

in that direction. I am now following the same procedure to seek a joint agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R. in the peaceful uses of outer space by writing to both President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev.

The only way I know of attaining peace is working for peace. If the two nations which have made the greatest advances in the exploration of outer space work together by directing their discoveries toward peaceful uses, which can create a world of abundance and bring all nations closer together, then the number of experiments in outer space could be expanded and at the same time result in savings of billions of dollars.

I want to develop this idea with you in hearings before my subcommittee.

With best wishes for a more fruitful new year, I am,

Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 17, 1959.

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VIC: In the President's absence, this will acknowledge your December 15 letter in further regard to international cooperation on the peaceful uses of outer space.

Your interest in the advancement of space exploration is appreciated, and you may be sure that the specific proposals you set forth in your letter on this subject will have consideration.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1959.

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VICTOR: Thanks so much for your thoughtful letter of December 15. I am sure that you will be interested in the progress we have made in developing a program of international cooperation. We will be happy to discuss this in hearings before your subcommittee and with you personally before that date if you so desire. Naturally, I am grateful for your vigorous support of the total space program. Only with congressional interest and support can we make

the progress which we must make in this area of national endeavor.

Kindest personal regards and best wishes for the holiday season.

Sincerely,

T. KEITH GLENNAN,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 31, 1959.

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ANFUSO: I refer to your letter of December 15 to the President discussing the possibility of cooperation with the Soviet Union in the field of outer space. In this connection, it is significant that during the recent session of the United Nations General Assembly, the United States and the Soviet Union reached agreement concerning participation in a new United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and in an international scientific conference to be held under United Nations auspices during 1960 or 1961. Further, on an informal technical basis, exploratory talks were conducted by scientists of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and Soviet scientists during a visit by the latter to this country in November. Technical talks have also been held with scientists of a number of other countries. Such steps as these should provide the basis for an increasing degree of international cooperation in outer space activities.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary.

UNOFFICIAL TRANSLATION
DECEMBER 31, 1959.

DEAR MR. ANFUSO: In response to your letter of December 15, 1959, addressed to N. S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, I have been instructed to inform you of the following:

The Soviet Government and its head N. S. Khrushchev appreciate your efforts toward further development of cooperation between our two countries.

The Soviet Government regards favorably the idea of concluding a bilateral agreement on peaceful uses of outer space. If the Soviet Union receives definite proposals to start negotiations on this question, we will be prepared to express our attitude toward them. The Soviet Union is ready to cooperate not only on a multilateral basis, as in the U.N. Committee, but also on a bilateral basis, when such cooperation is based on mutually advantageous conditions. As is

known the Soviet Union has already more than once made proposals on cooperation on the outer space problems. I have been also instructed to inform you that satisfaction is being expressed in the Soviet Union that XIV session of the U.N. General Assembly, which ended not long ago, decided to establish a United Nations Committee on Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. It goes without saying that the Soviet Union will take an active part in the work of the Committee.

Sincerely,

M. N. SMIRNOVSKY,
Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the U.S.S.R. in
the U.S.A.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1960.

HON. WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary, Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Thank you for your letter of December 31, 1959.

Yesterday I was handed the U.S.S.R. response to my letter of December 15, 1959. For your information I am mailing you a copy of the letter as well as the translation.

I believe this is a good sign and I trust the Department will immediately engage the Russians in talks regarding the same.

I am at your disposal in anything I can do to cooperate.

With warm regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 5, 1960.

DR. T. KEITH GLENNAN,
Administrator, National Aeronautics and
Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR KEITH: Thank you for your letter of December 17, 1959.

Yesterday I was handed the U.S.S.R. response to my letter of December 15, 1959. For your information I am mailing you a copy of the letter as well as the translation.

I believe this is a good sign and I trust your agency in cooperation with the Department of State will immediately engage the Russians in talks regarding the same.

I am at your disposal in anything I can do to cooperate.

With warm regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1960

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

Our Father, God, enable, we pray, with the light of Thy wisdom and the strength of Thy might, those who in these fear-haunted times are here entrusted with the stewardship of the Nation's life.

In our debates we face the things that divide this troubled world and set people against people, as their selfish interests clash. In prayer that is true and searching, we face Thee and ourselves, in Thy light.

Give us to see that the pride of nations, their greed, their lust of power, their aggressiveness against the lives of others, their deceitfulness and hypoc-

risy, are the very evils that corrode our own souls. And so we pray for ourselves, create in us clean hearts, O God.

Breathe on us, breath of God,

Fill us with life anew,

That we may love what Thou dost love,
And do what Thou wouldst do.

Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

JOHN ALBERT CARROLL, a Senator from the State of Colorado, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 7, 1960, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the

Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. William Langer, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Richard M. Simpson, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE SIMPSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of thirty-three Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] I submit a resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 219) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

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

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and unanimously agreed to.

Under the provisions of the foregoing resolution, the Presiding Officer (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio) appointed Mr. CLARK and Mr. SCOTT as members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Aviation

Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

ORDER DISPENSING WITH THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the calendar today under the rule was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF ADULT HONEY BEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act relating to the importation of adult honey bees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Postmaster General, reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation in that Department; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITION, OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions of that Office, for the quarter ended September 30, 1959; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 19, 1934, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the calendar year 1958 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS WITH BIRDSBORO ARMORCAST, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dated December 31, 1959, relating to his report on examination of Department of the Army contracts and subcontracts with Birdsboro Armorcast, Inc., Birdsboro, Pa., submitted on July 23, 1958; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

STUDY RELATING TO RESPONSIBILITIES OF FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY IN EVENT OF WAR

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the progress made relating to responsibilities of that Agency in the event of war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the period July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD ON POSITIONS IN GRADES GS-16, GS-17, AND GS-18

A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the calendar year 1959, on positions in grades GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. F. A. Tinker, of Harrisville Heights, Ogden, Utah, relating to the protection of Rainbow Bridge from the water of Glen Canyon Dam, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation of Wisconsin, at Milwaukee, Wis., relating to the public ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The petition of Charles S. Ballinger, of Chattanooga, Tenn., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The petition of B. D. Diaz, of Brawley, Calif., relating to child education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees, of New York, N.Y., signed by Joseph Ecker, secretary, relating to the death of the late Senator William Langer of North Dakota; ordered to lie on the table.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS FOR FLORAL TRIBUTE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER, OF NORTH DAKOTA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Lydia Langer Irwin, expressing appreciation to the Senate for the floral tribute in memory of

the late Senator William Langer, of North Dakota, which was ordered to lie on the table.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original bill to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts, and I submit a report (No. 1019) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2778) to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts, reported by Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was received, read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2765. A bill for the relief of Sofia Skolopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. ENGLE):

S. 2766. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood control accomplishments of the multiple-purpose developments to be constructed on the Moke-lumne River by the East Bay Municipal Utility District of Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2767. A bill for the relief of Hans Christian Gunnar Mikkelsen; and

S. 2768. A bill for the relief of Frederick T. C. Yu and his wife, Alice Siao-Fen Chen Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 2769. A bill for the relief of John George Sarkis Lindell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina: S. 2770. A bill for the relief of Borinquen Home Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2771. A bill for the relief of Shahrokh Basseri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 2772. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey land in the town of Cascade, El Paso County, Colo.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 2773. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between ports in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in southeastern Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in the United States outside Alaska, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 2774. A bill to foster the national defense, the postal service, the development of civil aeronautics, air commerce in the United States and abroad, and for other purposes, by providing for Government guarantee of loans to certain air carriers for purchase of effi-

cient, newly developed, modern cargo aircraft and components of a cargo airlift system; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 2775. A bill to promote just and lasting peace by amending section 3 of the act of January 5, 1905, incorporating the American National Red Cross, so as to include among the purposes of such incorporation the prevention of war and the establishment of a just and lasting peace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2776. A bill for the relief of Raymond Thomason, Jr.; and

S. 2777. A bill for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 2778. A bill to amend the act relating to the Commission of Fine Arts; placed on the calendar.

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

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 2779. A bill relating to the election under section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the Augusta Furniture Co., Inc., of Staunton, Va.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 2780. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238) to clarify and protect the right of the public to information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 2781. A bill for the relief of Alessandro Cellhorn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2782. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act to further protect the right to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2783. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections against denial on account of race, religion, color, or national origin, by providing for the appointment of Federal registrars by the President; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 2784. A bill to protect against deprivation of the right to a fair trial by lynching and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2785. A bill to provide for the retention, preservation, and production of Federal election records, papers, and ballots; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. 2786. A bill to provide for permissive intervention by the United States in cases involving the denial of equal protection of the laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. JAVITS for himself and Mr. KEATING:

S. 2787. A bill to assume the States' liability for activities of members of the National Guard engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site which is under the control of the Army or the Air Force and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 2788. A bill to extend the Library Services Act for a period of 5 years, and to amend such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BEALL:

S.J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to authorize the District of Columbia to erect a municipal fish market at the waterfront in Southwest Washington; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S.J. Res. 145. Joint resolution providing for the designation of Tuesday following the second Monday in June each year as National Fraternal Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S.J. Res. 146. Joint resolution designating the American Marigold (*Tagetes erecta*) as the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S.J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing that the Commission of Fine Arts render advice and comment on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. SCOTT) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 219) relative to the death of Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 220); which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdictions specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to—

- (1) banking and currency generally;
- (2) financial aid to commerce and industry;
- (3) deposit insurance;
- (4) the Federal Reserve System, including monetary and credit policies;
- (5) economic stabilization, production, and mobilization;
- (6) valuation and revaluation of the dollar;
- (7) prices of commodities; rents, and services;
- (8) securities and exchange regulation;
- (9) credit problems of small business; and
- (10) international finance through agencies within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to

January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$70,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS PERTAINING TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE HOUSING BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 221), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to public and private housing.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1960, to January 31, 1961, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ, upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than \$1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1961.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE STEVEN V. CARTER

Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. HICKENLOOPER) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 222) relative to the death of Representative STEVEN V. CARTER, of Iowa, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE ALVIN R. BUSH

Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. SCOTT) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 223) relative to the death of Representative ALVIN R. BUSH, of Pennsylvania, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES A. BOYLE

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted an original resolution (S. Res. 224) relative to the death of Representative CHARLES A. BOYLE, of Illinois, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, which appears under a separate heading.)

