concluded we all unanimously agreed that the charges against the B-36 and its acquisition were absolutely false. I do not feel that Admiral Denfeld was unjustly treated, and I am still standing by that statement. I can still say to you today that I am standing behind the minority report. We only disagreed in this report in one item. Seven members of the committee voted the same as I did, but on the other 29 or 30 items, I have forgotten how many there were, we were unanimous in our report. Of course, a committee of this size and importance disagrees. We disagree here today violently in our feelings. But I think if there is one thing we can do is to get it out of our systems and we can fight here on the floor of the House, but tomorrow and henceforth we will go forward fighting together to win this war. I could point out to this Member and other Members their voting records in the past. I could, if necessary, point out where he failed to vote for what I consider to be the best interest of the defense of our country. I know that I, too, have cast bad votes, but what I am saying now and wanted to point out in my earlier remarks, is that these things do not matter now.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Tell me where.

Mr. WALSH. I said I am not going to do it.

Mr. FORD. Well, I am asking you to.

Mr. WALSH. I will produce the record here tomorrow, if you want it brought forth.

Mr. FORD. I certainly do.

Mr. WALSH. You are the one who brought this argument up—not me. I do not care to indulge in personalities.

Mr. FORD. But you certainly did.

Mr. WALSH. After all, my good friend, you are the one who took the floor first. I did not know you from Adam. I will have your record tomorrow and show it in the Record if you wish.

Mr. FORD. You can come to my office and I will give it to you to save time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

I do not care to get in any discussion. The point I am trying to make is that tempers are flaring here today. I hope when it is all said and done we can forget the votes we have cast in the past and the mistakes that we have made—and we have made plenty of them, all of us—and go out of this Chamber united, because we are certainly in a world conflict which we may never see the end.

As the father of four children, and I am proud of it, I am going to do my level best to see to it that those children have the opportunity to live in a free world, free of communism. I hope my vote in the future, as I hope it has been in the past, will never be cast along political lines, especially at this time when the fate of the world rests to a great extent upon us, the Members of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I cannot add much more information on these two measures, but tempers seem to be flaring here this afternoon. After all, you know it is very pleasing to me to see the difference in the debate today and the unanimous cooperation in a matter which probably means the life or death of our Nation in the years to come. There is a big difference between now and 1939, 1940, and 1941, when we were voting on measures far into the night. Roll call after roll call occurred at that period and this body at that time was seriously divided. Not so today. These measures, which are very far-reaching, are going to pass unanimously.

It has also been pointed out to you the difficulties under which we are operating today. I do not believe it is any time to point out the faults or mistakes that may have occurred in the past. I think it is best for us at the present time, in this hour, to confine ourselves to the job ahead and not forget about the situation and the predicament and obligations that this Nation has taken upon itself.

We have listened, and I particularly have listened, for the last year to the intelligence reports around the world. We, of course, have had a policy of confinement against communism, and they

MR. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I regret to do this, but I am going to serve notice that there is going to be no extension of time today. Too many Members of the House have other engagements for tomorrow and want this bill concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

MR. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to clear up a point that arose in the course of debate just before adjournment yesterday. I think it is important that I do so.

Mr. Chairman, there has been some misunderstanding regarding the Reserve program. I did not have an opportunity to clear it up yesterday so I wish to do so at this time. I want to say at the outset that we have received very fine cooperation from the Committee on Appropriations in reference to the Reserve program. However, I notice in the report, and mention has been made in the discussion, about different programs—the 6 months trainee below 18½ years of age and the 6 months trainee above 18½ years of age. In my mind, it is all one program, Mr. Chairman, not separate programs. The 6 months training program was instituted because of the fact that we had certain individuals in our Reserve program who had had no field training whatsoever. Consequently, the Reserve was weak because it lacked the necessary manpower who had had field and service training. Therefore, we wanted some way to fill up the Reserve with prior trained personnel. And the 6 months training program is the way we decided it could best be done. So our subcommittee reviewed the problems that the Reserves encountered over a period of many years in getting trained personnel into the program. In the recent hearings, we state to this effect:

The Department is asking for funds for an Army Reserve program of 300,000 paid drill strength which is an increase of 44,000 over fiscal year 1957 strength. This figure will include an authorization to enlist about 42,500 6-month trainees although the Army Reserve is not entirely happy with this limitation. The subcommittee believes we should support this request and not ask for additional funds for the Army Reserve provided the funds requested will result in fiscal year 1958 in paid drill strength of 300,000 exclusive of 6-month trainees while engaged in active-duty training.

That is the end of the committee recommendations. In other words, we want a United States Army Reserve of 300,000, but every one of those ultimately will have at least 6 months' training.

There is a misunderstanding on the part of some that we are striving to get the utmost in the number of 6-month trainees for an indefinite length of time and perhaps for an indefinite purpose; but the program is set forth in the law. The recommendation of the committee is for a reserve of 300,000 men in the Army, but each one of those men ultimately will have at least 6 months' training.

Something was said about the age of 18½ years. We arrived at that age because that was the age set by law for

induction under selective service for men coming up of eligible age. But as the manpower pool increased selective service has raised the age for induction to 22½, so men now are being inducted at that age. We had trouble getting men below 18½ in the program because young men of 17 do not think they are going to be inducted, when the induction age is as far off as 22½; therefore, the Army raised the limit for the 6 months' program to age 26. So ultimately our manpower in the Army Reserve will be all prior-trained men with at least 6 months' training.

We do not want any misunderstanding that is going to confuse the issue, and we do not want anything to tear down the training in the Army Reserve. We should be united in our effort to get prior-trained men with at least 6 months' training. That is not a hard task to accomplish. For the first time in the history of this Republic we are building up a Reserve that will really be able to stand the test when it comes to meeting that test, and I do not think it is time to seek to tear down a program for which we have been battling for 25 or 30 years in this Congress. We see the end in view now.

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

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Army panel and the subcommittee feel to a substantial degree in agreement with the gentleman from Louisiana. We want every person in the Army Reserve to have prior training. I think, however, we ought to look back and review the history of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 to see the current situation. At the time that act was enacted into law we were told in this Chamber that the military wanted 6 months of training and a 7½-year Reserve obligation; and they wanted young people from 17 to 18½ so their manpower pool would be available and trained over the long pull.

I believe everybody in this Chamber who voted for that legislation accepted the bill predicated upon that theory.

Unfortunately, however, when the Army started to recruit people for this program they had some difficulty getting them initially, and the buildup was slow. Then the Department of the Army officials felt they were behind the eight ball, and had to do something to stimulate greater enlistments in this program.

They did two things: First, they reduced the Reserve obligation from 7½ years to 3 and 4 years, undercutting all of us who supported the original program predicated on a long active Reserve training period.

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

MR. FORD. Let me finish. I did not ask the gentleman to yield. I refuse to yield at this point. In other words, the Army in order to build up numbers in effect ruined a real factor in their real Reserve program. They will not be able in the future history of this legislation to get that back up to 7½ years where they told us they needed it and wanted it for a good, competent, qualified Reserve.

In addition to that, they could not get at the time this recruiting problem arose an adequate number of people for this 6 months training out of the age group 17 to 18½. In order to build up numbers again, not particularly the quality they wanted but solely numbers, they increased the age limitation so those in this group from 18½ to 26 could qualify, again pulling the rug out from underneath the Members of Congress who voted in good faith for that legislation on the theory on which the Department of the Army presented it to us. Of course, all the fellows who were over 18½ who could not have gotten into the program before and were faced with 2 years of active duty rushed down and signed up. The Army wound up with more enlistees than they could handle but not necessarily those they wanted, as they told the Congress. In my opinion, and I think in the opinion of the committee, the feeling is that the Army has not been fair with the Congress by the revision of these regulations.

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

MR. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

MR. BROOKS of Louisiana. I may say that I do not place the blame on the Army because the Armed Services Committee of the House approved all this. We went into it quite fully. Let me say to the gentleman the 6 months trainee above the age of 18½ who goes in has a Reserve obligation of 6 years, not an obligation less than that. The 6 months trainee below the age of 18½ still has an obligation of 8 years now in the Reserves.

MR. FORD. He does not have the same obligation that was included in the regulations initially drafted thereafter after we enacted the Army Reserve Act. The only reason was to get numbers and not to get quality. What we want is a reserve that has quality.

Mr. Chairman, the point I want to make and emphasize is that our committee and the Committee on the Armed Services, I am sure, are insistent that these men should have prior training before they go into the Reserve program. That is important. We also want the kind of people in the Reserve program that the Army in good faith told us they wanted at the time they proposed the legislation. We feel that it is unfair to Congress to substitute these people who are not in that category in order to just build up numbers.

MR. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to call attention to the language of the committee report on dependent medical care appearing at page 17 of the report and I would like to state that I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which formulated and reported the dependent medical-care legislation.

This is a new program that became effective on the 7th day of December 1956, so that it has had not quite 6 months of operation. I am concerned

There are not 36 people here, hardly \$1 billion a Member, as of this hour of the debate. Of course, I am satisfied, as I look about me to see who is here, that a great degree of appreciation and intelligence for the problem before the House is ably met by the Members who are present.

Mr. Chairman, I find this room today thick with an atmosphere of omniscient complacency, and out of an abundance of caution, if for no other reason, I violently take exception and beg to disagree with that attitude toward this bill and toward the circumstances with which it deals: the status of national defense.

I would like to begin by referring for a minute to the attitude of the Secretary of Defense to acts of Congress dealing with appropriations for national defense. Last year you will recall I was active in protesting and objecting to the Department of Defense demanding a cut in the Marine Corps of 15,000 men; this great elite combat corps of which we are so proud and the Nation is so proud. This Congress saw fit to agree with me and to disagree with the Secretary of Defense. And this Congress assisted, by passing the appropriation bill and restoring to the Marines 15,000 men and the necessary dollars for the support thereof.

That bill became law, was signed by the President of the United States. Despite that fact, the Secretary of Defense in his wisdom refused to utilize that money and refused to raise the Marine Corps 15,000 additional men.

Further than that, Mr. Chairman, he has imposed upon it this year a force strength which amounts to a cut of an additional 4,000-plus men.

At the hearings of the Defense Subcommittee this year I said to him, "Did you not in effect veto an act of Congress?"

And he said, "Yes."

I asked him if he consulted the President and he said, "No."

I asked him if he consulted the Attorney General on such a delicate and highly controversial constitutional question of law as between the administrative and the legislative; and he said, "No."

I asked him if he consulted the Chief Counsel of his own department, and he said, "No," that in his judgement he would not agree with the action of the Congress.

This very day, Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a statement from the Associated Press, taken from our ticker in the corridor, which shows that that same question was raised in the other body, when the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. CHAVEZ asked Mr. Wilson the same question on this problem:

Wilson said he belied Congress came to a "pretty snappy decision" last year in providing for an increase in the Pentagon-proposed manpower level for the Marine Corps.

Subcommittee Chairman CHAVEZ wanted to know why the Defense Department had asked to shift extra funds Congress voted last year in order to put 215,000 Marines in uniform.

Wilson said the Joint Chiefs of Staff had agreed on a personnel allotment of 193,000 Marines and the Corps itself "had not asked" for the increase. There had been sentiment in Chavez's group for the higher level.

"While I wanted to give due consideration to what the committee had suggested," Wilson said—

I repeat this for the purpose of emphasis. Here is a beau geste, indeed. Quoting Mr. Wilson:

"While I wanted to give due consideration to what the committee had suggested—"

And add this parenthesis from me. We are certainly grateful for that consideration at least.

"I didn't think it was quite proper for a committee to set the force level exactly, especially without hearings."

For that reason, Wilson said, he decided as a compromise to leave the Marines where they were—

He decided—
between 200,000 and 205,000.

Now that is the situation. The Congress proposes and the Secretary of Defense disposes. And that is the end of that, constitutionally and every other way, in case, Mr. Chairman, you are still interested.

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

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, of course.

Mr. FORD. Would it not be fair to say at this point that the amendment to which the gentleman referred in reference to the Marine Corps Fund for the fiscal year 1956 was defeated in this body. It prevailed in the other body by a 1-vote margin. In conference I believe \$47 million was made available for this additional increment of about 15,000. After the appropriation bill was signed the facts are, I believe, that instead of going down to the ceiling as recommended by the President for the current fiscal year they went down about half way or thereabouts. The net result was that there was a compromise between the figure approved by the Congress and the figure recommended in the President's budget for fiscal 1956.