AIR CARGO TRANSPORTATION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create an emergency airlift through a system of Government-insured loans. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk for 2 days for possible additional sponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection the bill will lie at the desk for 2 days, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 2774) to foster the national defense, the postal service, the development of civil aeronautics, air commerce in the United States and abroad, and for other purposes, by providing for Government guarantee of loans to certain air carriers for purchase of efficient, newly developed, modern cargo aircraft and components of a cargo airlift system, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY, was received, read twice, by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, during the closing days of the last session of Congress I discussed at some length the problems of modern military air transportation and the proper role of the Military Air Transport Service and the civil air carriers in providing the airlift necessary to an adequate national defense.

I suggested at that time that MATS could not maintain the immediate readiness required by its wartime mission if it continued to perform all routine military logistics in its own aircraft, nor without modernization of its fleet. I pointed out at that time that neither MATS nor the commercial carriers have modern cargo aircraft capable of intercontinental movement of significant quantities of fully equipped troops and military equipment. Since these remarks were made, we have had confirmation of this analysis from others with far more knowledge and experience than I in military affairs.

I suggested last year that the solution to these problems was apparent and attainable:

First, an orderly transfer of the routine logistics function from the MATS fleet to the civil carriers, to the extent of their present capacity to perform it; second, a comprehensive program to develop and encourage the civil carriers to procure modern cargo aircraft to provide the capacity required to perform the air logistics function in time of peace and permit its expansion in time of emergency; third, modernization of the MATS strategic transport fleet in terms of its primary hard core mission, and not in terms of its former airline mission.

It is my hope that before this session of Congress is concluded the reorientation of MATS toward a more effective military role will be well advanced. It is also my hope that during this session the Congress will receive from the Department of Defense recommendations for a comprehensive modernization and re-equipment of the MATS strategic transport fleet. But these are fields in which the Congress can do little but propose and in which ultimately the executive branch must dispose.

It is in terms of the second step in this three-point program that the Congress can take the most significant and the most immediate action. We can enact legislation to develop and to encourage the civil carriers to procure modern cargo aircraft to provide the logistic capacity required by our Military Establishment in peace and the reserve airlift required in war.

I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to do just this. It proposes that the Civil Aeronautics Board be authorized to guarantee the repayment of loans for the purchase of cargo aircraft by the Nation's commercial airlines.

This approach to adequate airlift is offered as the result of almost 3 years of study by the members of the Aviation Subcommittee and the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Military Air Transport Service of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The details of the proposal are equally the result of consultations within the executive branch over a period of some 10 months. I commend it to my colleagues as an indispensable step in the development of a truly modern military establishment in the United States. I ask that the text of the bill be printed in full at this point in my remarks for the information of the Congress.

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

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, in order to insure an adequate air cargo capacity to meet the needs of national defense, the postal service, the development of civil aeronautics, and to promote the development of air commerce in the United States and abroad: (1) to encourage the development by United States aircraft manufacturers of new, efficient and modern cargo aircraft which will provide economical air cargo transportation; (2) to facilitate the acquisition of such aircraft by United States certificated air carriers; (3) to encourage the use of such cargo aircraft operated by such carriers for the movement

of commercial and Government cargo, and mail; and (4) to insure the immediate availability of such aircraft to meet military requirements in time of war, national emergency, or whenever a military situation requires. In furtherance of this policy, it is in the public interest that provision be made to assist such air carriers to acquire sufficient numbers of such cargo aircraft by providing guarantees of loans, for purchase thereof, on such terms as to insure their military availability.

Sec. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) "Administrator" means the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

(b) "Air carrier" means an air carrier as defined in section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958.

(c) "Board" means the Civil Aeronautics Board.

(d) "Cargo aircraft" means a newly developed modern civil aircraft of the United States, including spare engines and parts, and other specialized components of a cargo airlift system directly associated with flight line cargo handling, designed exclusively for the carriage of property or mail, or emergency carriage of combat forces or materiel.

(e) "Cargo aircraft purchase loan" means any loan, or commitment in connection therewith, made to a United States certificated air carrier for financing the purchase of United States-manufactured cargo aircraft, and shall include loans to certificated air carriers or any other person engaged in flight line cargo handling, for financing the purchase of specialized components of a cargo airlift system.

(f) "Certificated air carrier" means an air carrier holding a currently effective certificate issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board authorizing it to engage in air transportation.

Sec. 3. For a five-year period after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with any lender guaranteeing him against loss of principal or interest on any cargo aircraft purchase loan made by such lender subject to the following conditions:

(a) The Board shall require that such cargo aircraft be adequately insured against loss or damage for the duration of the guaranty, and shall require that the applicant execute or agree to execute a suitable instrument or instruments to secure the cargo aircraft purchase loan. The Board may consent to the modification of the provisions of any such cargo aircraft purchase loan as to the rate of interest, time of payment of interest or principal, security, or other terms and conditions, or to the renewal or extension of any such guaranty, whenever the Board shall determine it to be equitable to do so: *Provided*, That such modification, renewal, or extension is not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

(b) No guaranty shall be made:

(1) Extending to more than the unpaid interest and 90 per centum of the unpaid principal of any cargo aircraft purchase loan;

(2) On any cargo aircraft purchase loan or combination of such loans for more than 75 per centum of the purchase price of the cargo aircraft;

(3) On any cargo aircraft purchase loan whose terms, modification, renewal, or extension thereof does not require repayment, in substantially equal principal payments no less than annually, to be completed within ten years after the date on which the loan is first made;

(4) In any case where it would make the total face amount of such cargo aircraft purchase loan, together with any other such loan or loans to the same air carrier, or corporate predecessor air carrier or air carriers, then currently guaranteed and outstanding under the terms of this Act, exceed \$75,000,000: *Provided, however*, That no more

than \$10,000,000 in total face amount of any cargo aircraft purchase loan or loans shall be guaranteed for any one air carrier, or other eligible persons, for the purchase of specialized components of a cargo airlift system;

(5) Unless the Administrator shall have certified that the characteristics of the cargo aircraft as defined in this Act to be purchased with the proceeds of the guaranteed loan conform to the general design and performance criteria established by him, and that the guaranty will further the objectives of this Act;

(6) Unless the Secretary of Defense shall have certified that the cargo aircraft to be purchased with the proceeds of the guaranteed loan has design and performance characteristics which satisfy the criteria of suitability for military use established by him;

(7) Unless the Secretary of Defense shall have certified to the Board that the borrower has executed a contractual undertaking to the Department of Defense that the cargo aircraft in respect of which the guaranty is made (i) will, in the event of war, a national emergency, or whenever a military situation requires as determined by the Secretary of Defense, be made immediately available to the Department of Defense during the period of this guaranty, on reasonable terms including pricing criteria and arrangements for operation of the cargo aircraft agreed to prior to the making of the guaranty, and (ii) will not during the period of this guaranty be disposed of, except to a United States certificated air carrier: *Provided, however*, That the borrower, with the consent of the Secretary of Defense, may, for the purpose of fulfilling the foregoing undertakings substitute for any cargo aircraft on which a cargo aircraft purchase loan has been made hereunder a newer, more efficient, and modern cargo aircraft eligible for a cargo aircraft purchase loan and guaranty pursuant to this Act;

(8) Unless the Board shall have received a contractual undertaking satisfactory to it that the cargo aircraft to be purchased with the proceeds of the guaranteed loan will be used primarily during the period of the guaranteed loan for the carriage of property or mail;

(9) Unless the Board shall have found (i) that, without such guaranty, the air carrier or other eligible person would be unable to obtain necessary funds for the purchase of such cargo aircraft on terms which are reasonable and compatible with efficient and profitable operation, (ii) that the prospective earning power of the air carrier or other eligible person furnishes reasonable assurance of the air carrier's ability to repay the loan within the time fixed therefor, (iii) that the value of the cargo aircraft covered by the guaranty will reasonably protect the interests of the Government in the event of default, and (iv) that the type and number of cargo aircraft proposed to be purchased by the air carrier will improve the economy and efficiency of the carrier's operation.

(c) Such guarantee shall be made in such form, on such terms and conditions, and pursuant to such regulations, as the Board deems necessary and which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 4. Any guarantee made pursuant to this Act shall provide that the sole recourse of the United States, as assignee of a defaulted loan, against the defaulting borrower shall be limited to repossession of the cargo aircraft and the receipt by assignment of insurance claims, and that the obligation of the borrower to the United States shall be satisfied and discharged by the surrender of the cargo aircraft and all right, title, and interest therein to the United States: *Provided*, That such cargo aircraft shall be (i) free and clear of all liens and encumbrances whatsoever (other than the lien of any instrument executed to secure the cargo aircraft purchase loan) and (ii) in as good

order and condition, ordinary wear and tear excepted, as when acquired, except that any deficiencies may, to the extent covered by valid policies of insurance, be satisfied by the assignment to the United States of claims under such policies. Where the conditions of the foregoing proviso have not been met, the United States shall retain all of its rights and remedies.

Sec. 5. No payments required to be made as a consequence of any guarantee by the Board under this Act shall be made unless the lender has assigned all his right, title, and interest to the cargo aircraft to the United States.

Sec. 6. The Board shall prescribe and collect from the lending institution a reasonable guaranty fee in connection with each loan guaranteed under this Act.

Sec. 7. (a) To permit the Administrator, the Board, and the Department of Defense to make use of such advice and services as each may require in carrying out the provisions of this Act, each is authorized to use available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government with their consent and on a reimbursable basis.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act, including an immediate and orderly transfer of increasing quantities of routine Government sponsored air cargo traffic to the certificated air carriers.

Sec. 8. (a) Receipts under this Act shall be credited to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

(b) Payments required to be made as a consequence of any guaranty by the Board under this Act shall be made by the Board from funds hereby authorized to be appropriated in such amounts as may be necessary for that purpose.

(c) Administrative expenses under this Act shall be paid from appropriations to the departments and agencies concerned by administrative expenses.

Sec. 9. Any sale or other transfer of any cargo aircraft, on which a guaranty loan is outstanding, shall be subject to the provisions of this Act, any regulation issued hereunder, or any undertaking required to be entered into pursuant to this Act.

Sec. 10. The provisions of this Act shall become effective upon its enactment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, briefly, the bill would authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to guarantee the repayment of loans for the purchase only of approved modern cargo aircraft. The loan could not exceed 75 percent of the purchase price of the aircraft and would have to be repaid within 10 years. Ninety percent of the unpaid balance would be guaranteed, and repossession of the aircraft would be the sole recourse of the Government in the event of default. Loans to any one carrier could not exceed \$75 million.