Mr. FLOOD. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan I have been quoting Mr. Wilson, and I think Mr. Wilson is a far superior authority on what he did or what he thinks than I. But the fact does remain that the Act of Congress was as I stated, and the fact also remains that Mr. Wilson did exactly what he told the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. FORD. The point I am making is that the sum of \$47 million, which was the amount for the additional personnel for the Marine Corps for 1956, was used in part, and there were more men kept on active duty for the Marine Corps during this fiscal year than had originally been planned.

Mr. FLOOD. Except, and this is the point I make, that the Secretary of Defense did not comply with the Act of Congress.

Mr. FORD. Of course, he has ample precedent for that in the case of the previous administration.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is going to follow me and he will do it well and ably. He knows the point I make. I know the point he makes. I hold a brief for nobody. I am not writing an editorial, I am merely reporting the facts. The record will establish all this.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, in addition I am concerned about the status of the

Army. I was going to propose in due course an amendment to the Army bill asking that one more division be restored to the Army. I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, that the Chief of Staff of the Army, who knows far more about this problem than I do, and even you, Mr. Chairman, tells my committee, and I am on the Army panel, that to do the job he thinks should be done under all the circumstances the United States Army should be next year 1,300,000 men. That is the testimony of the Chief of Staff of the Army, not mine. Next year the administration is going to give the Army a little over 1 million men. They will have at least 275,000 men short of what the Chief of Staff of the Army says and thinks he should have. Oh, of course he agrees with the budget. Oh, of course he accepts the budget. Oh, of course he goes along with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am just telling you what he told my committee. You draw your own conclusions. Your Army will be short 275,000 men to do the best job that could be done. You are not going to get the best job with 1 million men, says the Chief of Staff of the Army, not me.

I wanted to raise that one division, \$117 million, less than 22,000 men. I am satisfied that amendment will not prevail. I am satisfied this House is reconciled to the report and the action of this committee, and there is no sense of my flying in the face of them under that circumstance. I dissent. I cannot agree. If it were in my power, Mr. Chairman, I would vote the money for maintenance and supply, for materiel, and for men to raise the United States Army to that figure which the Chief of Staff says he can do the best job on under the circumstances existing in the world today, to 1,300,000 men.

Here is the situation. We do not have the biggest or the best army in the world—we do not have it. The pride of our Nation since we were born has been the power and the might of our Army. We do not have the biggest and the best army in the world today—somebody else has—we do not. We do not have the biggest and the best Air Force in the world today—somebody else has. We do not have the biggest and the best submarine fleet in the world today—somebody else has. We do not have the biggest and the best merchant marine in the world today—somebody else has. What have we left? What have we left? That is the situation. We are no longer top dog. Somebody is bigger than we are. Somebody is more powerful than we are in various areas—too many areas. We are settling—we want to make a deal—we are not the biggest, the strongest, the most powerful. The American people think so—well, they are wrong. That is no longer the case. If the American people know the truth—if the American people had the facts, and if the American people are satisfied with the second best Air Force, then that is up to the American people and I will not disagree with them, but I am sure they do not want it that way. I am sure they do not know it that way. But that is the way it is. He who prefers peace and prosperity in that situation must debate with me. I am not

actual Army strength beginning with July 31, 1955 and what they estimate the figure to be on June 30, 1956. It indicates that from a high on July 31, 1955 of 1,119,000 they will gradually drop down, not down to a valley and then up to a peak but rather a gradual drop down, to 1,040,250.

In other words, there has been some slight revision in the Army strength figures within the last several months because of the DEW line operations of the Army, the SCARWAF obligations of the Army, and the Reserve forces obligations of the Army, so that instead of going down and then back up they are gradually going to fall off to 1,040,250. Most of those reductions that have been made are in the support-type activities and in the training activities. That results from the fact that the Army reenlistment rate has gone up extremely well in the last year or year and a half. The net result is that you are having more people with experience staying on in the Army, which means you can cut down your training load. For every 4 men you train in the Army you have to have 1 experienced man as a trainer. As we build up our supply of trained men we get more experienced men and we increase our combat ratio. So that when we reduce our personnel it is not out of combat efficiency but out of support-type activities.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am glad to hear that. Sixty-five thousand men would be equal to approximately three divisions of men fully equipped. Is it the opinion of the gentleman from the testimony that has been rendered that this reduction is not going to appreciably affect our combat effectiveness?

Mr. FORD. It is my honest personal opinion that this reduction in personnel will have no appreciable effect on the combat effectiveness of our Army. In fact, our Army in fiscal year 1957, overall, will be a better Army, a stronger Army than in past or previous fiscal years.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is one further question: There have been quite a few articles here recently, and this has been with reference to the Air Force, as to the number of men who were not reenlisted. I notice in your report that the number of 6-year enlistments has risen during the past 2-year period, including 1956. Is the 6-year enlistment the only classification the Army has?

Mr. FORD. No; the Army has a reenlistment program of, I think, 4 years and possibly 3 years, plus an indefinite reenlistment term.

Mr. SPRINGER. On the 3-year and 4-year classifications, have those reenlistment rates been going up or down?

Mr. FORD. I cannot honestly break it down to that extent. All I can say is that the Army's reenlistment rate has gone up from around 20 percent as of several years ago to 68 percent at the present time. That is the regular Army reenlistment rate.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to ask this one further question which, perhaps, the gentleman may be able to answer. Can the gentleman give us any reason why the reenlistment rate in the Air Force should be so bad and the reen-

listment rate in the Army appears to be at the present time on the increase, and projected ahead is estimated to be on the increase?

Mr. FORD. I am not qualified to comment on the situation in the Air Force. I can only say for the Army that they have made a very great effort to convince young men that the Army is a good career. As a consequence, they have been getting results. Perhaps it would be wise for the gentlemen to speak to the gentlemen on the Air Force panel in reference to that specific problem.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Another significant point in this budget is that in the fiscal year 1957 we are finally going to conclude the cataloging, standardization and identification work for the Department of the Army. About 6 years ago, I think it was, Congress passed this legislation which required the services to standardize and to catalog. It was estimated at that time that substantial dollar saving would be the result. Last year we were told by the Army witnesses that they were 64 percent through this tremendous job. At the present time, they are about 85 percent through. By September 30, 1956, they anticipate to have the job done insofar as identification and stock numbers are concerned. That is a tremendous job. It might interest you to know that it cost about \$21 million for this current year and it will cost about \$27 million in the next fiscal year, to finally conclude this vital job.

You might be interested in certain similarities in this year's budget as compared to the fiscal 1957 program. Dollarwise, under direct obligations in fiscal 1955 the Army had \$10.7 billion. In the current fiscal year, 1956, the Army will have direct obligations of about \$9.5 billion. In fiscal year 1957 direct obligations will total approximately \$9.4 billion. In other words, the Army has about leveled off. From a point of view of net expenditures in fiscal 1955, the Army had net expenditures totaling \$8.9 billion. In fiscal 1956, they estimated it will be \$8.5 billion. In 1957, \$8.6 billion.

In other words, the Army's funds are about on a level plane and that, in my judgment, has produced results. From the point of view of personnel, as I have brought out in colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois, the Army personnel will get down in June this year to the figure, which I believe, will carry on for a considerable period of time—about 1,040,250. Included with the uniformed personnel for the Army, the Army has approximately 435,000 employed civilians. So the total Army personnel picture is about 1,500,000, when you include both uniformed personnel and civilians.

The Army has continued during fiscal 1956 and they expect more or less to finish in fiscal 1957 their financial management program. They have carried on with their integrated accounting, their financial inventory account, their industrial funds, their stock funds, their consumer funds and their internal auditing. All of these programs which have been pushed ahead in the last several years will pay big dividends dollarwise and otherwise.

Now, if I could turn to some of the differences between fiscal 1957 and fiscal 1956; first, procurement and production. The big change there is in missile procurement. If you will turn to page 425 of the defense hearings, you will find that the Secretary of the Army says that 55 percent of Army procurement in fiscal 1957 will be for missiles. That includes Nike, Honest John, and Corporal, missiles which the Army actually has with its troops. If you will turn to pages 1448 and 1450 of the Army hearings, you will find a statement by General Magruder, Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, indicating that in 1955 the Army spent \$403 million for missiles. It was originally planned for missiles, procurement, and production, for fiscal 1956, to spend \$406 million. That program has been revised upward so that in fiscal 1956 the Army will spend for missiles \$489 million.

In fiscal 1957 you will find that the Army will spend for missiles, in procurement, and production, \$361 million. Let me emphasize that this money is for Nike, Honest John, and Corporal, all of which are operational. In other words, the Army's program is aimed at these newer weapons. Almost 60 percent of the Army procurement funds will be in this category.

Now let us turn to another significant difference between fiscal 1956 and fiscal 1957. Under research and development we have almost the same situation. Greater emphasis is on missile research. In fiscal 1955 the Army spent on this kind of research \$68 million. In fiscal 1956 they expect to spend \$107 million on missile research. In fiscal 1957 they expect to spend \$113 million on missile research. That is almost twice as much as was spent on this research in fiscal 1955. Actually it is better than 25 percent of the Army research and development fund.

In addition to this kind of money which is programed for fiscal 1957, if there is any further need for missile research for the Army, the Secretary of Defense has in a little kitty in his office \$85 million in direct obligation authority, and authority to transfer an additional \$50 million. So the Army is going to have the money they need, the total which they get is \$407 million, \$77 million more than for the present fiscal year, and they have authority to go to the Secretary of Defense and say "For a special project can we have some of this additional money which the Secretary of Defense has available for all three branches of the service for vital research and development projects?"

There is another significant change between fiscal 1957 and fiscal 1956. Last November the Army and the Air Force conducted Operation Sagebrush. That was a major exercise jointly conducted by the two services. You might be interested in the comments made on that exercise by General Taylor. If you will turn to page 435 of the Defense Department hearings, you can see his thinking.

The net result is that the Army is going to change their divisional structure. That is necessary because of the problems involved with atomic warfare. I think that those changes in divisional

GERALD R. FORD

organization will be coming along rather rapidly now. I understand the Army has pretty well firmed up its views in this area at the present time.

You might also be interested that in fiscal 1957 the Army will put together the first completely air-transportable airborne division. It will probably be the beginning of many divisions in that category.

Another significant change, 1957 to 1956, is the full impact of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955. The legislative committee carried that legislation through the House and Senate last year. The services started the program in October 1955. The Army hopes to have around 88,000 young men trained under this 6-months' training program during fiscal 1957. They got off to a slow start, but they are building up very rapidly. Our committee wholeheartedly endorses this program, and if they need more money I am sure we would be most willing to make it available. Where you have this Reserve program building up as a result of the 6-months' training program you have to provide new facilities for the Reserve units. There is money in this budget for the construction of 180 new Reserve armories for the Army. Incidentally, that is going to cost about \$35 million.

There is also a very significant change comparing this fiscal year with next, and that is the combat effectiveness of our Army. In 1953 the ratio of noncombat forces to total forces was not very good. Your combat ratio actually as 59 percent; today it is up slightly over 70 percent. I think it is the kind of Army we want and it is the kind of Army that our leaders have been able to get for the country. It may be difficult to go better than that, but they deserve commendation for that accomplishment.

I would now like to make a comment or two about the personnel in the Army. General Taylor made some very significant comments before our subcommittee, and if you will turn to page 442 of the Defense Department hearings you will see this statement. He was answering a question propounded to him by the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. General Taylor made this statement:

The increasing professional character of the Army, as I said in my testimony, really gives me 30,000 more troops. The 1,025,000 really has 30,000 more effective troops in it for 1957 than it had the previous year, and there are other assets of that nature.

In other words, because your reenlistment rate has gone up, because you have increased the effectiveness of your training, the Army today even though the total numbers are slightly less, has, General Taylor says, 30,000 more effective combat troops.

I would ask you now to turn to page 535 of the same hearings where General Taylor had this to say. I was interrogating him. I will read you a portion of the colloquy:

Mr. FORD. In other words, divisionwise we have shown a decided improvement?

General TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. FORD. In some of the other units we have made some small decreases?

General TAYLOR. Now, your question, Where are these 30,000 men? If we had not had the increase in our enlistments, the increase in professional percentage, 30,000 of our present men would have to be recruits receiving training by a certain number of people. Of the total 30,000, about 25,000 of that number would be recruits and 5,000 trainers and overhead. Instead, these people are in factual units performing useful military work.