Because the purpose of this proposal is not simply to permit civil carriers to acquire more aircraft, but to facilitate their acquiring a particular type of aircraft which meets military requirements, the bill provides that before the CAB can guarantee a loan the Secretary of Defense must certify that the cargo aircraft to be purchased with the proceeds of the loan is one which has design and performance characteristics which make it suitable for military use in an emergency. On the other hand, in order to insure that the aircraft is also suitable

for commercial use, the bill requires a similar certificate from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

I am happy to report to the Senate that discussions between the military and civilian aviation agencies of the government looking toward a set of mutually acceptable design characteristics are already well advanced. I am also happy to report that it is the consensus among those most competent in this field that the development of a workhorse aircraft meeting both the needs of commercial and military aviation is now perfectly feasible.

Not only would this bill insure that the aircraft to be purchased from the proceeds of a guaranteed loan is suitable, but it would insure the availability of the aircraft to the Department of Defense in the event of a military emergency. On this score the bill is clear and unequivocal. It requires that the Secretary of Defense certify to the CAB that he has in his possession an executed contract with the borrower guaranteeing first, that the aircraft will be made immediately available to the Department of Defense in the event of war, or national emergency, or whenever a military situation is determined by the Secretary of Defense to require it; and second, that during the period of the guarantee the aircraft will not be disposed of by the borrower except to another U.S. certificated air carrier.

The responsibility for guaranteeing the loan and satisfying itself of the carrier's ability to repay it within the time fixed, and of insuring that the Government will be adequately protected by the value of the aircraft in the event of default, lies with the Civil Aeronautics Board. These and other detailed provisions of the bill will, of course, be the subject of thorough hearings, and Senators will have an adequate opportunity to study the details of the proposal.

I respectfully suggest to the Senate that the time has come to deal in the realities of today's military situation. I suggest that it is inexcusable that the greatest and richest Nation in the world let itself continue in a defense posture which makes it incapable of responding to anything but all-out thermonuclear war.

I respectfully suggest to the Senate that the indispensable element in preparedness for limited war situations is mobility and that in the decade of the sixties, military mobility means military airlift.

I am convinced that a substantial part of such airlift must be provided in a strategic fleet of military aircraft. I am equally convinced that a substantial part must be provided by a strategic reserve fleet of aircraft bought and used in peacetime by commercial carriers, but whose usefulness and availability to the Military Establishment in time of emergency is assured.

I believe that this bill is the means to achieve that reserve fleet. I believe that there is no greater contribution toward an adequate defense which can be taken at this session of Congress than the passage of this legislation.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO ADD WORLD PEACE TO THE INTERNATIONAL MISSION OF THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, considering the degree and the dangers of a thermonuclear world disaster threatening the very annihilation of the human race, man must strive relentlessly in his quest for peace. No stone should be left unturned, nor should any idea which may help the cause for peace go unexamined. This fact is more apparent today than ever before. For when we look back to 1945 when the atomic bomb was used on Hiroshima, we can remember that this 20-kiloton bomb, the equivalent of 20,000 tons of TNT, caused 150,000 casualties in an area of 5 square miles. It is important to remember, however, that today, this weapon is small as compared to the largest weapons in our present stockpile. Furthermore, the dread radiation resulting from these large bombs, should ever a thermonuclear war break out, would cause irreparable disaster not only to the many thousands of people in the immediate vicinity of the explosion, but perhaps would cripple and maim future generations. In such a war, no true victor could emerge. As a result, all our strategy and efforts should be directed toward the prevention of such a war.

Now as never before, our threatened world must have peace, and now as never before, men of good will everywhere must rise to the challenge of possible annihilation and contribute their talents, the world over, for a just and lasting peace.

Mr. President, it is with this thought in mind that I am pleased to introduce a worthy bill which was introduced earlier by my distinguished colleague in the House of Representatives, Representative WILLIAM H. MEYER, of Vermont. Representative MEYER's bill, H.R. 9027, introduced September 2, 1959, would amend the charter of the American National Red Cross so as to authorize the organization "to devise and carry on measures for the prevention of war and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace."

Section 8 of the American Red Cross charter reserves to Congress the right to amend or repeal the purposes of the organization as outlined in section 3 of the charter. This bill would provide a new clause to be added at the end of section 3, which would read as follows:

Sixth. And to devise and carry on measures for the prevention of war and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

RED CROSS COULD HELP PROMOTE PEACE

Mr. President, the first three purposes of the American National Red Cross relate solely to activities in time of war, mainly to furnishing aid to the sick and wounded. The fourth purpose permits voluntary relief and communication between the people and the Armed Forces in time of peace as well as in time of war. Only the fifth clause of section 3 of the charter refers to nonmilitary matters, and it refers to nonmilitary

matters only. It permits peacetime relief of "the sufferings caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods, and other great national calamities." This clause does permit preventive work for the calamities mentioned, but it does not include any reference to war or military matters. And since the other four clauses, which refer to war and military matters, do not contain any preventive measures, the bill I am introducing is needed to permit the Red Cross to engage in measures designed to prevent war and promote peace.

Naturally, the Red Cross may be reluctant to engage in the activities permitted by this proposed legislation, but it is important to note that this bill permits—but does not direct—the officials of the Red Cross to take on this additional responsibility. Whereas the original Red Cross was essentially a remedial agency, it has continually broadened its functions, until it has reached today a point where it has never had a greater prestige. It has now become a very important educational, health-protecting organization, as well as giving substantial assistance to individuals with misfortunes of many kinds. It administers first-aid and water-safety programs, and it has home nursing courses, blood banks, rural health centers, youth organizations, and generally does a great many things which otherwise would be left undone.

Although the President of the United States is ex officio the head of the American Red Cross, and although the Red Cross cooperates closely with the Government, it is independent of the Government. The Red Cross has never been involved in politics, for humanity knows no favorites. In delicate international situations, the Red Cross has performed valuable services, and through its continued nonpolitical nature, it has continuously promoted better understanding among peoples and thereby promoted an attitude of peace.

RED CROSS HIGHLY INFLUENTIAL

Mr. President, the International Red Cross is the most influential humanitarian lay organization in the world today. It has 125 million individual members, and as good loyal citizens of the 80 or more member countries, this ever-growing membership has been playing a vital part within the political, educational, religious, and other social organizations of their own countries.

The enactment of this bill would have a powerful effect throughout the world. The fact is that the American Red Cross, acting without political involvements, could do much toward the establishment of a just and lasting peace. The amendment to the charter would be an example of the peaceful aspirations of the American people, and it might well stimulate positive action by other countries in this same direction.

Mr. President, in the past the Red Cross has been in the background ready to act in case of a war. Today, however, the Red Cross cannot prepare for any next world war, as it prepared for

World War I and II, for a single 20-megaton hydrogen bomb carries more explosive power than all the bombs put together that were dropped during the entire Second World War. Since it would be impossible for the Red Cross to adequately prepare for a nuclear war, it can only prepare for a genuine world peace.

This proposal which I am cosponsoring with Representative MEYER is not a new proposal. In 1955, some 87 members of the Harvard Class of 1900, headed by Conrad Hobbs, retired Boston merchant, sent an open letter to President Dwight D. Eisenhower advocating the creation of a commission similar to the Red Cross for the study and promotion of world peace. This open letter suggested that the President appoint a commission of perhaps 20 men and women, from the industrial and financial leaders of the United States, from the clergymen, scientists, lawyers, farmers, labor leaders, educators, statesmen, philanthropists, historians, publicists, and others preeminent in their fields, who would make an exhaustive study in quest of a durable peace.

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT SUPPORTS PROPOSAL

This open letter was followed in 1958 by a petition signed by more than 150 outstanding Americans, asking President Eisenhower to recommend a charter amendment authorizing the American National Red Cross to work for the prevention of war and for the promotion of peace. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who has become synonymous in our time with humanitarian and good deeds, is among the many prominent signers of this petition. Among the other distinguished signers are Dr. Gunnar Gundersen, past president of the American Medical Association; Sarah G. Blanding, president of Vassar College; H. J. Gezork, president of Andover-Newton Theological School; Rev. Dana McGreeley, president of the American Unitarian Association; Samuel B. Gould, president of Antioch College; Robert J. Johnson, president of Temple University; William E. Stevenson, president of Oberlin College; Wesley A. Sturgis, dean of the Yale Law School; Miller Upton, president of Beloit College; Ralph Lowell, president of the Lowell Institute of Boston; and Dr. Robert H. Ellis noted retired physician of Portland Oreg.

The petition points out that "it has become obvious that bolder steps than ever before must be taken if this universal longing for peace is to be realized." It then argues that the Red Cross has unique qualifications in this field and that with its membership of millions on both sides of the iron curtain its prestige everywhere and its dedicated leadership and unequalled record in the relief of human suffering it is the ideal organization for creating an atmosphere favorable to the establishment of peace throughout the world.

NEED IS NOW IMMEDIATE

Mr. President, now as never before men of good will everywhere must rise to the challenge of possible annihilation and contribute their talents for a durable peace. This proposal I am introducing today would amend the American Na-

tional Red Cross charter so as to authorize this great humanitarian organization to engage in activities for the prevention of war and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace. This responsibility, if taken on by the Red Cross, would admittedly be a huge task. But, it is consistent with the lofty purposes of this organization which in 1959 celebrated, throughout the world, its 100th birthday, and it would be a natural extension of the humanitarian causes already served by the agency. Although the final measures for the establishment of a durable peace must come from the governments of the world, the preliminary work, and the establishment of conditions favorable for peace must come from the people themselves. As the petition to the President of the United States of America concludes:

A long, long step forward could be taken under the leadership of the Red Cross.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill which I have just introduced be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 2775) to promote just and lasting peace by amending section 3 of the act of January 5, 1905, incorporating the American National Red Cross, so as to include among the purposes of such incorporation the prevention of war and the establishment of a just and lasting peace, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the American National Red Cross", approved January 5, 1905 (36 U.S.C., sec. 3) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Sixth. And to devise and carry on measures for the prevention of war and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the open letter to the President of the United States by members of the Harvard class of 1900, the petition to the President of the United States in 1958 to which I have just referred, together with an editorial from the Boston Herald of September 17, 1959, entitled "New Task," supporting enlargement of the Red Cross charter.

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

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the spirit of your repeated declaration that no stone should be left unturned in the quest for a durable peace, we wish respectfully to suggest that you appoint a commission of perhaps twenty men and women, preeminent in their fields, to make an exhaustive study of this vast and complex problem.