In other words, even though the numbers in our Army this next fiscal year will be about what we have at the present time, the net result is that our Army will be infinitely more effective.

Now let us turn to another part of the manpower situation and I refer to the Army Reserves. The Army Reserves in fiscal 1956 show a total on a yearly average of about 190,000. In fiscal 1957 they expect that yearly average to be 256,000. In other words we go from an average of 190,000 in fiscal 1956 to 256,000 in fiscal 1957. I believe in the prepared statement that the Secretary of the Army submitted to our committee he estimated the increase in the Army Reserve personnelwise would be about 35 percent.

The average strength of the National Guard for fiscal 1953 will be 376,000. In fiscal 1957 it is anticipated their average strength will be 407,000. In other words, numberwise your Army Reserves and your National Guard will be substantially stronger comparing this fiscal year with the next.

The next question is, Will they be any better trained? Will they be more adequate to do the job? I refer to General Taylor's testimony on page 536 of the Defense Department hearings. At that point I asked this question:

Based on your observations within the last 6 months since you have become Chief of Staff, how would you rate the potency of our National Guard and the Army Reserve?

General TAYLOR. I visited some of the guard training last summer and I was impressed by the general improvement in the quality of the training I saw. Certainly the guard is stronger in experienced officers than at any time I have had an acquaintance with it; also its strength is quite good.

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan 5 additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, pursuing that particular point further, when General Lindeman, who is in charge of the Army Reserve program, was before the committee, I asked this question:

General Lindeman, will you give for the record your estimate of the quality of the Army Reserves at this time compared with a year ago? I would appreciate your full and frank analysis of the readiness of the Army Reserves, comparing the current situation to the circumstances in 1955.

General LINDEMAN. I feel that the quality of the Army Reserves has improved over last year.

He goes on to make certain other comments, but that is the net result of his testimony.

When General McGowan of the Army National Guard was before the committee, I propounded several questions to

him. The gentleman from South Carolina, in addition, pursued this line of questioning. Mr. RILEY asked:

Do you have a proficiency rating of the National Guard?

Colonel Taylor, who was then testifying, said, "Yes."

Mr. RILEY asked this question:

Could you give us a little of your estimate of the proficiency of the National Guard?

General MCGOWAN. I can say it is at its highest point in history.

I think the gentleman has in mind perhaps mobilization readiness.

On page 1324 of the hearings General McGowan, in response to a question, said, in effect, the same thing. I asked this question:

Earlier in the hearing this afternoon Mr. RILEY was asking you about the efficiency or quality in the guard today, and you explained means and methods by which that is evaluated?

General MCGOWAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORD. If you were asked the categorical question, Is the National Guard today better trained than it was a year ago, what would you answer?

General MCGOWAN. I would say each year I have continued to be amazed at the evident increased efficiency of the units I have been associated with.

In other words, our Regular Army and our Reserve forces are today, according to the testimony of General Taylor and the responsible officials for the Reserves and the National Guard, are in the best shape in their history.

Now, we may have an amendment subsequently proposed today which would seek to increase the strength of the Army by one division. I would like to point out why I think that amendment is unnecessary. General Taylor was asked in the hearings, if he had an opportunity to get more money, what would he use that money for, and on page 466 of the hearings General Taylor replied as follows:

Before asking for more manpower I would feel I needed more money for this particular Army.

Mr. SIKES. What would that money be spent for?

General TAYLOR. It would be spent in part for equipment. It would be spent for deferred maintenance. It would really go across the board, but the emphasis would be first on equipment.

Mr. SIKES. What type of equipment?

General TAYLOR. I will get my "shopping list" out.

Incidentally, he pulled out a shopping list, and he enumerated the kind of equipment that he would want if he had some additional money. He did not ask for a single additional soldier.

Now, he further emphasized that on page 439 in response to a question propounded by our chairman:

Mr. MAHON. If you were going to have a sizable slice of additional money, how do you think it could be best applied? How would you want to apply it?

General TAYLOR. I always have a priority list of Army needs. If you gave me another dollar, I could tell you how to spend it. I could use more money for equipment up to a certain point, then I would look at the Army force structure and see if I wanted to get more people.

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his statement and join in every word of it. It just seems to me that this is a highly inappropriate time to reduce the key forces in the United States Army.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. I want to compliment the gentleman from Florida for offering this amendment. I think the facts justify favorable action on the part of the House. The Committee on Armed Services, who have investigated this matter, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks], urged that the forces be set at 900,000 and a sufficient amount of money to care for them be appropriated.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

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

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

Mr. BRAY. I wish to congratulate the gentleman for the stand he has taken. There have been three wars within my lifetime where the United States frantically tried to make up for lack of preparation. It has certainly been uneconomical and it has cost the United States billions of dollars not to have been ready, aside from the loss in lives. One of the things we must do, in my opinion, is to keep and maintain a stable, well-organized defense force, and not one that changes in strength continually. This amendment merely keeps the Army exactly where it is today. This will in the end save money and maintain a greater strength than will a constantly changing vacillating policy. I believe that in the interest of economy and for a sound defense we should try to keep the forces at the strength that we now have.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan be permitted to speak for an additional 5 minutes, equal time with the gentleman from Florida.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, opposing the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is not an easy job, purely on the basis that I have the highest regard and the greatest respect for him as a colleague. Furthermore, I know well of his knowledge and experience concerning the Department of the Army and the defense program. Neither is it easy for me to

oppose the amendment because I happen to be a personal friend of the Secretary of the Army. He comes from my State. He and I have been good friends for some time. It is likewise difficult for me to oppose this amendment because I probably have more friends on active duty in the Army than in any one of the other services. Furthermore, I do not have to look back and feel that over the past years I have failed to be cognizant of the Army's needs. I think the record is very clear that in those instances where I thought the Army was right they had no more energetic and helpful spokesman on their behalf in the House than myself.

However, it seems to me we have to look at it from this point of view. On the one hand we have the Secretary of the Army feeling strongly that 870,000 men is not adequate. I know that General Taylor, as Chief of Staff of the Army, feels that way. Many people in the Department of the Army join him in this regard.

On the other hand, we must recognize the fact that the President of the United States has a long record of accomplishment in the Army and if there is any area in our Government where he is an authority it is here. He personally feels that 870,000 is the right figure for the Department of the Army in fiscal 1959.

The Bureau of the Budget did not set that figure. As a matter of fact, guidelines were drawn setting the Army active duty strength at 850,000. The Joint Chiefs of Staff had some reservations about that strength figure for the Department of the Army. Those were communicated to the President. As a result of those reservations by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President himself increased the strength figure for fiscal year 1959 from 850,000 to 870,000.

It seems to me that if you are going to weigh one judgment against another, in this instance it is sound for us to take the decision of the President of the United States and the overall recommendations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who did endorse this budget as a whole, against the recommendations of the Secretary of the Army and the recommendations of General Taylor.

Mr. Chairman, it might be interesting to know that the subcommittee of 17 Members which heard all of the testimony, had a vote on this amendment, if my recollection is correct, voted two to one against the proposal submitted by my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. It is not a partisan issue because the vote could not have been two to one with the composition of the subcommittee.

But turning from the broad views of individuals in authority to my own analysis of why the 30,000 increase is not necessary for the Department of the Army in the fiscal year 1959, I would first like to discuss the problem of the quality of the Army active duty strength in fiscal year 1959. Mere numbers in and of themselves, do not make a strong fighting organization, whether it is the Army, the Navy or the Air Force. It is the quality of the personnel involved. As I indicated during general debate, the Army in fiscal 1958 inaugurated certain manpower programs which will re-

sult in a considerably improved personnel program for the Army in fiscal 1959.

Our reenlistment rates are going up. They are going up despite the fact that the eligibility rules for reenlistments have been increased considerably. This means that you are getting better people than you would have gotten and have gotten in the past. It means despite these higher eligibility requirements that we are keeping more trained people on active duty, so that the people in the divisions and in the units throughout will be the best soldiers the Department of the Army has ever had on active duty in peace time or in a cold-war era.

Because of the legislation which has been passed under the leadership of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], which has been costly, we are seeking and approaching a career Army. Our dependence on the draft is being reduced, which means that our training burden is less, which means that our ratio of combat forces to overall strength will be higher.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The gentleman, of course, is well aware of the missions that have been assigned the Army around the world. If he were Secretary of the Army, would he feel that the Congress had given him sufficient men to carry out these missions?

Mr. FORD. As I tried to indicate earlier, whether I were Secretary of the Army or a Representative from the State of Michigan, it is my considered opinion that for fiscal 1959 the strength of the Army should be 870,000.

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

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman has been making a very comprehensive and sound statement. Knowing his, may I say, affection for the Army, inasmuch as he has served on the Army panel for so many years, I know that if there is any branch of the service closer to his heart than the other two it is the Army. For that reason I know he is speaking from his heart and based on sound judgment.

I would also point out that I trust the gentleman will go into the matter of equipment, because if we have not wasted many, many millions of dollars, a better equipped Army with a smaller number of men should be able to do much better than the larger sized Army we have had in previous years.

Mr. FORD. I was just about to turn to the question of equipment, because that is the second important ingredient in a good army. There are three elements that are highly essential for a modern army: One, firepower; two, mobility; and three, communications.

I think a year or two ago it was pointed out in our hearings that the firepower of the Army in the last 10 years has gone up 84 or 85 percent, and the forecast was that it would go up even greater in the next decade.

We have missiles units in the field today, such as SEITAF in Italy. They have the Honest John, they have the Corporal. Just today I read that a combat trained unit fired a Redstone missile. This is an operational unit ready for deployment. The firepower of the Army is going to increase tremendously. In this budget, through the recommendations of the President and through its implementation by this committee, the Army will have about \$800 million for the modernization of its equipment across the board, which is the biggest program the Army has had for modernization of firepower, communications, and mobility in my recollection.

I should like to turn to another problem. This committee, in order to insure that the ground forces would have adequate personnel, added funds to the extent of approximately \$80 million to beef up the National Guard and the Army Reserves. We went above the President's recommendations to the extent of 70,000 people for the Reserves and the National Guard. We must remember the National Guard and the Army Reserve are well equipped and well trained. Since the Guard and the Reserves are an integral part of our defense team their larger size and improved capability, in part, justifies the strength figure of 870,000.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. The gentleman refers to beefing up the National Guard and the Army Reserves. The gentleman, of course, means only to beef it up in the President's budget and not to beef it up from the actual numbers which have previously been authorized or which were previously in existence.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman is half right. In the National Guard, it means keeping it at a 400,000 level, but in the case of the Army Reserve it means going from about 255,000 up to 297,000.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The National Guard had reached the point where it had 437,000 persons. Now they come in with the recommendation to reduce this down to 360,000 persons. This was such a reduction that it shocked the conscience of your committee. I am glad to say that your committee did not accept those recommendations. And the same recommendations that we are debating here today regarding reducing the size of the Army come from the same sources, and it shocks the conscience of many of us who are in the Congress.

Mr. FORD. As I said, when you combine the National Guard or the Army Reserve increases with the 870,000, in my judgment, the Armed Forces, the Department of the Army will have adequate troops on hand and in the reserve to do the job.

In addition, it should be pointed out that this committee provided funds to increase the size of the Marine Corps from 188,000, which is the end strength

for fiscal 1958, to 200,000. I personally felt the Marines should have been kept at 188,000. The President wanted them to go down to 175,000. This committee to be certain and positive that we have on hand additional combat-ready outfits of three combat divisions with their accompanying air groups provided sufficient funds so that a larger Marine contingent will be ready to go at an instant's notice. So in two instances this committee has provided additional funds for increased ground forces, National Guard, Army Reserve and for the Marine Corps.

In addition to that, I think it is fair to point out that despite the comments of my friend, the gentleman from Florida, the NATO forces are stronger than they have been in the past and the forces of our allies elsewhere are stronger than they have been heretofore. They, through the mutual security program, are being beefed up with new weapons and better training to the extent of almost \$2 billion annually.

Mr. Chairman, when you look at the overall I hope the amendment is defeated.

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

Mr. Chairman, as you can well imagine, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida. I have been introducing an amendment of this same kind every year since the Korean War. This Congress saw fit to cut the Army about 500,000 since the Korean war. I have begged you and pleaded with you not to do that, but in your wisdom you proceeded, and you have consistently cut the Army. I thought you were wrong every time you did it. If you persist you will be wrong again. I have served on this panel of the committee with my friend from Michigan. Just examine this a minute. My friends say, "You take your word from the President on this. He knows. He is the one. If he ever knew about anything he knows about this." May I point out, Mr. Chairman, it was the same President who recommended that you cut the National Guard this year, and you said, "No. The President is wrong. He does not know about this. This is one thing he does not know about." The same President in the same budget in the same bill said, "Let us cut the Reserves." You said, "No. The President is wrong. The President does not know about this. This is one thing he does not know about."

The President said, "Let us cut the Marines 50,000." You said, "Never. Do not touch the Marines. That is one thing the President does not know anything about."

Well now, that is 3 to 1. That is pretty good odds.

Now, I will not try to gild the lily. I submit to you as a jury, the finders of the facts, you who are lawyers, and there are many of you here, you do not take the facts from me. You hear the evidence. You decide. This is important. It is important to the Congress, just as it is important to the Executive.

How many times did you hear the judge charge: "Oh, this is important to the State. It is important to the defendant. You decide."

But there is no margin for error here. Not today. No margin for error. There are two schools of thought. There are the big missile boys. Everybody is going to have missiles, and that is right. Two years from today everybody will have missiles, IRBM's and ICBM's. Everybody will be loaded with missiles, up to here. And nobody will object. But nobody. How do I know? Do I have a crystal ball? No. Do you? Certainly I do not. I do not know any more about it than you do. You decide. Your feeling is that you agree with me that 2 years from today nobody is going to push a button and start thermo-nuclear warfare. That means what? There will be by the Bible, there will be by history, "wars and rumors of war unto the end of time." In those wars, as always, you will need the Queen of Battle—Infantry.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the question before the Committee at the moment is perhaps more of a moot question in some ways than some of us would like to see it. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. McElroy, in a press conference last Thursday was asked about this bill, and his comment was as follows:

Our view about that is that in each instance the force levels proposed in the present budget message are adequate; and we think that the increases that are provided in the Appropriations Committee's determination of their proposal of our budget go beyond what is required.

Then on further inquiry by a member of the press as to what would be done about that if it became law, Mr. McElroy said:

I am sure I am right in what I say and that is that this is an authorization to do, but not a command to do. So any of these items on which there have been increases provided by the Appropriations Committee will have to be considered along with all the items in the budget as a whole; so I do not think I would like to say what we will do about any individual item without knowing what the budget is as it finally comes out of the Congress.

Of course, I fully agree with much that has been said by both the advocates and the opponents of this amendment. I fully agree that our very competent Defense Department and our great President are going to have the last word on this anyway. One thing that we can do in this committee and in this Congress is to air the issues, make our personal views known to the country and to the executive department. Then we will probably sit by and watch nature take its course.

One item in this bill that to me is more important than the question of how big an Army we might have at any particular time or in any fiscal year is the welfare of our civilian components, which I believe are the most economical form of defense even in these days of so-called split-second reaction.

While it is true that our National Guard and our Organized Reserve Forces

Byrd	Harden	Scott, N. C.
Canfield	Hillings	Shelley
Celler	Hosmer	Sheppard
Chelf	James	Shuford
Christopher	Jenkins	Smith, Kans.
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Smith, Miss.
Devereux	Kearney	Spence
Dies	Kilburn	Steed
Diggs	Lankford	Sullivan
Dooley	Lennon	Taylor
Dowdy	Marshall	Teague, Tex.
Doyle	Miller, Calif.	Tollefson
Eberharter	Morris	Tuck
Elliott	Phillbin	Udall
Fallon	Pillion	Utt
Farbstein	Polk	Vursell
Garmatz	Powell	Williams, Miss.
Gregory	Reece, Tenn.	Williams, N. Y.
Gubser	Rivers	Wilson, Calif.
Hale	Robeson, Va.	Winstead
Halleck	Saund	Zelenko

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McCormack) having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 12738, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 351 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, just prior to the quorum call I was discussing the degree of flexibility that does exist in the 1958 Department of Defense appropriation bill. I pointed out that the Secretary of Defense has a \$30 million contingency fund which is wide open. In the emergency fund he has \$35 million in outright obligational authority, plus the transferability of another \$50 million. This emergency fund is primarily limited to research and development.

In addition, within each account in the various services there is also a very high degree of flexibility, providing, of course, that the Secretary of Defense or the individual service makes known to the committees the changes in the program and the funding between what was submitted at the time the budget was justified and what they want to do under the revised program.

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

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. In connection with the gentleman's statement relating to the flexibility that does exist, has existed, and will exist, it might be well for the Members to turn to page 258 of the Department of Defense appropriation hearings which on the front page bears the words "Advanced Research Projects Agency," where Secretary McNeil, who is well conversant with these facts and figures, shows that in 1957 and 1958 there was flexibility and reprogramming of better than \$5 billion. In other words, it amounts to about 5.5 to 6 percent of flexibility, which on a \$40 billion bill is rather complete flexibility if the services care to exercise it.

Mr. FORD. For example, if we take the Department of the Air Force appropriation called Aircraft, missiles, and related procurement, the figure for fiscal 1959 is \$6,303,000,000. Within that total of over \$6 billion there is complete flexibility, provided the committee is notified

of any major changes in the program between what was submitted and what they intend to execute.

Let us take a minute to see why and when flexibility is required. Whenever Congress is in session flexibility within an account can be handled adequately purely by notification to the Committee on Appropriations. If there is a transfer needed from one account to another, that requires Congressional action, but with Congress in session, to my knowledge every such request has been completely honored. The only area where there is a requirement for flexibility of an unusual character is when Congress is not in session. If you look at the record of Congressional sessions for the last 5 or 6 years, you will see that we have not been in session on an average of about 4 months a year.

If in this 4-month period when Congress is not in session a dire emergency should arise, Congress, of course, would be called back into session and under such circumstances the Congress would promptly take affirmative action to provide additional funds in whatever amounts were necessary. But, if the emergency were not a serious one, but only resulted from a breakthrough in some scientific area, the Secretary of Defense under the existing law has a total obligational availability of \$30 million plus \$135 million plus the flexibility in the various individual accounts. \$135 million plus \$30 million is a lot of flexibility to meet any foreseeable breakthrough. That is a lot of money to obligate for any scientific breakthrough in the first instance.

Now, the committee went further than we did in 1958 because we did wish to cooperate and give even greater flexibility to the President and Secretary of Defense. What have we done? We honored the President's request for the \$30 million contingency fund in fiscal 1959. The President asked for \$85 million in appropriations for the emergency fund and \$50 million for transferability in this fund. We took the appropriation and increased it to \$150 million—a \$65 million increase. Furthermore, we doubled the amount of transferability from \$50 million to \$100 million. We gave the President in the emergency fund area, \$250 million in contrast to his request for \$135 million.

Additionally we changed the language to give the Secretary of Defense greater flexibility in the use these funds. Heretofore, in the emergency fund they could only use this money for research and development. We kept those two words in the language, but added, and I quote "test and evaluation or procurement or production related thereto". In other words, we increased the funds in the emergency category substantially and we broadened the language to permit them, if a breakthrough should come while Congress was not in session, to actually procure. It is my considered opinion, we have given to the Department of Defense all of the flexibility they need for any conceivable breakthrough as a practical matter.

Now, I would like to talk about the Department of the Army and its budget.

It is my honest opinion that this budget, as submitted by the President, and this budget for the Army, as implemented by the committee, will give to the Army the necessary funds to make it the best Army the United States has ever had in peacetime, the best Army the United States has ever had in a cold war year, and the best Army in the case of any outbreak of hostilities.

What is required for a first-class army in the atmosphere of today? First, you must have good leadership at the top. I firmly believe Secretary Bruker of the Department of the Army is a top notch Secretary, one of the very best in our Nation's history. He has done a remarkably good job. The Chief of Staff for Army, General Maxwell Taylor, is an outstanding military leader, a man of experience, foresight, and a man who has done a terrifically good job as Chief of Staff.

From General Lemnitzer, on down to the lowliest enlisted man, I think the people in military uniform in the Army are first-class soldiers.

What is the second ingredient of a good army? We must have a trained and experienced personnel from the lowliest private on up.

I think the programs that the Congress has enacted, of which there are many to keep trained personnel in the service has resulted in our enlisted personnel today being the best in the history of the Army.

On the equipment side, a good army must have increased firepower, mobility, and communication. As I will point out later, the President's budget, as implemented by this committee, takes a big step forward in the modernization of our Army in those three crucial categories. As a result, I wholeheartedly and fully endorse the President's budget for the Department of the Army, as implemented by this committee.

What is the funding picture for the Department of the Army for 1959, as represented in this bill? This bill gives to the Army in new obligational authority \$9,042,626,000. The program calls for expenditures in fiscal 1959 of \$8.6 or \$3.7 billion dollars. It will result in an unexpended balance at the end of fiscal 1959 in the area of \$4.3 billion. The program will result in unobligated balances at the end of fiscal 1959 of about \$400 million, all or most of which will be committed to sound constructive programs for fiscal 1960.

The total expenditures available for the Department of the Army, if this budget is approved as recommended by the committee for fiscal 1959, will total \$13 billion.

The one account which I think deserves special attention in the Army this year is that for military personnel. In the bill we have provided new obligational authority to the extent of \$3,326 million, which includes transfer of obligational authority to the extent of \$423 million from the Army stock and industrial funds. The committee made only one reduction in the President's budget in this account, a reduction totaling \$3,800,000. It was a percentage cut for all three services. In the Army it

resulted in \$3.8 million, a very insignificant reduction in comparison to the total in the account.

What does the dollar availability mean in the way of troops? Here is what it will provide: 870,000 active duty personnel; 14 divisions; one armored combat command; 11 brigades, battle groups and regiments; 4 missile commands; 36 surface to surface missile units; 74 surface to air missile battalions, and 30 aviation companies.

It does provide that there should be 30,000 reduction in active duty personnel, comparing end strength 1959 to end strength 1958. But as I indicated a minute ago, there are certain increases in the surface to surface missile units; seven. There are increases in surface to air missile battalions; nine. There are increases in aviation companies; five. There is a reduction of one division, comparing fiscal 1959 to fiscal 1958.

I want to make this point especially clear, however: You do not measure the quality of an army necessarily by the number of people on active duty; you measure, to a substantial degree, the quality of the army by the people who are in it, whether they are experienced, whether they have capability of assimilating the complicated jobs to which they are assigned, and whether or not the ratio of combat forces to overall strength is good.

In this area it seems to me that in fiscal 1959 the Army will be immeasurably improved, it will be substantially improved in fiscal 1959 compared with fiscal 1958 for several reasons:

1. Our enlistment rates are going up, which means that more people who have had experience in the service are reenlisting. This is the result of legislation enacted by the Congress over the last 4 or 5 years, such as reenlistment bonuses, dislocation allowances, social security coverage, dependent medical care, and more housing for the military than ever in the history of the Army, Navy, or Air Force. In addition there are other fringe benefits which have been approved by the Congress which make the military a more attractive career.

In addition, it should be pointed out, you cannot always compare reenlistment rates of last year with reenlistment rates of this year. The reason for that is that within the last 12 months the Army has severely restricted the eligibility of people who can reenlist. They have raised the requirements of those people who want to reenlist. As a consequence, many people who have the desire have not been eligible to continue service in the Department of the Army. But despite these higher criteria the reenlistment for the Department of the Army has gone up, and I am ready to believe that with the pay bill it will improve further in fiscal 1959.

Another aspect of this problem is the weeding out of those who for one reason or another have not been able to qualify on the various mental tests that have been given by the Department of the Army. People in category 4 have always been a problem to the Department of the Army. We find that they are the ones who tend to go a. w. o. l. more fre-

quently; they are the ones who seem to get in more trouble than the others.

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

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. We have had some testimony that there are persons who fall into still another category than category 4, and that is the so-called gold-brickers.

Mr. FORD. That is correct. That is another group that has been involuntarily released from the Department of the Army. The Army in fiscal 1958 has involuntarily released 65,800 of these people they felt did not live up to or meet the requirements for further service in the Army. For example, on January 31, 1957, the Army had 244,300 people in category 4. One year later, January 31, 1958, that number had been reduced to 181,900. In other words, the Army has gotten rid of those they felt could not assimilate the requirements of handling new equipment, this complicated equipment that we are making available.

They have raised the criteria for reenlistment, but despite the increase in this criteria the reenlistment rate has gone up. So overall in fiscal 1958 and again in fiscal 1959 you are going to have a larger percentage of people qualified to do a better job in the Army than they had in the past.