The problem, as we see it, encompasses far more than lies within the field of the Gov-

ernment, which is concerned, primary, with its military, diplomatic and political aspects. It reaches in to the fields of religion, racial prejudice, nationalism, economics, mass psychology and many other fields.

We all know that heretofore the search has been fruitless; that wars have persisted with cumulative and aggravated horrors. But we cannot admit that the futility of past attempts foreshadows failure for fresh efforts. We cannot concede that man is biologically and inherently a destructive, suicidal creature. The certainty that another major war would inflict on all mankind, on victors as well as vanquished, on civilians as well as combatants, on children and women, the most cruel calamity in history, impels us to plead for sympathetic consideration of this new approach.

We recommend that you muster the proposed commission from both the business world and the professions—industrial and financial leaders, clergymen, scientists, lawyers, farmers, labor leaders, educators, statesmen, philanthropists, historians, publicists, and others. We believe that the coordinated, matured judgments of the clearest minds might provide a program for the country at large, a program that would supplement and fortify the comprehensive efforts which the Government is making. Under your inspiring leadership, Mr. President, far more could be done in every community in the land—by study groups, debates, lectures, forums and the like; far more in schools and colleges; far more by the radio and TV and the press. Millions could be spent with profit on such endeavors.

We recommend that this Commission be asked to give serious consideration to the establishment of an agency, somewhat similar in structure to the American National Red Cross, which is a nongovernmental body yet closely associated with the Government. The Red Cross has its charter from the Congress of the United States; its Honorary President is the President of the United States; eight of its Board of Directors are appointed by the President. But, at the same time, in its operations it is autonomous; it raises its funds from the people (in its fiscal year 1953-54 well over \$85 million) and it carries on its multifarious activities largely by the work of its volunteers, in its 7,700 branches and chapters throughout the country. Furthermore, it has taken a leading part in the creation of similar institutions in 70 other countries, joined together in the League of Red Cross Societies.

Such steps would give further evidence to the world that our vast military machine must be maintained, only because we live in a world of international discord and anarchy, from which we have, so far, been unable to escape. Such an undertaking, we submit, might have many far-reaching benefits:

It might stimulate to positive action many segments of our people who today, without leadership, participate only passively in the search for peace.

It might stimulate other countries to take similar action, as has the Red Cross.

It might lead the way for a spiritual and moral resurgence throughout the country and perhaps the world.

It might, in fact, prove the catalyst which would bring all these and many other forces together in such an overwhelming demand for peace that no government would dare ignore their mandate.

To be sure, many individuals and organizations are hard at work on this problem, but no one, to our knowledge, has proposed a definite, feasible plan so far reaching and so likely to gain the cooperation and support of our countrymen.

Nearly a hundred years ago, an obscure Swiss businessman crossed the bloody battlefield of Solferino the day after the battle and, viewing the abandoned wounded, dying, and dead, vowed that such inhumanity must

no longer be endured. From that day forth, Henri Dunant, renouncing all else, began sowing the seed which became the great farflung humanitarian organization the Red Cross is today. Does not our proposal present to you, Mr. President, a similar opportunity for a great organized movement of our people, leading, under God, to a lasting peace?

Respectfully,

Members of the Harvard class of 1900: Prof. Edward L. Adams, Ann Arbor, Mich.; William H. Armstrong, Amherst, Mass.; Dr. Floyd G. Ballentine, Lewisburg, Pa.; Dr. J. Dellinger Barney, Boston, Mass.; W. Lee Beardsell, Belmont, Mass.; Dr. Conrad Bell, Waltham, Mass.; Alfred A. Benesch, Cleveland, Ohio; Carroll M. Bill, East Weymouth, Mass.; George W. Billings, Milford, Mass.; Earl D. Bond, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Henry C. Boynton, Trenton, N.J.; Dr. Thomas D. Brown, New York, N.Y.; Frank M. Buckland, West Hartford, Conn.; Freeman F. Burr, Wayne, Maine; Frank W. Buxton, Brookline, Mass.; Dunbar F. Carpenter (deceased), Winchester, Mass.; Dr. George O. Clark, Newburyport, Mass.; Albert A. Cobb, Lakeland, Fla.; John F. Cole, Somerville, Mass.; Harry F. R. Dolan, Cambridge, Mass.; Lewis M. Dougan, Middle Granville, N.Y.; Harold T. Dougherty, Westfield, Mass.; Arthur Drinkwater, Cambridge, Mass.; Walter Prichard Eaton, Sheffield, Mass.; William Edmunds, Wellesley Hills, Mass.

Dr. Robert H. Ellis, Portland, Ore.; Owen David Evans, Prospect Park, Pa.; William P. Everts, Cambridge, Mass.; Dean Floyd Field, Atlanta, Ga.; Maj. Gerald F. Furlong, Hampton, New Brunswick, Canada; Arthur M. Goodridge, Cambridge, Mass.; George W. Harrington, Providence, R.I.; Duncan G. Harris, New York, N.Y.; Edmund Heard, Mathews, Va.; A. Stedman Hills, Washington, D.C.; Conrad Hobbs, Boston, Mass.; Byam Hollings, Concord, N.H.; Llewellyn Howland, South Dartmouth, Mass.; Gardiner G. Hubbard, Barcelona, Spain; Herbert L. Hunt, Guethary, B.P., France; Frank L. Jewett, Austin, Tex.; William N. Johnson, Mattapoisett, Mass.; Walter D. Lambert, Canaan, Conn.; Aubrey E. Landry, Washington, D.C.; Frederic W. Lane, Tacoma, Wash.; Samuel W. Lewis, Lancaster, Mass.; Walter Lichtenstein, Cambridge, Mass.; Robert Livermore, Topsfield, Mass.; Edward F. Loughlin, West Concord, Mass.; Marklove Lowrey, Utica, N.Y.

Albert G. Mason, Milton, Mass.; Wilbur Morse, Long Beach, Calif.; James H. Morss, North Abington, Mass.; Walter G. Mortland, New York, N.Y.; Clifford Norton, Chatham, N.J.; John H. Page, Phoenix, Ariz.; George W. Presby, Melrose, Mass.; Dr. Richard R. Price, Hutchinson, Kans.; C. Newton Prouty, West Brookfield, Mass.; Wynn M. Rainbolt, Pine Valley, Calif.; Montgomery Reed, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. James A. Richards, Winter Park, Fla.; Avery Robinson, New Lebanon, N.Y.; Herbert G. Robinson, Aurora, N.Y.; George F. Root, Concord, Mass.; Dr. Ernest Sachs, North Haven, Conn.; Robert A. Sanborn, Brookline, Mass.; William N. Seaver, Melrose, Mass.

T. Mott Shaw, Concord, Mass.; Homer H. Smith, Gloucester, Mass.; Frank H. Stevens, Marblehead Neck, Mass.; Ralph W. Stone, Harrisburg, Pa.; William B. Swinford, Norman, Okla.; Harold Tappin, Far Hills, N.J.; Cecil H. Taylor, New Milford, Conn.; Myron E. Terbush, Utica, N.Y.; George A. Towns, Atlanta, Ga.; Fred H. Train, Orange, Mass.; Rev. Arthur L. Washburn, Siena, Italy; James Otis Watson II, Fairmont, W. Va.; Ralph H. Watson, Greenwich, Conn.; Charles F. Wellington, Boston, Mass.; Ross K. Whiton, Springfield, Vt.; George A. Whittemore, East Orange, N.J.; Frederick M. Wilder, Port Huene, Calif.; Charles R. Woods, Southboro, Mass.; Stanley Woodworth, Seattle, Wash.

A PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the undersigned, respectfully petition that, as honorary president of the American National Red Cross, you recommend to Congress an amendment of its charter, whereby it will be authorized to engage in activities for the prevention of war. The amended portion (sec. 3, par. 5) would then read as follows:

"And to continue and carry on a system of national and international relief in time of peace and apply the same in mitigating the sufferings caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods, and other great national calamities, and to devise and carry on measures for preventing the same, as well as measures for the prevention of war."

We submit this petition to you in the spirit of your inspiring address to the Peoples-to-Peoples Conference, in which you said: "The problem of permanent peace is for the people to get together; to lead governments; if necessary, to evade governments; to work out not one method but thousands" in the endeavor to establish peace throughout the world.

It has become obvious that bolder steps than ever before must be taken if this universal longing for peace is to be realized. The Red Cross has unique qualifications in this field, qualifications far superior to those of most governments and private organizations.

The Red Cross has a membership of millions on both sides of the Iron Curtain, in its 75 national societies. Its prestige is high everywhere. Under dedicated leadership its members could form the nucleus of a mighty army of workers for peace. Its unequal record in the relief of human suffering indicates clearly what it might accomplish in this new field.

It is no disparagement of other agencies to assert that they lack the organization and the facilities possessed by the Red Cross to stimulate to action millions of people who have been passive heretofore. As a war-preventive agency, the Red Cross would rivet the attention of mankind. An undertaking of this kind would be typical of the ever-widening scope of the Red Cross since it was established over a century ago to relieve the sufferings of soldiers lying wounded and uncared for on the battlefield of Solferino.

We do not venture to submit a bill of particulars for the Red Cross in this new and by far most important service it could render to mankind. That must be left to the directors of the Red Cross and to the committees which they would set up; and as you have pointed out, Mr. President, there are a thousand methods which could be employed, and the Red Cross is particularly well equipped to put many of these into operation. If the minds of millions of people could be directed to the problem of establishing peace throughout the world, is it not reasonable to expect that some far-reaching, deep-reaching programs, not yet developed and not foreseeable, might emerge, to the blessing of all mankind?

As it is not from huge armaments that freedom from war and from the fear of war will come, so it is that any expenditure of money, however large, is not only justified but necessary. Billions are spent annually for defense and, in present circumstances, these must continue. But can we not also afford to expend millions in an attempt to remove the conditions which make these heavy outlays unavoidable? We should not falter at spending vast sums in an attempt to arouse throughout the world a public opinion so strong that no government will dare to ignore the mandate.

The final formal measures for the prevention of war must come from governments, of course. The preliminary work, however, the establishment of an atmosphere for peace must come, as you have said, Mr. President,

from the people themselves. A long, long step forward could be taken under the leadership of the Red Cross.

Respectfully,

John R. Alden, Durham, N.C.; Philip R. Allen (Retired), Boston, Mass.; Samuel F. Ashelman, Jr., Brinklow, Md.; Professor Thomas A. Bailey, Stanford, Calif.; Sam W. Banks, M.D., Chicago, Ill.; John Bardeen, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.; James M. Baty, M.D., Brookline, Mass.; Rev. David Nelson Beach, New Haven, Conn.; Conrad Berens, M.D., New York, N.Y.; Walter L. Biering, M.D., Des Moines, Iowa; Gordon B. Bliderback, president, Investment Trust, Champaign, Ill.; Roy A. Billington, Evanston, Ill.; Sarah G. Blanding, president, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.; Lyman J. Briggs, physicist, Washington, D.C.; Donaldson Brown, Port Deposit, Md.; Donald L. Burdick, M.D., New York, N.Y.; Allan M. Butler, M.D., Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Mass.; Frank W. Buxton (Retired), Brookline, Mass.

Charles C. Cabot, LL.D., Boston, Mass.; Rev. Raymond Calkins, Cambridge, Mass.; Thomas P. Callaghan, Boston, Mass.; Oliver C. Carmichael, New York, N.Y.; Hamilton M. Chase, Old Greenwich, Conn.; John Chipman, Winchester, Mass.; Dr. Albert Buckner Coe, Boston, Mass.; Rabbi Beryl D. Cohen, Brookline, Mass.; Donald Comer, Sr., manufacturing, Birmingham, Ala.; Kathleen Costello, editor, New York, N.Y.; Dr. Merie Curti, Madison, Wis.; Arthur C. Curtis, M.D., Ann Arbor, Mich.; Francis W. Davis, Belmont, Mass.; Dr. Lewis Dexter, Boston, Mass.; Dr. Theodore A. Distler, Washington, D.C.; Prof. Stuart Carter Dodd, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.; Stanley E. Dorst, M.D., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. Truman Douglass, D.D., New York, N.Y.

Robert D. Dripps, M.D., Philadelphia, Pa.; Marriner S. Eccles, banker, Salt Lake City, Utah; B. M. Edwards, banker, Columbia, S.C.; Robert H. Ellis, M.D., Portland, Ore.; Gertrude Ely, Bryn Mawr, Pa.; Kenneth C. Farnsworth, M.D., Weston, Mass.; Mrs. Donald F. Fenn, Boston, Mass.; Dr. Frederick A. Figi, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.; Frances Fenner, Afton, N.Y.; Paul C. French, executive director, CARE, New York, N.Y.; Douglas Van Arden Frost, Abbott Laboratories, North Chicago, Ill.; Frothingham Channing, M.D., Boston, Mass.; Lawrence H. Fuchs, Weston, Mass.; Dr. Claude M. Fuess, Brookline, Mass.; Leonard T. Furlow, M.D., St. Louis, Mo.; Dr. James L. Gamble, Brookline, Mass.; Herbert J. Gezork, president Andover-Newton Theological School, Newton, Mass.; Prof. Clinton S. Golden, Solesbury, Pa.; Thomas R. Goethals, M.D., Brookline, Mass.; Rev. James Gilkey, D.D., Weekapaug, R.I.; Francis G. Goodale, LL.D., Boston, Mass.; Rev. Dana McLean Greeley, D.D., Boston, Mass.; William C. Greene, Center Sandwich, N.H.; Samuel B. Gould, president, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio; Samuel R. Guard, editor, Louisville, Ky.; Luther H. Gulick, city administrator, New York, N.Y.; Trygve Gunderson, M.D., Boston, Mass.; Rev. Basil Hall, Cambridge, Mass.; Mrs. Lorraine W. Hall, Cambridge, Mass.; Oscar Hammerstein II, Doylestown, Pa.; Rev. S. Ralph Harlow, Northampton, Mass.; Oscar W. Hausserman, LL.D., Boston, Mass.; Alexander B. Hawes, LL.D., Washington, D.C.; Edmund Heard, Matthews, Va.; Marion H. Hedges, Washington, D.C.; Andrew H. Hepburn, architect, Concord, Mass.; Ogden B. Hewitt, New York, N.Y.; Conrad Hobbs (retired), Boston, Mass.; George C. Holt, Woodstock, Conn.; Mrs. Robert Homans, Boston, Mass.; Mark A. DeWolfe Howe, author, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Kenneth Howes, Framingham Center, Mass.; Mrs. Llewellyn Howland, Weston, Mass.; Palmer Hutcheson, Sr., LL.D., Houston, Tex.; Maynard Hutchinson, investment counselor, Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. T. J. Jemison, Baton Rouge, La.; Robert J. Johnson, president, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.; Jacob

J. Kaplan, LL.D., Boston, Mass.; Burton S. Kaufman, Brighton, Mass.; Nicholas Kelley, LL.D., New York, N.Y.; Henry P. Kendall, manufacturer, Boston, Mass.; Edward A. Kitlowski M.D., Baltimore, Md.

Leon J. Kowal, LL.D., Boston, Mass.; David B. Lackman, scientist, Hamilton, Mont.; Dr. John H. Lamb, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Rev. John Howard Lathrop, Berkeley, Calif.; Dr. Charles N. Leach Newfane, Vt.; Wyland L. Leadbetter, M.D., Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Mass.; John C. Leonard, M.D., West Hartford, Conn.; Samuel R. Levering, orchardist, Ararat, Va.; Alfred B. Lewis, Mount Vernon, N.Y.; Clarence C. Little, biologist, Trenton, Maine; Ralph Lowell, banker, Boston, Mass.; J. Franklin McElwain (deceased), manufacturer, Boston, Mass.; Thomas H. Mahoney, LL.D., Boston, Mass.; Julius A. Migel, Charlestown, R.I.; Prof. Perry Miller, Cambridge, Mass.; Lewis Mumford, author, Amenia, N.Y.; Charlton Ogburn, LL.D., New York, N.Y.; A. H. Parker, Jr., banker, Boston, Mass.; Miles Pennybacker, manufacturer, Norwalk, Conn.; Rev. Palfrey Perkins, D.D., Boston, Mass.; Ernest C. Pervier, East Templeton, Mass.; Clarence E. Pickett, Philadelphia, Pa.; Walter B. Pillsbury, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Mrs. Abraham Pinanski, Boston, Mass.

Perry T. Rathbone, director, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass.; B. F. Reed, Drift, Ky.; Frank H. Reichel, Villanova, Pa.; Robert H. Reno, LL.D., Concord, N.H.; Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Hyde Park, N.Y.; John H. Rubel, Hughes Aircraft Co., Culver City, Calif.; Harold Russell, AMVETS, Natick, Mass.; Mrs. William Scheft, Newton, Mass.; R. Minturn Sedgwick, investment counselor, Boston, Mass.; Harry H. Semmes, Washington, D.C.; Hans Christian Sonne, financier, New York, N.Y.; C. Maxwell Stanley, manufacturer, Muscatine, Iowa; William E. Stevenson, president, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio; Dr. Wesley A. Sturgis, dean, Law School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.; William Warren Sweet, Dallas, Tex.; Norris P. Swett, M.D., Hartford, Conn.; Dr. Jan H. Tillisch, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.; Edward C. Tolman, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Miller Upton, president, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.; George H. Utter, Westerly, R.I.; H. Gerry Voorhis, executive director, Co-op League of U.S.A., Chicago, Ill.; Harold E. Wagoner, architect, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Earl Walker, M.D., Baltimore, Md.; James P. Warburg, author and lecturer, New York, N.Y.; Dr. Alfred H. Washburn, Denver, Colo.; William Van N. Washburn, Boston, Mass.; Prof. Arthur P. Whitaker, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; James White, investment counselor, Boston, Mass.; James Chapin, artist, Glen Gardner, N.J.; Gunnar Gundersen, M.D., LaCrosse, Wis.; Rensselaer W. Lee, historian, Princeton, N.J.

Paul Dudley White, M.D., Boston, Mass.; Prof. George H. Williams, Arlington, Mass.; Stillman P. Williams, Lexington, Mass.; Mrs. George B. Wislocki, M.D., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.; Herman Wouk, author, New York, N.Y.; Arnold S. Zander, AFL-CIO, Madison, Wis.; Frederick J. Libby, executive secretary, National Council Prevention War, Washington, D.C.; Mark Van Doren, author, Falls Village, Conn.; Rabbi Dudley Weinberg, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Standish Weston, Boston, Mass.

[From the Boston Herald, Sept. 17, 1959]

NEW TASK

Is peace attainable?

Intellectually, most of us say "No." But in our hearts we answer differently. For us and ours, we say, it must be attainable. There must be a way.

A few people—too few—try to reconcile these points of view. They keep looking for some intellectually satisfactory expression of the universal peace urge. They haven't

found it yet, but they deserve our support. They are at least headed where we all want to go.

Representative WILLIAM H. MEYER, of Vermont, has just introduced a bill in Congress to amend the charter of the American National Red Cross authorizing the organization "to devise and carry on measures for the prevention of war and for the establishment of a just and lasting peace."

It doesn't sound like a very imposing step. And the Red Cross itself isn't enthusiastic about it. But the legislation is permissive and it just might lead to something valuable. Locally, Mr. Conrad Hobbs and fellow members of the Harvard Class of 1900 have been advocating the same step on the ground that the Red Cross is the private international organization best equipped to take the assignment on.

Why not? What harm could come of it?

Dr. Jean S. Pictet recently observed: "The Red Cross is the only great idea in whose name men have never slain; it remains one of the few reasons for not losing hope; its work during many years offers the certainty and proof that love is stronger than death."

The task is a huge one, but it is consistent with the lofty purposes of the Red Cross. It is a natural extension of the humanitarian causes already served by the agency. Perhaps in this, its centennial year, it should assume a new responsibility.

The Meyer bill at least represents a forward step. Peace will certainly be no less attainable if it is passed. We join the call for an enlargement of the Red Cross charter.

RAYMOND THOMASON, JR.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize Raymond Thomason and his wife, Pauline, to adopt a third Korean orphan. Oddly enough, under the law only two such orphans can be brought into the country by them. The third orphan has already been adopted, and is in an orphanage in Korea; and they wish to bring this orphan into the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2776) for the relief of Raymond Thomason, Jr., introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GEORGE E. WILLIAMS AND WILLIAM L. JOHNSON

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill in the nature of a claim against the Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2777) for the relief of George E. Williams and William L. Johnson, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

Mr. HENNING. Mr. President, for some time the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has been considering freedom-of-information legislation in connection with its study of

the extent to which constitutional rights are being infringed by undue secrecy in government.