How are some of these things reflected in your overall program? For example, the Army forecasts that in fiscal 1959 they will take in 150,000 selectees or those who come to the service by the draft method. If the reenlistment rate continues as it is on the upward side, despite the fact they are raising their standards, it is fair to assume that instead of drafting 150,000 it might be 140,000 or maybe even less.

What does that mean to your overall Army effectiveness? It simply means that you require less instructors for the reduced number of trainees; it means more instructors can be with combat units. The ratio in the Army of instructors to trainees is about 4 to 1 overall. When you have a decrease in your number of new enlistees, it means your training load goes down, it frees people who are skilled and trained to return to combat duty.

It is my honest and considered judgment that with the money made available and with the programs the Army has underway and intends to have underway that we have an adequate number. We will have an adequate number on active duty in fiscal 1959 to give the Army the best cold war Army in the history of the United States.

Let us turn to the next account, operations and maintenance. That covers a large miscellaneous area. The committee has recommended \$3,215,950,000. This is the money that provides the Army with funds to purchase everything they use on a day-to-day basis. It provides for procurement of some equipment. It provides for some travel. It is kind of a catchall. It is an area where I think in the past the Congress has been a bit too restrictive. In this bill we re-

duced the operations and maintenance account for the Army by \$30 million. This percentage reduction is applicable to the three services. It is a small reduction percentagewise and small dollarwise.

However, here I conscientiously disagree with the committee's recommendations. I do not deny that the Army through improved management can do a better job, but I would have preferred if the additional funds in this particular and specific case had not been deleted from the budget.

We made a reduction of \$2.6 million in the dependent medical care portion of the operations and maintenance account.

We did provide some increases in the operations and maintenance account. We added \$5 million to continue the mapping program at the level at which it has proceeded for the last few years. About 5 years ago the Army started a 10-year mapping program which required funding on an annual basis of about \$40 million. This year the budget reduced that to approximately thirty-four or thirty-five million dollars. The committee felt, and I wholeheartedly agree with them, that that reduction by the executive branch was wrong.

We have added \$5 million, and I hope that the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, spends it the way the committee recommends.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I will be happy to.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I think it is worthy of comment, because perhaps it is not fully understood by all the Members, that while this is in the Army budget, it is a Defense Department activity and involves all the services and is of the utmost importance for that reason.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, who has been a valuable member of this committee for the last 6 years.

In the operations and maintenance account we also added \$37 million for the National Guard and the Reserve; \$24 million of the \$37 million was for the Guard and \$13 million for the Army Reserve. This money is needed to permit the Guard and the Reserve to conduct their program to the extent of 400,000 personnel for the National Guard and 300,000 for the Army Reserve.

Under the President's budget, the strength ceiling for the Army Reserve was to be 270,000. The committee felt that the limitation was unsound. As a consequence we have recommended that the ceiling on the Army Reserve be lifted from 270,000 to 300,000. We have provided \$202,499,000 for the implementation of the Army Reserve program to a 300,000 ceiling.

Now the Army Reserve is on the build-up. With this program and with these funds they can reach their ceiling of 300,000. The committee, in order to finance the additional 30,000 for the Army Reserve, added \$17,499,000 in this account. When you add that to the operation and maintenance increase, the total for the Army Reserve is \$30,499,000.

I must point out that the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard are

an integral part of our overall defense team.

I would like to read the testimony of General Palladino of the Army Reserve, which points out the improvement that has been made in the Army Reserve. On page 155 of the hearings, General Palladino had this to say:

In 1948 we had no units. Today we have more than 5,500 units organized and active throughout the country.

As recently as 1950 we had no training centers we could call our own. As of December 31 we had 155 constructed facilities and another 79 under construction. Also we have 1,746 leased or donated facilities.

Then, on page 156, General Palladino had this to say:

The truly remarkable growth is in our enlisted strength. As recently as June 1953 we had only 71,000 enlisted men in drill-pay status. By the end of February 1959 we had over 200,000. Of these, the large part have received basic training or have served 2 or more years in the Active Army. Many are combat veterans.

In other words, the Army Reserve is a good outfit, and with the additional funds we have made available they will be even better and will constitute a real backup to the active Armed Forces.

The National Guard program as submitted by the President called for a strength limitation of 360,000. The committee has recommended funds at a strength level which would take them up to a ceiling of 400,000. The committee has recommended for this program \$333.8 million. In this account there is an increase of \$27,419,000. When you add that to the money for the Army National Guard in the operations and maintenance account, it indicates a total increase over the President's budget for the Department of Defense to the extent of \$51,419,000.

Again I would like to quote from a responsible officer of the Department of the Army, on this occasion General McGowan, who is the head of the Army National Guard. On page 219 of the committee hearings General McGowan had this to say:

Contrast this with June 30, 1956, as shown on the left of this chart. Using the same criteria, 66 percent of the guard were then trained individuals, including 24 percent who had prior service or active duty training. By the end of fiscal 1959, practically 100 percent will be basically trained.

In other words, in 1956 only 66 percent of the Army National Guard were adequately trained. By the end of the fiscal year 1959 the Army National Guard will be 100 percent trained, a substantial increase in their effectiveness in case of any outbreak.

Again, General McGowan had this to say at page 219 of the committee hearings:

We have been splendidly equipped by the active Army was a vast quantity of modern equipment.

Then I would like to turn to page 222 of the hearings where General McGowan summarizes the status of the National Guard and here is what he said in that regard:

That the National Guard today is well equipped; that its members are trained and

possess more and better facilities than ever before in its long history; that it is truly a Ready Reserve;

In other words, the Army National Guard in fiscal 1959 will be well equipped, well trained, and in General McGowan's opinion, in the best combat status it has ever been in the history of the National Guard.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. The same may be said of the Air National Guard. We were all impressed with General Wilson's presentation on the Air National Guard and we share with him confidence in his ability to do the job.

Mr. FORD. Speaking for myself, I was tremendously impressed with General Wilson's testimony. It was my first opportunity to hear him, and I certainly concur in the observation of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

In the Army account for research and development the President originally asked for \$471 million. Contrast that, if you will, with the funds for fiscal 1958 of some \$400 million in the first instance. An amendment to the President's budget in this account raised the figure from \$471 million to \$493.7 million.

In my judgment, the Army's research and development program is sound. It will be adequately financed by the budget as submitted and amended. I am certain, I am positive that they can proceed expeditiously and effectively on the many programs which are so vital to the future of the Army and to the security of the United States.

In the final account, that of procurement of equipment and missiles, the committee has recommended \$1,644,000,000. Most of the increases over and above the original budget submission of \$1.4 billion are for the modernization of the Army, the modernization of its equipment. The committee accepted the President's amendment to this account which called for an increase of \$213 million but added to that \$37 million of our own to accentuate the modernization program. So that in fiscal 1959, the Army will have for its modernization program almost \$800 million, modernization in these three broad categories—mobility, communications, and firepower.

It seems to me that with the funds which we have made available the Army is going to take more rapid steps forward in its modernization program than at any time in recent history.

In conclusion may I just summarize by saying this: The budget as submitted and as amended by this committee for the Department of the Army is the best Army budget I have ever had the opportunity of working with in the 6 years I have been on this subcommittee. I think it will provide an excellent peacetime, cold-war Army and will be the sound foundation for any active war if this country should become so engaged.

I feel that with the fine leadership from the Secretary of the Army and the

Chief of Staff, General Taylor, this program in dollars will bring about a first topnotch fighting outfit.

I think we have provided sufficient funds for active-duty personnel. We are going to have people in the ranks of higher quality and more experience than at any time in the past.

We have bolstered over and above the President's budget the Army Reserves and the National Guard to the extent of 70,000. We have found that the Guard and the Reserves from the point of view of combat effectiveness are in the best shape they have ever been.

As I pointed out a minute ago, there is over \$900 million in the Army procurement account for equipment and missiles for an expanded modernization program.

When you look at the whole picture within the Army plus other factors, such as the increase in the strength of our NATO allies and our Free World allies, the increased strength of the Marine Corps, and the other programs which this committee has funded, it is my considered opinion that we should stick with the budget as this subcommittee has recommended it, which includes an Army strength on active duty of 870,000.

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

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

Mr. BEAMER. I want to compliment my colleague from Michigan on an excellent statement. I should like to ask this question: I realize that we cannot legislate on an appropriation bill, but since the armed services are going to be spending these billions of the taxpayers' dollars, should not some consideration be given to their contracts being placed in distressed areas in this country? I am referring to many instances, and they are happening all around us, where the money is being spent overseas. Only recently I was advised by the Air Force that they were buying some particular products from Canada because there was an unemployment situation in that area. We have unemployment situations in this country, too. I wonder, when they are spending this large amount of money, whether they cannot give consideration to our own manufacturers, to our own consumers, to our own employees, to our own taxpayers. Has the gentleman any comment on this particular subject?

Mr. FORD. It is my belief that the vast majority of funds included in this overall program will be spent in the United States with American producers.

Mr. BEAMER. I am asking the question because I was advised by the Armed Forces that the State Department is asking them to spend money with our friends and allies, because they seem to be more interested in making foreign friends than in bolstering our domestic economy. If this condition exists, I think that this information should be passed on to the Members of the House.

Mr. FORD. I am not personally familiar with such situations. If there is any such overall program, I think an investigation to determine the why and wherefore is appropriate.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to say a word of commendation about the gentleman's presentation and for his unusual grasp of the issues presented to us in this legislation. I always feel very comfortable about the activities of the gentleman regarding matters of national defense because I always know that he is going to look at both sides of every problem and give us the very best answer we can possibly have.

I want to ask the gentleman a question with reference to the size of the Army. In the Committee on Appropriations, do you endeavor to establish what the size of the Army should be? There apparently is an issue here over whether there should be 30,000 more in the standing Army. Is that entirely a matter of appropriations? I do not exactly understand how that becomes an issue here.

Mr. FORD. The President submitted a budget calling for an end strength in fiscal 1959 of 870,000. He recommended certain funds which would finance such an active duty Army. I understand there is to be an amendment offered which would increase the funds in the military pay account to the extent, I believe of \$9 million, which would finance the additional 30,000 to keep the end strength at 900,000. Our committee and, in fact, the Congress can only provide funds for such a program. We cannot affirmatively and mandatorily direct the funds to be spent. That has been a long standing argument between the executive branch and the Congress. But, this committee in its wisdom, if it so desires, may add sufficient funds so that a 900,000 man Army could be financed.

Mr. KEATING. But that would not necessarily mean that the military authorities would decide that a 900,000 Army was desirable.

Mr. FORD. I think the ultimate decision in that case would rest on the Commander in Chief, the President.

Mr. KEATING. And his recommendation is for 870,000?

Mr. FORD. That is what he submitted in the budget for funding in fiscal 1959.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, might I say at this point that that is his position as of today.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, of course, that is true in the case of any other appropriation in the entire budget; is that not correct?

Mr. FORD. That is right. I mean we are simply making funds available, and then it is within the discretion of the executive branch to obligate it.

Mr. FLOOD. And that would apply to the Polaris submarine or the Marines or anything else. It is not peculiar to the Army.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As the gentleman very well knows, it is impossible for some of us, and certainly for me, to know about these things and to get accurate information. So it is that now I want to express my very deep appreciation to the gentleman upon whose testimony and

statement I can rely. I am sure I speak for the majority of Michigan Republicans, at least, to the same effect.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman for his very fine statement concerning this Department of Defense appropriation bill. I was interested in the gentleman's remarks with regard to the Army National Guard. Of course, we know that there has been a great deal of discussion and concern about this proposed cut, and I am happy to see that the committee has retained the strength at 400,000, which I understand is the intention of the committee; is that not correct?

Mr. FORD. The committee provides funds in both the Army National Guard account and in the operations and maintenance account to maintain the Army National Guard at an active-duty strength of 400,000.

Mr. CHAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, one of the most essential and accepted traditions of the United States is the maintenance of the National Guard of each State. In World War I they served nobly beside regular Army troops—in the Second World War the Guard, 300,000 strong, were on hand to quickly react following the attack at Pearl Harbor—and in the Korean conflict the National Guard units of this Nation served to stop the invasion of the Communists.

It may easily be said that the National Guard has played a vital role in the organization of our Army both in the past and as it is constituted today. They have maintained a brilliant record both in peacetime and in war. Survival today depends upon trained men in organized combat units largely in ready status and it is my sincere opinion that the National Guard is a proven and most efficient vehicle for providing an immediately ready group of trained and equipped soldiers to back up the regular defense units of the Nation. There will be no warning and no opportunity for extended training should, God forbid, the aggressive nations of this earth force us again into the position of defending our homeland. The National Guard is vital to our very existence today.

I take this opportunity to clearly express my strong feeling against any cut in the National Guard below its present strength of 400,000 men.

Sufficient funds as contained in this bill must be appropriated by this Congress and the use of this grant by the Executive follows to maintain this minimum Guard strength, fully equipped and properly trained.

The Guard should continue an organizational pattern, within the concept of the modern Pentomic army, of a balanced tactical structure.

In making my suggestions I am prompted particularly by a pride in the National Guard units located in the First

District of Florida, which is an outstanding example of the effectiveness of this guard arm of the Army. The 51st Division, located both in Florida and South Carolina, is one of the outstanding divisions in the entire Nation. For 4 years this unit has been either in first or second place in strength of all National Guard divisions; for 2 of the last 3 years the 51st has won the Third United States Army trophy for best trained and most efficient division; during field training for 1957 the Florida National Guard attained a higher rating than any other State or Territory; for 3 years the 51st has been a "ready" unit considered to be the most advanced in training and readiness with "M" day assignments of immediate mobilization.

There is a wealth of evidence as to the validity of the request that the National Guard remain at a base strength of 400,000. The Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, has stated in an address made at Phoenix, Ariz., on the 15th of April this year:

My position last year and my position this year is that there should be a floor of 400,000 in the Army National Guard.

He had earlier stated:

I am determined that the guard shall not be reduced below the 400,000 level at which it is set.

The ability of the guard to sustain itself results in tremendous dollar savings and leaves the Army free to conduct its own training or assist in planning and conducting field training for its other reserve component. The National Guard serves in two capacities—vital to the proper defense of the Nation and important in the functioning of the State body—as both a service of the States in time of peace and a basic unit of our military strength in time of conflict.

The place of the National Guard in the modern Pentomic army is one of importance and a responsibility that the guard is more than willing to accept. I quote the reasons for this reorganization from the remarks of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, made before the Governors Conference and recently held in Miami Beach:

After several years of study of the effects of modern atomic weapons and their impact upon the tactics of future warfare, the active Army decided in the autumn of 1956 to initiate the reorganization of its divisions in line with the Pentomic concept. This concept derived from the need to equip our divisions with atomic weapons, while at the same time giving them a pentagonal structure by increasing the basic combat units within the divisions from 3 to 5. Hence this artificial word, Pentomic; to describe the new structure.

The new organization of these divisions was based upon four considerations. The first was to give the division commander atomic weapons within the organic structure of his division. The second was to organize the division so that it could disperse readily in the case of atomic attack into semi-independent battle groups replacing the present infantry regiments. Third, the new organization was to take full advantage of the progress in signal communications which permits a division commander to control more subordinate units than formerly. Finally, it was considered important to reduce

of the Army, Navy, or the Air Force. I commend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations on his statement.

Mr. CANNON. I am most interested in the gentleman's suggestion that the President did not go quite far enough. But, certainly, we should go as far as he recommends.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. I want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri on his very wonderful association with the ideas of the President to have what he desires in the Department of Defense Reorganization bill. I listened to all the hearings and I can assure the gentleman I shall certainly support these amendments. As the gentleman has said, let us go at least as far as the President wants and not cut it short at this time. This is no time to sidetrack these ideas when we need the finest streamlined military department that this country can possibly have. These changes then will certainly give the President and the Secretary of Defense the necessary implements to carry forth what the people of this Nation want, namely, a real security program. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CANNON. I am in agreement with the gentleman. It is a time to forget partisan distinctions, a time to forget every consideration except the most effective way of providing an efficient fighting force ready for service on short notice.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 27 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SANTANGELO).

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this bill, H. R. 12738. This bill appropriates \$38 billion for the Department of Defense. This appropriation is \$4.5 billion more than the bill which was approved by Congress last year. It provides for programs which last year seemed quite beyond our capability.

Without preparedness, there can be no security. This bill provides the funds for preparedness and for our security. It provides funds for relatively new programs that make sense as a means of defense for this country.

Since October of 1957 when sputnik electrified the world, the American people have asked themselves soul-searching questions and are critically appraising our governmental leaders. The people want to know the facts. They were humiliated, angry, frustrated, and aroused. They became slightly hysterical. But today hysteria has disappeared, and the people are determined; they are determined to recapture our world leadership in all fields.

We are the leaders of the Free World. We seek not war, but peace. We have enjoyed the monopoly of atomic bombs and technological inventions, and we did not abuse our power. We have shared the fruits of our scientific advances with the nations of the world. We have shared our atomic resources. We have

given generously of our economic aid to more than 60 countries to fight poverty and to bolster their economy. Because we were the strongest nation in the world, we became smugly complacent. While we dawdled and enjoyed our televisions and automobiles, another nation with less noble and peaceful purposes has advanced with great strides. Today the Russians have surpassed us in rockets and missiles. Today the Russian submarines, more than 600 in number, present the greatest potential danger to our security. Despite our great struggle, we are perhaps not even the masters of our fate.

We are determined, however, to be free and to regain the prominence in industry, science, and military striking power. We are prepared to pay the financial cost as contained in this bill. While we are behind in submarine strength and missile development, we need not minimize our prowess. We have in orbit three satellites. We are very strong today. We have in the Strategic Air Command a very powerful and ready force. Our great strength and retaliatory power are the greatest deterrent to war. In overall striking force, we are superior to the Soviets, but the Russians are moving fast and we cannot tarry or dawdle.

This bill provides funds for necessary programs. I shall, in my limited time, mention some provisions which are of paramount importance.

One billion three hundred million dollars are provided for the fleet ballistic missile firing submarine, the Polaris. Heretofore, we made provisions for three such submarines. We are now ready to build a fleet of nine Polaris boats to offset the Russian submarine strength. We are providing funds for killer submarines and more antisubmarine warfare activity.

Nine hundred and fifty million dollars are provided for intercontinental ballistic missile program. Principally, this is for Atlas, Titan, and the solid propellant minutemen ballistic missiles.

Four hundred and fifty million dollars are provided in the intermediate range ballistic missile.

One billion five hundred million dollars are provided for the modernization of equipment, including a very considerable sum for Army missiles.

These and other provisions will help us compete in this space age. If we desire to remain free in this world, we must conquer space out of this world and have the will to incur the high financial cost to build a community of nations right here on earth.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this bill, as has been stated in the debate yesterday, calls for new obligational authority to the extent of something over \$38 billion. Approximately \$113 million more than the Presidential request. It totals approximately \$4 billion more than the obligational authority available in fiscal year 1958. In other words, it is more than what is available this year and it is more than what the President himself requested of the Congress. Some people might assume that the Congress

in this bill was going off on an unending spending program. I sincerely hope and trust that the people who will administer these funds in the Department of Defense in each and every service will be guided by the principle of getting the most defense for the least dollars.

Last year we were concerned primarily with economy. The House reduced the President's budget for the Defense Department by \$2½ billion. We insisted that economy be practiced in the Pentagon. I would caution anybody in the Defense Department that they should follow the same guidelines in the administration and expenditure of these funds as they were cautioned last year in the handling of the funds then made available. I am sure that our committee will be just as scrutinizing in the future, when we are called upon to review how these funds have been handled, as we have been in the past.

May I talk about transferability and flexibility. The President in the budget as presented requested authority to transfer \$2 billion from one account in one service to another account in another service. In addition, he indicated he would submit a request for a \$500 million contingency fund. Furthermore, it was stated that in the preparation of the 1960 budget a specific request for increased flexibility would be made. Our committee had several hearings where Mr. McElroy, Secretary of Defense, discussed this problem. It was pointed out to the Secretary of Defense that the Defense Department does have substantial flexibility today.

Let me review what flexibility does exist. In the first place, in fiscal 1958 there was \$30 million made available in obligational authority under the contingency fund program. In this program the Secretary of Defense can obligate up to \$30 million for any purpose that he desires. In addition, in fiscal 1958 the Secretary of Defense has \$95 million in obligational authority available in the emergency fund, plus the right of transfer of an additional \$50 million, making a total in the emergency fund, both as to new obligational authority and transferability of \$135 million. The language in the bill did however restrict this to research and development. Furthermore, there is additional flexibility. For example, take the account in the Army part of the budget, for the procurement of equipment and missiles, where approximately \$1,500,000,000 is available in 1958.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 85]		
Adair	Auchincloss	Boykin
Allen, Calif.	Belcher	Brownson
Anderson	Bentley	Buckley
H. Carl	Boggs	Burdick

the Science Foundation knew the Navy could get the dough and they could not.

Mr. MAHON. But it has been said that in that bill we did cut the funds for the satellite program. That is not correct, if it has been said.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not recall that that was said. But let me continue. Another thing that should be thoroughly understood by all is the fact that when the IGY satellite program was undertaken, it was undertaken with the distinct understanding that it should not delay our military missile program as much as a single day. And if it had interfered, if the satellite had delayed the missile program by as much as a single day, if you think there has been some squawk about what has or has not happened, the comparison would be that of a whisper to a shout.

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I must yield to the gentleman from California, yes.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Taking all of this discussion together, some of it good and some of it bad, in the final analysis, after the Congress has made appropriations in whatever amount, we have people at the Pentagon who are there for the purpose of deciding what should be done in these guided-missile programs, is that not the fact?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Why, certainly. It seems a rather simple thing to some people to get these guided missiles into the air. One man says that the Titan is the one; the other says the Atlas; but in the Pentagon we have men who are recognized in the field of knowledge, in the field of science. They know more about it than I do by far. It is their job, it is their responsibility, and it should be, to decide scientific programs. We are not in a position to make these decisions. There have been many decisions made that I have not agreed with. But that has been true all my life, and even though most of my future is behind me, as time goes on there will be many more decisions made, even in our own subcommittee, with which I shall not agree. But when a decision is made, then let us go on from there.

Another question was asked and that is this. If these things about which we are talking here today are so important, why have they not come before us sooner? As a matter of fact, you will recall that we had our appropriation bill up last year and we adjourned shortly before Labor Day. The reason these programs were not in sooner was because we have just convened this month. Many of the things that happened during the past 4 or 5 months since we adjourned, made it possible for them to see that now the program was realistic, and that they should go ahead and advance with it. There would have been no factual reason 6 months ago for us to have given any additional money for the Polaris missile for submarines. But now they have made a scientific breakthrough; now it is a reality. The same thing is true of the other missiles, the Jupiter, the Thor, the Atlas, the Titan, and many others.

Let me say here that with the new change in the subcommittee setup I

suppose that we would do well to complete our hearings on the military program by Thanksgiving. Of course, we shall move faster than that, if we can. But I was about to say that before we report a bill for appropriations for the fiscal year 1959 for the defense program, our scientists, and our production men probably will come through with other breakthroughs which will justify the Department of Defense coming before us and asking for money for those programs, to expedite them. And we shall do it, because speed and progress is what you have been asking for, and that is what you are going to get.

Perhaps that will answer the question as to why these programs were not suggested sooner.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly what I was trying to get at. First of all, I want to commend the very able presentation of the gentleman from Kansas. But did I understand from the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGLESWORTH] that the \$1.5 billion approximately provided in this bill is a down payment or an installment on the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. That the regular appropriation bill will be reduced in the amount of this bill?

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is correct. What we are doing in substance, as you have been told several times, is buying time so that we can get on to some of these programs 6, 9, or 12 months ahead. These items would have been included in the fiscal year 1959 program, so it is just a question of whether you are going to give them \$1.3 billion right now to get on with the job, get these things built, or wait until August, or later before making the funds available. You are buying time, and it is a purchase that is very well made.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. FORD. I think it ought to be made clear that this \$1.3 billion has already been reflected in the budget for fiscal 1959, so the budget as submitted in the dollar amount cannot be further reduced another \$1.3 billion. It has already been reduced.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I have covered in at least part the salient points. We are buying time for these various programs. The financial picture, the numbers and all, have been clearly given to you by the other members of the committee. It is all set out very clearly in the committee report. I cannot agree with all of that report because I cannot agree with the statement in the committee report that our vast superiority has receded. I do not think it has. But I do agree that our military superiority overall is greater than that of Russia. They do have a bigger army, more men, no question about it. They have had it ever since 1916. So, that

is no reason for alarm. They do have more submarines of various types. Many of them are for their own defense. It is nothing new. That force has been there for some long time.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is quoting words from the report which I wrote with my own hands.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I still cannot agree with it.