In the 85th Congress the subcommittee considered two freedom-of-information bills which I introduced: Senate bill 921, the language of which became Public Law 85-619; and Senate bill 2148. The subcommittee received and published the views of executive departments and agencies on S. 2148, but because of the press of other business was unable finally to consider and report the legislation before the Congress expired.

In the present 86th Congress, I introduced Senate bill 186, a bill identical to Senate bill 2148. Although this bill was referred to the newly established Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee continued its work on this proposed legislation with the agreement of the chairman of the other subcommittee, who is also a member of this subcommittee, and during the first session of the 86th Congress held hearings on the proposal.

A majority of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has voted to report a clean bill which follows the lines of the proposed legislation above, referred to, with strengthening and clarifying amendments shown to be desirable by the subcommittee's study and hearings.

I now introduce this clean bill for the subcommittee, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2780) to amend section 3 of the act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238) to clarify and protect the right of the public to information, introduced by Mr. HENNING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act of June 11, 1946 (60 Stat. 238) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. In order to provide adequate and effective information for the public—

"(a) ORGANIZATION RULES AND FORMS.—Every agency shall separately state and promptly file for publication in the Federal Register and for codification in the Code of Federal Regulations: (1) Descriptions of its central and field organization, including statements of the general course and method by which its functions are channeled and determined, delegations by the agency of final authority, and the established places at which, and the methods whereby, the public may obtain information or make submittals or requests; (2) all procedural rules; (3) all other rules; (4) descriptions of all forms available for public use and instructions relating thereto, including a statement of where and how such forms and instructions may be obtained; and (5) every amendment, revision, and revocation of the foregoing.

"(b) ALTERNATIVE METHODS.—An agency may, pursuant to a published rule, use an alternative method of publishing the in-

formation specified in subsection (a) or of communicating it to all interested persons, when to do so will achieve economy and expedite dissemination of information to the public. No information published by such alternative method shall be relied upon or cited against any person who has not received prior, reasonable, and actual notice thereof.

"(c) **ORDERS AND OPINIONS.**—Every agency shall promptly publish its orders and opinions or make them available to the public in accordance with published rule stating where and how they may be obtained, examined, or copied.

"(d) **PUBLIC RECORDS.**—Every agency shall promptly make available to the public, in accordance with a published rule stating where and how they may be obtained, examined, or copied, all records, files, papers and documents submitted to and received by the agency, including but not limited to applications, petitions, pleadings, requests, claims, communications, reports or other papers, and all records and actions by the agency thereon, except as the agency by published rule finds that withholding is permitted by subsection (f) hereof. Every individual vote and official act of an agency shall be entered of record and made available to the public.

"(e) **EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PUBLISH.**—No rule, order, opinion or public record, shall be relied upon or cited by any agency against any person unless it has been duly published or made available to the public in accordance with this section. No person shall in any manner be bound by or required to resort to any organization or procedure not so published.

"(f) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The provisions of this section shall not require disclosure of subject matter which is (1) specifically exempt from disclosure by statute, (2) required to be kept secret in the protection of the national security, (3) submitted in confidence pursuant to statute or published rule, or (4) of such a nature that disclosure would be a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; however, nothing in this section authorizes withholding of information or limiting availability of records to the public except as specifically stated in this subsection."

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have five bills to introduce on the subject of civil rights. As I understand the rule, I am allowed 3 minutes on each bill. If the Chair will indulge me, I shall try to wrap them up together in less than 10 minutes.

I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a group of five civil rights bills, including three measures to further protect and secure voting rights for all citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. The bills are keyed to the major recommendation of the President's Civil Rights Commission that a system of Federal voting registrars be established in areas where there is valid proof of denial of the right to vote for discriminatory reasons. Another bill would make lynching a Federal crime where it deprives an individual of his right to a fair trial, subjecting violators to a fine, imprisonment, or both. The remaining proposal introduced today would permit the U.S. Attorney General to take part in those civil cases where an individual charges that he is being deprived of one of his constitutional rights.

I am introducing these measures as bills, even though the ideas have previously been proposed by me as amendments to other bills. I think the time has come to give them bill status, and to provide for their reference to appropriate committees. I believe that the question of the committees to which the various bills are referred will have a considerable influence upon what happens to them.

In his state of the Union message, President Eisenhower commended to the Congress for action this session the civil rights legislation sent down by the administration almost 12 months ago and the recommendations of the Civil Rights Commission made last September. He called upon us to signal the world, by our action on this legislation, that "our Government is striving for equality under law for all our people."

To me, his words—particularly as they stressed the historic importance of every citizen being able to exercise his constitutional right to vote—hammered home the point that civil rights is the number one domestic issue of 1960 before this Congress.

In 1957 the Senate debated the Civil Rights Act directly when it came over from the House of Representatives. The test of the Senate rules made at that time demonstrated that this was an effective and expeditious procedure particularly adapted to the situation we face of long delayed committee action in the Senate on civil rights matters.

A drive is being made now in the House of Representatives to bring up the civil rights bill for consideration by the discharge petition route. I am urging all the members of my party in the House to favorably consider the advisability of signing this discharge petition, notwithstanding a normal and understandable reluctance to sign discharge petitions.

In the first place, I believe this reluctance to join in a discharge petition is far less applicable as a principle to the minority, though we all know that in this instance Speaker SAM RAYBURN has practically invited signing of this discharge petition by the majority. Also, it is clear that Republican signatures are essential in view of the large number of Members from the South on the Democratic side. Hence, the discharge petition may well prove to be the crucial test of whether a Member has sought effectively to get essential civil rights legislation enacted in the House of Representatives at this session.

If the past events of 1957 are prologue to the civil rights debate scheduled to start on the Senate floor no later than February 15, according to the assurances of the majority and minority leadership, there will be spirited debate on both sides. For, as we must all realize, the climactic fight is at hand and the Senate Chamber will be the critical battleground. Here it will be determined whether a meaningful civil rights legislation is to pass the Congress in 1960, or whether complacency, and campaign fever will prevail to postpone effective and desperately needed civil rights legislation.

While civil rights is our number one domestic issue, it is also supercharged

with international implications affecting our world position. Premier Khrushchev would probably much prefer to sit down at the Summit Conference this coming May with President Eisenhower in an atmosphere in which the U.S. Congress had turned deaf ears on the report of the Federal Civil Rights Commission and the words of the President's message urging civil rights action. As leader of the Free World, the U.S. in the person of President Eisenhower will be the spokesman at the summit for a free world which is more than two-thirds non-white. It is of vital importance to us that these populations educate themselves to the priceless heritage of ruling themselves while making economic progress in freedom. If the voting conditions which exist today in at least 32 counties in 5 of our own States, according to the Civil Rights Commission, were to prevail in these predominantly non-white areas of the free world, then only about 5 percent out of a population of more than 1 billion people would be able to vote in their own national elections. The total vote in the countries of the non-Communist world whose total population is already six times that in the U.S. would not even add up to the number of U.S. voters in the 1952 or 1956 national campaigns. No society can hope to remain strong enough to sustain democratic institutions for very long when only 1 out of every 20 citizens does or can go to the polls to vote for candidates pledged to support them. Instead of allowing discriminatory practices to limit the size of our electorate, this is the beginning of a new decade when in the interest of our own national strength and survival, every citizen must have maximum opportunity to develop his talents, through education, to train for and work at the kind of job for which he is best suited by his skills, and to back the candidate of his choice at the polls, regardless of race, creed or color.

To quote the President again from his message last Thursday:

The right to vote has been one of the strongest pillars of a free society * * * our first duty is to protect this right against all encroachment.

The same day those words were spoken by the President, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, Senator HENNING, announced that later this month or early in February, public hearings will be held on proposals which would authorize the President to appoint temporary officials to register qualified U.S. citizens to vote in Federal elections. I hope that when they are held, testimony will be heard pertinent to three voting measures I am introducing today, which were originally submitted late last session as amendments to other civil rights bills previously introduced.

One of these measures provides for the retention of voting records in Federal elections for at least a 5-year period as recommended by the Civil Rights Commission. It reported that the unavailability of such records seriously hampers efforts to investigate alleged denials of

voting rights. A second bill in the voting rights series implements another of the Commission's recommendations that the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 should be amended to safeguard an individual's right to vote in cases where boards of registrars and other public officials attempt to deny voting rights by failing to fulfill their legal duties to meet at specified times for the purpose of registering voters and by other means without legal justification.

This is the much discussed proposal to have Federal voting registrars.

In that connection, there are two small straws in the wind, in the form of events which took place since the report of the Civil Rights Commission was issued. I do not elaborate upon them as being great points, but they are small straws in the wind.

Since the Civil Rights Commission recommended a system of Federal voting registrars in its report to the President and the Congress this September, new developments have taken place in Southern States which affect voting rights. One new law, the Commission reports, gives the local registrars in Alabama statutory authority to devote some of the time which was formerly allocated for the purpose of registering qualified voters for other time-consuming clerical duties. It could be used to facilitate the closing of registrars' offices in the face of Negroes who might wish to register. Also, the Civil Rights Commission reports that in Harris County, Tex., the county tax assessor-collector has started to use a long-standing practice of registrars in Louisiana—it requires those paying poll taxes to swear to their identity and place of residence, and upon challenge to produce witnesses whose qualifications are to be determined solely by the local registrars.

The third measure which I am introducing deals with the subject covered by part 3 of the 1957 bill. I think it meets a great many of the objections which have been made to part 3, and at the same time retains the essential proposition that where the individual is facing the machinery of an entire State, an entire county, or an entire community, and is being deprived of civil rights, he is entitled to have the majesty and authority of the United States asserted, in a case which has widespread implications of civil rights being denied to many people.

Since 1960 is a national election year, it is a paramount importance that every eligible citizen be encouraged to register and vote. We would stand an excellent chance of having a really high record vote this year if a bill such as the Federal Elections Voting Rights Act which I am introducing today is enacted during this session of Congress. It would be of major importance in those areas where a disproportionately small number of nonwhites have registered in the past. Henceforth when nine or more complainants about denial of voting rights in one locality during the same year are received and substantiated, the President would be authorized to appoint a local Federal official to act as a voting regis-

trar for as long as discriminatory practices jeopardized individual voting rights in that locality.