Mr. MAHON. I stated that after World War II, or words to that effect, we were vastly superior to the Soviet Union in military strength. We had the atomic bomb and they did not, and so forth. The point that we were trying to make was that this gap between the Soviet Union and the United States has been narrowing, and our relative position has receded.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I know, but when a man is at the bottom of the hill he has no place to go but up. When we get to the peak, he is going to start catching up if he keeps climbing; sure.

Mr. MAHON. It just so happens that the Soviet Union is ahead of us in some of these space areas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. And we are ahead of them in other space areas.

Mr. MAHON. They are ahead of us in the number of airplanes, fighter aircraft, and so forth.

Mr. SCRIVNER. They have had a need for more fighters because they had a greater threat against them. They still have a greater threat because our Strategic Air Command today can visit all the death and destruction that is necessary to deter war. It is so great that the Russians do not dare accept that cost of that devastation.

Mr. MAHON. The object of our program is to have something more effective when the Strategic Air Command loses its maximum effectiveness.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. MAHON. When it begins to lose in importance we will have something to take its place.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is why we are going to have missiles. It is to augment the Strategic Air Command and the Tactical Air Force. If it is not going to help, we have no business spending the money.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. The statement was made that we were ahead at the end of World War II, but with regard to missiles we were starting out both even because we both captured V-2's and some German scientists, did we not?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, we did. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons, perhaps, that Russia is ahead of us in submarines is that the Russians got the German submarine pens, they got the German submarine scientists, they got the plans and blueprints for the snorkels, 36 of them, and the 6 that were completed were divided between us, England, and France. But that is past history. I am not so much concerned about the

cannot and would not, except in direct emergency. We must therefore rely principally upon one or more major deterrents to war which the Soviets fear so greatly they will not risk conflict.

We must follow through to the perfection of those deterrents to aggression as fast as we can with every action and every dollar that is needed to insure that America goes out in front and stays in front just as long as danger threatens.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, as we all will recall, last May there was a considerably different atmosphere in this Chamber when we were considering the fiscal 1958 military appropriation bill. The atmosphere, in my opinion, is infinitely better today than it was, for example, on May 29 of 1957. Perhaps the situation is something like the oft-quoted comment in reference to the weather: If you do not like the weather, wait a minute. If you do not like what the Congress did in May, June, July, and August of 1957 in reference to military appropriations, if you will wait a minute I think perhaps some errors may be remedied and changes made.

It is not often I disagree with my very good friend and extremely able colleague, the gentleman from Florida, in reference to military appropriations, but I think it is fair and proper to say in light of what he said just a minute ago that in this supplemental appropriation bill for the Department of Defense, there is over a billion dollars for ballistic missile detection systems, the acceleration of the Atlas, Thor, and Jupiter ballistic missiles program and the acceleration of the Polaris ballistic missile submarine program. This bill does provide for the urgent acceleration of those programs. I think it is also fair and proper to say that within the last week or two decisions have been made which give to the Army the authority to proceed more rapidly with their Nike-Zeus program, which is an anti-missile missile program. In addition, the Air Force has been told to proceed in the same way with their part of the anti-missile missile program, the radar detection system. I personally feel these programs are proceeding well and rapidly.

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

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

Mr. SIKES. I have the very greatest respect for my able and distinguished colleague from Michigan. He and I have worked very closely together for years for a stronger defense and I respect him in every way. However, I do want to quote to the gentleman a statement by Secretary McElroy supporting my position. I refer to a statement on page 2 in the report which accompanies this bill.

The report says:

This is not in any way a true 1958 supplemental. It does not represent resubmission of requests for purposes heretofore budgeted and denied either in fiscal 1958 or the prior year.

At the same point Secretary McElroy is quoted as saying:

The programs covered by the supplemental request are all part of the 1959 budget but have been advanced into fiscal year 1958 in order to get them under way as quickly as possible.

Then, further, the statement of the Comptroller of the Department is quoted from page 314 of the hearings:

As indicated earlier in these hearings, this supplemental request does not include any amounts for programs previously submitted to the Congress for fiscal year 1958.

I believe this makes the situation perfectly clear.

• Mr. FORD. I would like to respond to the gentleman's statement. It is absolutely proper and accurate to say that there are no programs in here which were submitted in the regular 1958 military budget. There is no doubt about that. These are new programs. However, I think it should be said that to the extent of \$203,500,000 out of the \$1,260,000,000, we are being asked in this appropriation bill to replenish accounts which were reduced by the Congress in the last session.

Let me point them out. In the last session the Congress cut the Navy shipbuilding and conversion account—I want to be fair and accurate—to the extent of \$70 million. In this supplemental appropriation bill we are being asked to replenish that account to the extent of \$296 million.

In the Navy account, procurement of ordnance and ammunition, the Congress in the last session cut it \$80 million. In this supplemental appropriation request the Congress is being asked to replenish that account to the extent of \$31,830,000.

In the Air Force procurement other than aircraft account, last year the Congress cut it \$53,500,000. In this supplemental there is a request to the extent of \$360 million for this account.

In the Air Force military construction account in the last session the Congress cut it \$100 million. In this supplemental bill there is a request to replenish that account to the extent of \$520 million.

I want to reemphasize that although these are new programs, we are being asked as a Congress to replenish these accounts which the Congress cut last year. If Congress had not reduced the funds in these accounts in the last session, the Navy and the Air Force in these accounts would have had more obligatory authority available for the new programs submitted in the supplemental bill.

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

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

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am not sure whether they are included in the figures you have just given, but it is true, is it not, that a substantial portion of these funds are to be used to replenish the accounts for the Tartar and the Talos and other programs of that kind against which borrowings have been made in the current fiscal year?

Mr. FORD. Certainly in the case of the Navy, as I understand the testimony,

all of the Navy program here submitted to us has already been moved ahead and obligations have been made, so all we are doing by this particular supplemental, as far as the two Navy accounts are concerned, is to replenish the accounts so that they may proceed with other programmed projects that are urgent.

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

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

Mr. MAHON. I realize that the gentleman from Michigan voted for many of the cuts that were made last year in the defense bill.

Mr. FORD. He also, if I might say, opposed many.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Michigan opposed many of them. But, it is perfectly clear, and I believe we all agree, that the Defense Department has not come back and said, "We asked you for money for the Polaris submarine and we asked you for money for the Air Force Alert, we asked you for money to expedite the missile program, and you did not give it to us, and we now again ask you for it." They did not do that. Is it not true that the Defense Department came before us and said, "Gentlemen of the committee, we have some new projects never before presented to the Congress, and we need the financing." Should we have financed these projects before the Defense Department knew there were any such projects in the making? It seems to me, if we want to cast away every vestige of control of the purse, we should give them these blank checks and say, "If you dream up some project, you will have the excess money from which to finance it." I realize there are many who say we hurt the Defense Department last year by cuts, and everybody in the House knows we did not, because ceilings were imposed by the Bureau of the Budget and the services could not spend the money we gave them. Does the gentleman not know that there is \$539 million in the aircraft and related procurement account of the Air Force that is not being used and is being applied as an excess against the 1959 budget?

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman would let me take my time—and I know he is not the kind that imposes on others—I would like to discuss that particular point to which he refers. He made a statement in the bill's debate yesterday which I think ought to be explained. It relates to what the gentleman has just said. On page 741 of the Record for yesterday, the gentleman from Texas said this:

It is unmistakably clear and now undisputed from any responsible source that last year Congress gave the Department of Defense several hundred million dollars more than is being used for this year's operation. The amount as given by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNeil, is \$299 million.

Now, I am afraid that the gentleman's remarks of yesterday, which I have just quoted, could lead to an erroneous impression. I know that he has been in the forefront for as long as I can remember for a sound and constructive policy of full funding. As a matter of fact, last May 15 the chairman, the gentleman from

August 17, this directive from Mr. Wilson's office became effective. What did it do? It gave to the Army, Navy, and Air Force the right to obligate 90 percent of the total amount that Congress had made available—90 percent of \$1,575,000,000. You could do an awful lot of research on \$1,400,000,000. In other words, in the first 45 days of the fiscal year the Army, Navy, and Air Force got 50 percent of their total funds for the full year. There was no order precluding them from the possibility of having the remainder of the 10 percent before the end of the fiscal year. All that Mr. Wilson was trying to do was to get the three services to review their research and development programs and, perhaps, to reprogram, if they found some research and development programs which were not proceeding satisfactorily or which were for one reason or another unproductive.

You know, Mr. Wilson, as Secretary of Defense, must have been reading the debates in the House of Representatives last year on May 29 with reference to research and development when he issued that order. I would like to read some excerpts from the debate on that day, because I think they are pertinent and because they coincide precisely with what Mr. Wilson decided to do in research and development. As you may remember on May 29, I offered an amendment to increase the research and development appropriations for the Army by \$8 million, to restore back what the subcommittee cut below the President's budget. During the course of the debate, my real good friend, our chairman, the gentleman from Texas, had this to say in opposing the amendment restoring research and development funds. I quote:

Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, after meeting for 4 months, sat down and marked up the bill and agreed on cutting research and development a little bit in the Army, a little bit in the Navy, and a little bit in the Air Force in an effort to get more efficiency and economy in the program.

Then, he goes on to say:

We have been so kind toward research and development that some have tried to make a grabbag out of it. That is exactly the situation I am inclined to exclaim, "Oh, what crimes have been committed with the taxpayers' money in the name of liberty and in the name of research and development. This is such a popular area."

Then, he goes on to say later:

I agree with Mr. James M. Bridges, who was director of electronics in the office of an Assistant Secretary of Defense speaking in Washington on the 22d of May, who said: "If this country is to stay ahead in weapons' development without going into bankruptcy, we must find ways to be more economical in the conduct of our program."

Then, after that quote, our chairman says:

Is there anything wrong with that?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield since I have been quoted?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I want to say I find no fault with those words, and I am sure they are quoted not out of context.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman can be sure I have tried not to do so.

Mr. MAHON. I find no fault with the statements I made at that time. I was saying at that time in effect that many crimes have been committed in the name of research and development, and that if the taxpayers knew how many crimes were committed, they would probably be very disturbed. But there can be no crime committed in the name of research and development if we are really doing the essential thing. We were complaining last year because they were taking research and development dollars in the service to crash automobiles to try to do something about traffic accidents. That is important but we should not have to do such things in a defense bill. Then the Army had a project study on sleep. There were people in the Government who probably needed that research program, because they were asleep to the dangers that were about us at the time.

Mr. FORD. All I am saying to my distinguished chairman is that Mr. Wilson, when this order was written on August 17, must have just a day or so before read the statement of my chairman who urged on May 29 precisely what the August 17 directive ordered.

Mr. MAHON. What the Secretary of Defense did was to cut back research and development funds by 10 percent, as the gentleman has so well pointed out. He said later after the Soviet satellite that they would be released. Really what the Secretary of Defense was doing was trying to keep the Department of Defense from spending forty or forty-two billion dollars that had been given to the Department to expedite these defense procurements. The Secretary of Defense, after clearing with the Bureau of the Budget, was compelled to cut down defense spending. He said we ought not to have to do it, but he did it by reason of the orders he received from the Bureau of the Budget and higher authority. So the reason we gave too much for the Department of Defense last year for the program was that our Defense Department was held back as the result of a budgetary order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 8 additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. May I say in addition that during the debate on this issue of whether or not we were going to increase Army research and development, as I had suggested on May 29, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SNES] had something to say about research and development. As I say, he and I have worked long and hard together, and seldom do we disagree. But I think that his statement on the floor of the House on May 29 is also in support of the decision made by Mr. Wilson on August 17.

The gentleman from Florida's statement is as follows:

I make that statement frankly and freely. I felt that a small reduction in research and development service areas would require economic belt tightening all the way along the line. I would not vote for cutting re-

search and development excessively, but I do not rule out the possibility of wide reprogramming, which will eliminate unnecessary and obsolescent projects.

That is precisely what Mr. Wilson's order of August 17 had in mind. On October 25 this order was rescinded. It is interesting to note the impact of that order from its inception to its conclusion. If you will turn to page 345 of the hearings, you will find a statement by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force as to whether or not this order by Mr. Wilson had any adverse impact. The Army and the Navy say it had none. The Air Force says, with a long and rather windy explanation, that it could have, that it might have, and so forth. But they say the reduction had no effect on the ballistic missile program. So on the missile program this order as far as the Air Force was concerned had no adverse impact. It may have had in some, temporary and insignificant impact on their other research and development programs; armywise and navywise, no.