The permissive intervention legislation I am also submitting today is designed to do away with one of the most serious weaknesses of the 1957 Civil Rights Act as it was finally approved by the Senate. By permitting the Attorney General to enter into civil cases brought by persons charging denial of equal protection of the law, individuals of the most modest circumstances will not be prevented from appealing directly to our Federal courts when they believe, for example, that they are being deprived of the right to vote, to ride on desegregated public transportation and, of course, to attend a desegregated public school.

The final bill to make lynching a Federal crime is one of several proposals put forward since the lynching of a Negro, Mack Charles Parker, in Poplarville, Miss., where he was in jail awaiting trial on a charge of criminal assault, at a time when we had a right to hope that no similar lynching would take place in any part of our country.

At present, a Federal grand jury has been called to review the case following the failure of a local jury to bring an indictment, to call a single witness or even review the extensive FBI report of its investigation into the lynching. The first report that a gang of masked men dragged Parker out of his cell and killed him was a severe shock to all of us, regardless of what section of the country we live in. Although lynchings in the United States have reportedly been few and far between in recent years, the need for a strong Federal antilynch law is more urgent than ever for one such tragedy of mob violence leaves the kind of open wound on our national conscience which can take years to heal. We cannot tolerate the angry scars with which discrimination on account of race, religion, color, or national origin can disfigure a society. The enactment of meaningful civil rights legislation at this session of Congress will enormously strengthen us in our determination to work together to win freedom at home and abroad.

Finally, it must not be underemphasized that what we do about civil rights in our country is critically important, in connection with what takes place in the rest of the world. We are going into a summit conference in May with Khrushchev. In that connection, we shall be the spokesmen at the summit for a free world which is more than two-thirds nonwhite. If voting took place in other countries where we are seeking self-determination of peoples as it does among many of the nonwhite populations of our Southern States, there would be less than 5 percent of the population of 1 billion people able to vote in their own national elections.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills I am introducing today may be printed in the body of the RECORD following my statement.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, were received, read twice by their titles, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"S. 2782. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act to further protect the right to vote in Federal elections.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971) as amended by section 301 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 637) is further amended by inserting at the end of subsection (b) the following:

"Nor shall any person or group of persons, under color of State law, arbitrarily and without legal justification or cause, act, or being under duty to act, fail to act, in such manner as to deprive or threaten to deprive any individual or group of individuals of the opportunity to register, vote and have that vote counted for any candidate for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, Delegate or Commissioner for the territories or possessions, at any general, special or primary election held solely or in part for the purpose of selecting or electing any such candidate."

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"S. 2783. A bill to protect the right to vote in Federal elections against denial on account of race, religion, color, or national origin, by providing for the appointment of Federal registrars by the President.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, this Act may be cited as the 'Federal Elections Voting Rights Act'.

"Sec. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

"(a) The term 'Federal election' means any general or special election held solely or partially for the purpose of electing any individual to, or any primary election held solely or partially for the purpose of selecting any individual as a candidate or nominee for, any of the following Federal offices:

"(1) The Office of President or Vice President of the United States;

"(2) The office of elector for President or Vice President of the United States;

"(3) The office of Member of the United States Senate;

"(4) The office of Member of the House of Representatives of the United States; or

"(5) The office of Delegate or Commissioner of any territory or possession of the United States representing such territory or possession in the House of Representatives of the United States.

"(b) The term 'registration district' means a county, parish, district, or other political subdivision of a State which, under State law, is authorized to provide for the registration or qualification of voters, living within such county, parish, district, or other political subdivision.

"Sec. 3. Any individual who—

"(1) believes that he is qualified under the laws of the State in which he lives, to vote in Federal elections held in such States;

"(2) within one year before the date of filing a petition under this section, has been denied the right to register to vote, to vote, or to have his vote counted in such elections after having attempted to do so in the manner and at the time and place provided for by the laws of such State; and

"(3) believes that the sole reason he was denied such right was because of his race, religion, color, or national origin,

may file a sworn statement with the President of the United States alleging that he has been denied the right to register to vote, to vote, or to have his vote counted in such

elections solely because of his race, religion, color, or national origin, and petitioning the President to appoint a temporary Federal registrar for his registration district. Such sworn statement shall be filed in such form and manner as the President may by regulations prescribe and shall contain a detailed account of the facts upon which the allegations contained therein are based.

"Sec. 4. (a) Whenever there shall, within a period of not more than one year, have been filed with the President not less than nine petitions under section 3 by individuals from the same registration district, the President shall refer such petitions to the Commission on Civil Rights (hereinafter referred to as the 'Commission').

"(b) The Commission shall conduct an investigation with respect to any such petitions referred to it for the purposes of determining whether or not the allegations contained in such petitions are true. If the Commission, on the basis of its investigation of such allegations, determines that citizens of the United States living in the registration district of the petitioners are being deprived of the right to register to vote, to vote, or to have their vote counted in Federal elections solely because of their race, religion, color, or national origin, the Commission shall certify that fact to the President. The Commission shall also certify to the President and to any temporary Federal registrar who may be appointed for such district the names of any petitioner living in such district whom the Commission believes to be entitled, under the laws of the State in which such district is situated to vote in Federal elections held in such State.

"(c) Upon receipt of a certification from the Commission under subsection (b) with respect to any registration district, the President shall appoint, from among Federal officers or employees living in or near such district, an individual to serve as a temporary Federal registrar for such district. Any such Federal registrar shall serve until such time as the President determines that citizens living within the registration district for which such registrar was appointed are no longer being denied the right to register to vote, to vote, or to have their vote counted, in Federal elections solely because of their race, religion, color, or national origin.

"Sec. 5. The Federal registrar for any registration district shall accept vote registration applications from all individuals living within such district who allege that they are being denied the right to register to vote in such district solely because of their race, religion, color, or national origin. All applicants whom the Federal registrar finds to have the qualifications requisite, under the laws of the State wherein such district is so situated, for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of such State shall be registered by him as being qualified to vote in Federal elections held in such district, and the Federal registrar shall certify to the appropriate election officials of such State the names of all applicants registered by him and the fact that such applicants have been so registered.

"Sec. 6. Any individual who is registered under this Act by a Federal registrar to vote in Federal elections shall have the right to cast his vote and have such vote counted in any Federal election, and any election official who willfully denies him such right shall be fined not more than \$300 and imprisoned for not longer than six months, or both."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"S. 2784. A bill to protect against deprivation of the right to a fair trial by lynching and for other purposes.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 1509. Deprivation of right to a fair trial.

"(a) The Congress finds that willful interference with, or obstruction of any process or proceeding of a State or Territory or political subdivision thereof, for the apprehension, confinement, trial, and punishment of any person charged with a crime or held for investigation or as a material witness through acts or threats of force by persons not acting under lawful authority constitutes a deprivation of rights, privileges, and immunities guaranteed to such person by the Constitution of the United States, including such person's right not to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. The Congress further finds that such interference or obstruction threatens the administration of justice of the several States and thereby imperils their republican form of government which, under the Constitution of the United States, it is the obligation of the United States to guarantee.

"(b) Whenever two or more persons shall knowingly in concert for the purpose of depriving any person, either directly or indirectly, of his right to a fair trial or his right not to be deprived of life, liberty, or property except by due process of law, willfully interfere with or obstruct any process or proceeding of a State or Territory or political subdivision thereof, for the apprehension, confinement, trial, and punishment of any person charged with a crime or held for investigation or as a material witness through acts or threats of force, then anyone who knowingly instigates, incites, organizes, aids, abets, or participates in such action shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided, however,* That where such action results in death or maiming or other serious physical or mental injury, constituting a felony under applicable State, Territorial, or similar law, any such person shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

"(c) Any officer or employee of the United States or any State, Territory, or subdivision thereof, who shall have been charged with the duty, or shall have possessed authority in his official capacity, to prevent actions punishable under subsection (b) of this section and who shall have refused or knowingly failed to make diligent efforts to prevent them; or who, having custody of any person or persons shall have neglected, refused, or knowingly failed to make diligent efforts to protect such person or persons against the actions made punishable under subsection (b) of this section shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"S. 2785. A bill to provide for the retention, preservation, and production of Federal election records, papers, and ballots.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, every officer of election shall retain and preserve, for a period of five years from the date of any general, special, or primary election at which candidates for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate or Member of the House of Representatives are voted for, all records and papers which come into his possession relating to any application, registration, payment of poll tax or other act requisite to voting in such election, except that, when required by law, such records and papers may be delivered to another officer

of election and except that if a State designates a custodian to retain and preserve these records and papers at a specified place, then such records and papers may be deposited with such custodian, and the duty to retain and preserve any record or paper so deposited shall devolve upon such custodian: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained herein shall require the retention and preservation of ballots for a period of more than 18 months from the date of any such election. Any officer of election or custodian who willfully fails to comply with this section shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"Sec. 2. Any person, whether or not an officer of election or custodian, who willfully steals, destroys, conceals, mutilates, or alters any record or paper required by section 1 to be retained and preserved shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"Sec. 3. Any record or paper required by section 1 to be retained and preserved shall, upon demand in writing by the Attorney General or his representative directed to the person having custody, possession, or control of such record or paper, be made available for inspection, reproduction, and copying by the Attorney General or his representative.

"Sec. 4. Any record or paper demanded pursuant to section 3 shall be produced for inspection, reproduction, and copying at the principal office of the person upon whom such demand is made or at any other location mutually agreed upon by such person and the Attorney General or his representative.

"Sec. 5. Unless otherwise ordered by a court of the United States, neither the Attorney General nor any employee of the Department of Justice, nor any other representative of the Attorney General shall disclose any record or paper produced pursuant to this Act, or any reproduction or copy, except as is necessary in the performance of his official duties, including presentation of any case or proceeding before any court or grand jury.

"Sec. 6. The United States district court for the district in which a demand is made pursuant to section 3 or in which a record or paper so demanded is located, shall have jurisdiction by appropriate process to compel the production of such record or paper.

"Sec. 7. As used in this Act, the term 'officer of election' means any person who, under color of any Federal, State or local law, statute, ordinance, regulation, authority, custom, or usage, performs or is authorized to perform any function, duty or task in connection with any application, registration, payment of poll tax, or other act requisite to voting in any general, special, or primary election at which candidates for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate or Member of the House of Representatives are voted for."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"S. 2786. A bill to provide for permissive intervention by the United States in cases involving the denial of equal protection of the laws.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, chapter 161 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by inserting a new section immediately following section 2403 as follows:

"§ 2403A. Intervention by United States: Loss or threat of loss of equal protection of the laws.