It is also important to take a look at the Army research and development program to see how their rate of obligation stands. If you will turn to page 375 of the hearings you will see what their obligation rate has been from July 1 of this fiscal year and what it will be to June 30 at the end of this fiscal year. It shows that \$459,900,000 will be obligated, which is \$59 million more than the Congress gave them in the area of research and development. This greater figure is possible because of certain transfers into the account from the emergency fund and the greater use of unobligated funds from fiscal year 1957.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.


Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I have listened with a great deal of interest to this explanation of what has been called in the newspapers, arbitrary administrative restrictions on defense funds. Would the gentleman not admit that it did eliminate overtime in missile plants?

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman will turn to page 345, as I have indicated, he will see that as far as the Army and Navy are concerned it indicates there was no adverse impact on their research and development program. In the case of the Air Force there was for a limited period of time, a reduction, as I understand, from either 3 or 2 shifts or from 2 to 1 shift. The pertinent part of that Air Force statement seems to indicate that as far as ballistic missiles are concerned there was no adverse effect.

Mr. BROWN of Missouri. I am disturbed, as I think the American people are, by the confirmation statements that come out about our defense. I have a newspaper article before me from the New York Times dated January 13, 1958. Overtime restrictions still exist. I quote an article by Milton Becker in which he says:

Because of restrictions on overtime at the Air Force missile base center, activities at Canaveral tend to slacken over weekends. Since launches require many hours of preparation even before the start of the final countdown, part of the rockets have been fired on a Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday.

*Memorandum - copy
alternative
to basic speech*



NEW DRAFT OF NATIONAL SECURITY SPEECH

Some of the tone of this year's political campaign is reminiscent of another campaign sixteen years ago.

In 1960 -- and many of you recall this -- there were charges that President Eisenhower had let our country fall behind the Soviet Union in its strategic missile arsenal. All of a sudden, everyone was worried about a so-called "missile gap."

President Eisenhower flatly denounced the charge because he knew it wasn't true.

U.S. defense leaders denied it too.

Those in positions of responsibility and with knowledge of facts denied it across the land.

But the folks at home could not be certain. Only a short time before the Soviet Union had startled the West by launching the world's first satellite, and the Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev had banged his shoe belligerently at the United Nations.

So this notion of a "missile gap" was believed -- for a while -- but only until the votes were counted in November. Then, with the office chairs in Washington still warm from the just removed Eisenhower Admin. the new Defense Secretary, Robert McNamara, checked into it and, lo and behold, he found no "missile gap" at all. It had been a phoney charge -- one of the worst in our political history.

A concept which was just plain false had gained currency because too many people were trying to make simple slogans describe a complex subject...our national security.

I am convinced that the American people won't be taken in by this kind of sloganeering in 1976.

In the past decade we have heard a similarly simplistic set of charges on the other side of the issue. We have heard statements by prominent public officials which have suggested that the U.S. need not worry about our national defense, that there was no real threat to our security in the world, that we had peace and stability and could therefore cut the defense budget year after year, that we could take the money and apply it to domestic needs at no risk to our freedom, that the Defense Department didn't need all the weapons and that we could save billions of dollars by greater efficiency. These appealing notions led to repeated defense cuts totaling almost \$50 billion in the past 10 years.

Viet Nam?
Probably most arguments focused on defense cuts to curtail U.S. military involvement in Viet Nam. Doesn't the 10 year time frame re. Viet Nam issue?

I am equally convinced today that the American people will not be taken in by these simplistic and erroneous statements.

In recent weeks, two similarly false charges have been directed at the national security policies of the United States. First, it is said, that the Nation has fallen dangerously far behind the Soviets in military weapons. It is also said that the reason is a policy based upon an acceptance of inferiority ...and a willingness to simply try to get the best deal we can before it's too late.

I want to say straight and hard, right here and right now, that these two charges of U.S. military inferiority and U.S. acquiescence in inferiorism to the Soviets are just as phoney as the missile gap charge was back in 1960, and just as irresponsible.



My record and the record of my Administration on this is clear and consistent to anyone who examines the problem seriously. In brief:

-- For 25 years in the Congress, I stood, voted and spoke out for a strong U.S. military force.

-- While, for the last 10 years, as Congress has cut almost \$50 billion from the defense budgets recommended by Presidents of both parties, I have stood and fought for maximum defense strength.

-- For the last two years, I have submitted the two largest defense budgets in our peacetime history.

-- And I pledge to you today that as long as I hold this office, I intend to see to it that we will never be second to any nation -- period.

As President and as Commander-in-Chief, I cannot responsibly let this nonsense about U.S. "inferiority" go unchallenged. Too much is at stake.

this is refuted by Concessions of second rate on pg.

Fortunately, most foreign nations understand our system well enough to place such remarks in their proper context.

Still the truth must set forth and now. I honestly believe the American people have had enough of this kind of simplistic approach. We must see the world as it is. We must form our policies out of hard realities, not political fiction

And the facts of the matter are clear.

First and foremost is the reality that the United States is today the greatest nation on earth -- and indeed, in all of history.

Our economic power is far and away the largest and the most productive, producing ____% of the world's wealth with but ____% of the world's population.



The genius, creativity and productivity of our free system stands as a beacon for free and aspiring people across the globe.

It should be clear from the fact that the most advanced Communist nation, the Soviet Union, seeks to acquire our technology and is committed to reliance upon us for the most basic need of its citizens -- food. That certainly says something about the relative value of the two systems.

We remain the best hope and inspiration for mankind.

And the military power of this mighty country remains today unsurpassed by any other nation. Specifically, the military power of the United States and the Soviet Union are today roughly equivalent -- that is to say, we are ahead in some areas, even in others, and to a degree behind in still others. What is vital is that there clearly is an overall military balance now between the world's two greatest powers. Not allowing that balance to be upset to a point where the U.S. could be said to be inferior is what is vital.

However, it is true that the trends of the past decade and a half have been adverse, as this Administration has been the most vocal in saying for some time now. I wish more of those seeking public office

Why make this damaging concession? It contradicts claim of a defense "second to none"

Reagan
Jackson

would have started to pay attention to the trends earlier, in years past when the Congress was slashing at military budgets in an annual ritual. Then they were not so vocal. Then we almost stood alone in objecting to cutting away at our national security. My other hope is that these critics will be around in the future when the country may again have to realize that its national security cannot be allowed to slip. Looking at the present situation, my Administration has continually pointed out that military strength can't be measured by any single, isolated index. As Defense spokesmen have repeatedly pointed out, what one must look to is the overall balance. Our top national security and military leaders are agreed that, fitting this whole complicated process all together, we are today capable of defending ourselves and deterring nuclear war.

What they properly also point out very vigorously is the second reality of this world -- that the Soviets are doing everything they can to develop their military strength and, therefore that the trends have been largely adverse and that our policies and programs must be shaped to meet that threat.

Consider these developments:

Over the past 10 years, the Soviets have expanded their real defense spending by about a third.

The size of their military forces is about a third larger than 10 years ago.

Since 1965, they have built 800 new ships.

Why
report
Reagan
level
?

Since 1968, they have sharply increased their tactical aircraft force and they are building very powerful technological and production bases.

This tells only part of the story, for over these same years we have also seen clear examples of Soviet adventurism in Asia, in Europe, and very recently in Southern Africa.

These events give no support at all to wishful thinking that, Soviet actions are benign and we can therefore let our defense programs drift.

The message to us and our friends is clear: We must never drop our guard. Both now and in the future, we must be fully prepared to protect our interests. Here in the United States, it is especially critical that we reverse the trends of the past 15 years. In 1964, 43 % of our Federal budget was devoted to defense and 30 % to social spending. Now, the figures are reversed: 55 % to social spending, 25 % to defense. We are still strong, but the trend is wrong and unacceptable. We cannot go on bleeding our country's defense without one day paying the price.

That is why, for two years running, I have asked the Congress for the defense budgets which are the biggest ever submitted in peacetime. That is why I flatly oppose any cut in the now pending defense budget and why I have promised to veto any defense bill --

Why
Reagan
line?

BUT
IN 1964
WE
WERE
AT WAR
IN VIET
NAM
AND
BUILDING
UP
STRENGTH
FOR
COMBAT

as unprecedented as that would be -- that would shortchange the safety of our country.

I make this added point, I genuinely welcome this sudden interest of various candidates with defense and foreign policy provided they stick to the facts and not engage in polemics. I welcome it because I know that it reflects the firm belief of the American people now that our goal of peace and stability can only be achieved through strength. It also may give some of the chronic congressional backsliders the will to stand up for enough dollars for defense.

*of class
Resign
Humphreys*

So if they would only join me in presenting the facts and in working with the Congress to support a defense program adequate to the nation's needs, they could contribute something valuable to our country. Right now, even though what they have been saying on defense is impressive and simplistic, if they'll pay attention to the facts they can do something right for America in helping us to arrest the adverse trends of the past 15 years.

the deterioration of our defense?

Even as we are unyielding in our defense, we shall also be unyielding in our search for a just peace.

We are today committed to a constructive effort in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks for the simple but good reason that they offer the best hope for sanity in world relations. Since the beginning of these talks eight years ago, there have been pressures to either speed up or slow the negotiations. Instead, we have chosen a steady, solid course based on a realistic appreciation of our interests. Those interest do



not lie in an uncontrolled arms race but in maintaining a balance at the lowest possible level. And as we seek to stabilize the strategic balance, our resources can be used in other critical areas such as regional defense and sea power.

People who argue that the SALT talks penalize the United States are flat wrong. In Vladivostok, we began negotiating an agreement which -- if successfully completed -- will place equal ceilings on missiles, heavy bombers and multiwarhead missiles and would require the Soviets to dismantle many weapons.

There are still important issues to resolve in the SALT talks. I do not know whether we can succeed. We are working to do so. But under no circumstances will we be stampeded by arbitrary deadlines. One of the worst ways to negotiate is within an arbitrary time limitations. We cannot be stampeded into an early agreement nor be reluctant to enter into a well conceived agreement.

This election year is still young. There is time to restore reason and perspective to our debates over national security. Those who seek public office have an obligation, I believe, to prove they are responsible leaders in part by spelling out alternative directions ~~they would propose in our foreign policy and our defense policy.~~ It is not enough to criticize policies and yet refuse to elaborate new ones. Those who seek the Presidency must be equal to its burdens.

I say that also to those in Congress who we have all heard say, "I'm for a strong defense but ..." and then they slice away at defense funds thereby weakening our national security. None of us can escape the responsibility for securing the nation's vital interests and contributing to stability in the world. Only on a foundation of strength do peace and the programs which improve the lives of a free people flourish.

the Israeli withdrawal process?

STET

So, too, those in Congress who say, "I'm for a strong defense, but ..." and then would slice away at defense budgets to pay for other programs. Those legislators cannot escape the responsibility for securing the nation's vital interests and maintaining relative stability in the world. Only on a foundation of strength do peace and the programs which improve the lives of a free people flourish.

The task of statesmen today is to seek the best in America. The American people still accept and welcome the challenge of world leadership. If we summon the spirit and restore the dedication of our people, we can have a decisive impact on the future of the world.

are our people no longer dedicated?

Those with faith in America must speak the truth to the American people:

-- The truth that we have the strength and determination to defend our interests and the resolve to uphold our ideals and the freedom we cherish.

-- The truth that though we are the greatest nation on earth, we cannot allow our national defense to be further weakened, and that that cannot be achieved at no cost.

bolster Reason

-- The truth that for the first time since the days of Dwight Eisenhower, a President standing for election can say that America is at peace; and finally,

still

-- The truth that we must remain actively engaged in maintaining world peace, without escape or respite.

Our challenge is not to build an isolated fortress America. Rather, it is to remain the best hope for human freedom and dignity everywhere.

[Handwritten scribbles]

I pledge to do all that is within the power of your Presidency to keep America strong -- militarily, economically, and morally -- not just so that we can survive in a world increasingly hostile to freedom, but so that this great experiment in human dignity conceived 200 years ago can be like that fabled "city on a hill," shining forth as a jewel in the human firmament.

Each of us is a trustee of the future. The precious heritage that was bestowed on us must now be preserved and enhanced for our children and the generations of Americans to come. That is our highest calling as we begin our third century together as a people.

Thank you very much.