"In any action, suit, or proceeding in a court of the United States to which the United States or any agency, officer, or employee thereof is not a party, wherein any person alleges on oath or affirmation that

he is subject to or threatened with loss of his rights under the Constitution of the United States to equal protection of the laws by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin, the court shall certify such fact to the Attorney General, and shall permit the United States to intervene for presentation of evidence, if evidence is otherwise admissible in the case, and for argument on the question of whether such person is subject to or threatened with loss of his right to equal protection of the laws and the relief to be granted. The United States shall, subject to the applicable provisions of law, have all the rights of a party and be subject to all liabilities of a party as to court costs to the extent necessary for proper presentation of the facts and law relating to the questions of whether such person is subject to or threatened with loss of his right to equal protection of the laws and the relief granted by the court.

"Sec. 2. Such chapter is further amended by inserting in the analysis at the beginning of such chapter, immediately following section 2403, the following:

"2403A. Intervention by United States: Loss or threat of loss of equal protection of the laws."

LIABILITY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN CONNECTION WITH ACCIDENTS INCIDENT TO CERTAIN AIR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to assume the States' liability for activities of members of the National Guard engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site which is under the control of the Army or the Air Force, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill itself, together with an explanation thereof, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2787) to assume the States' liability for activities of members of the National Guard engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site which is under the control of the Army or the Air Force and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING) was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2671 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"As used in this chapter and sections 1346(b) and 2401(b) of this title, the term—
"Federal agency" includes the executive departments and independent establishments of the United States and corporations primarily acting as instrumentalities or agencies of the United States, but does not include any contractor with the United States.

"Employees of the government" includes officers or employees of any Federal agency; members of the military or naval forces of the United States and, while engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site that is under the control of the Army or the Air Force, members of the National Guard, as

defined in section 101(2) of title 32; and persons acting on behalf of a Federal agency in an official capacity, temporarily or permanently in the service of the United States whether with or without compensation.

"Acting within the scope of his office or employment", in the case of a member of the military or naval forces of the United States or, while engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site that is under the control of the Army or the Air Force, a member of the National Guard, as defined in section 101(2) of title 32, means acting in line of duty."

Sec. 2. Section 2733(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) For the purposes of this section—

(1) a member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey or of the Public Health Service who is serving with the Navy or the Marine Corps, or a member of the National Guard who is engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site that is under the control of the Army or the Air Force, shall be treated as if he were a member of the armed force concerned; and

(2) a person employed by the National Guard under section 709 of title 32 who is engaged in air defense activities on a tactical site that is under the control of the Army or the Air Force, shall be treated as if he were a civilian officer or employee of the military department concerned.

Sec. 3. Section 710 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(g) Notwithstanding subsections (b) and (c), each State and Territory, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia is relieved of accountability and pecuniary liability for military property issued by the United States to its National Guard for air defense activities on tactical sites that are under the control of the Army or the Air Force, except for loss or destruction of, or damage to, that property attributable to an officer, employee, or agent of that State or Territory, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, or the District of Columbia, whichever is concerned, who is not engaged in those activities."

The statement submitted by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

Amendment of Federal Tort Claims Act to extend liability of the Federal Government to cover accidents incident to air defense activities of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard, thus relieving the States of liability

The New York Army National Guard, and the National Guard of other States, has been requested by the Department of the Army to man missile bases on tactical sites. They will replace units of the Regular Army on such bases and they will be employed in the tactical defense of the United States against enemy air or missile attack.

The Department of the Army has presented to New York State a form of agreement for the manning of such missile sites. The form of the agreement is generally unobjectionable and the defense of the United States against enemy attack is a mission which the New York Army National Guard is qualified and glad to perform and is within the scope of its duties as the first line Reserve component of the U.S. Army. However, the manning of a missile base could give rise to an untold amount of liability in the event of the accidental explosion of a missile on such a site, such as happened in New Jersey several years ago.

In order to avoid the assumption of such liability, New York State has suggested that the appropriate Federal authorities include in the proposed contract a form of indemnity agreement whereby the Federal Government would indemnify and hold harmless the State of New York and its Army

National Guard units and personnel with respect to any liability which may arise out of acts or incidents in connection with the manning of such a missile base. While the Federal Government admits in its contract that the Army National Guard units so employed will be an integral part of the U.S. Army, the Federal Government has refused to execute the indemnity agreement requested.

Since the defense of the United States against enemy attack is a Federal mission and the Army has accepted the Army National Guard as an integral part of the Armed Forces of the United States while so employed, it is felt that any liability resulting from an act or incident in connection with the operation of such a missile base may be ultimately determined to be a Federal responsibility. However, in the absence of a statute, such liability would probably be determined only after a long period of litigation. In order to avoid the necessity for litigation to determine financial responsibility for damages which may result from an accident or incident in connection with the operation of a missile base, legislation to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act is urgently necessary. A bill to accomplish this purpose is submitted herewith.

It will be noted that the provisions of the proposed bill include the potential liability of the State, not only with respect to the manning of missile bases by Army National Guard units, but also the employment of units of the Air National Guard in the tactical defense of the United States against enemy attack. Air National Guard units, for many years, have performed a Federal mission in that they have had jet planes constantly on a 24-hour alert to intercept any enemy air attack. Since these planes are armed with air-to-air rockets and missiles, the arguments set forth above with respect to the possible exposure of New York State to liability for the accidental explosion of a ground missile are equally applicable to the air-to-air mission of the Air National Guard.

THE MARIGOLD AS OUR NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the present occupant of the Chair, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] will be interested in at least the opening paragraph of my remarks.

I believe it is in Ashland, Ohio, that there is a marker to Johnny "Appleseed" Chapman. He was one of the dedicated persons who in the early days in the Middle West, gathered and scattered apple seeds. While others were foraging with guns and fighting with Indians, Johnny "Appleseed" Chapman went about with a canoe load of apple seed, if he could contrive it. He left a very rich heritage; and I suppose the genetic offspring of some of those apple trees are still extant in the great Buckeye State, together with the wholesome fruit they provide.

It seems to me that in every generation there are such people. They are unselfish and devoted, even as Johnny Appleseed was.

I consider David Burpee, of Philadelphia, a member of a long line of very distinguished seedsmen, as a person of that kind. Interestingly enough, he is a cousin of the late Luther Burbank. So, much of his life has been devoted to techniques which make the great complex of sun and soil and moisture produce more abundantly, and even im-

prove upon nature, and, particularly, produce flowers of great beauty and perfection. In so doing a vast improvement on natural processes has been brought about.

For two generations, David Burpee has experimented with flowers, in the hope of producing one that is of American origin, and so hardy, so lovely, so easy to grow, so diffused, so long-blooming, that it might properly claim a place as the national floral emblem of this country.

At long last, he felt that the marigold, a flower first discovered by the explorer Cortez in Mexico, the seeds of which Cortez took back to the Old World, was the flower that should rightly become our national floral emblem.

I emphasize the term "our national floral emblem" because, of course, a floral emblem must be in the form of a flower. In the West they have been presenting the cause for the corn tassel as the national flower. I am not enough of a plant geneticist to know exactly whether it is a flower. The experts disagree about that.

In any event, this flower from the New World, which was taken to the Old World, and improved upon, was in those days used for church functions and was called Mary's gold. Subsequently it became the marigold.

I can say I have taken real delight in producing a few prize marigolds.

Over the years, David Burpee has worked tirelessly to improve the marigold and develop greater ranges of color, larger flowers, greater hardiness, and foliage with a more agreeable scent, so that it might with the least effort be produced in every part of the United States and be rightly considered as our national floral emblem.

I am not insensible to the fact that selection of a flower as our national floral emblem has been a matter of high controversy. The rose, the carnation, the corn tassel, the aster, and others have all been advanced for consideration.

I believe that an outstanding seedsman and florist who has devoted incalculable hours and untold sums of money to research in this field is fully entitled to have the product of a lifetime of effort properly considered.

To that end, I assured him, when he was in my office, that, by request, I would be glad to introduce a measure to designate the marigold as our national flower.

We have a national bird—the American eagle. We have a national emblem—the Stars and Stripes. Sometime Congress may wish to designate a national floral emblem; and by joint resolution, I formalize, for consideration, the marigold, at the request of a great seedsman and a great florist, David Burpee. I introduce the joint resolution for appropriate reference.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 146) designating the American marigold (*Tagetes erecta*) as the national floral emblem of the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN (by request), was re-

ceived, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, last Thursday, January 7, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] introduced Senate bill 2764 to extend the Library Services Act. I wish to announce my cosponsorship of that bill at this time, and to commend the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for his work on this proposal.

It is my understanding that the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and who was the author of the original Library Services Act, is planning to submit a more comprehensive bill on this subject in the near future. I will fully support that measure when he finds it appropriate to bring it to the attention of the Senate, because it is clear that this basic library program is of tremendous educational and recreational benefit to millions of Americans in all walks of life.

Action will be required soon, since the present act is scheduled to expire on June 30, 1961.

This bill fills an important gap in our educational system. It brings to the rural areas the books and other library services that are so vital to self-improvement beyond the basic educational requirement. It helps extend to each of our citizens, no matter how remote from the urban centers of communication, the tools for being an intelligent and well-informed citizen.

Mr. President, because of Texas vast geographical area and substantial rural population, the Library Services Act constitutes an important adjunct to our basic educational program. It is a program which thousands of Texans have come to use and to appreciate.

Mr. Witt B. Harwell, the distinguished State librarian of Texas, informs me that nearly 50 Texas counties are now being served through this program and that officials of several dozen other counties have given notice that their citizens also want and need this excellent library service. In its first year, the Library Services Act resulted in the formation of several local permanent libraries in Texas and otherwise greatly increased the circulation of existing libraries. I am grateful for the opportunity to add my name to cosponsorship of this fine bill.

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

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Address on economic trends, labor and management conferences, and the steel strike, delivered by Secretary of Labor

James P. Mitchell before the Economic Club of Detroit on January 11, 1960.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

Address entitled "Citizenship Versus the Power Groups," delivered by George Romney, president of American Motors Corp., before the Commonwealth Club of California on September 4, 1959.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Editorial entitled "Another Tom Dooley," from the Milwaukee (Oreg.) Review of November 19, 1959, commenting on the Criss award of the Mutual of Omaha Insurance Co., to Dr. Thomas A. Dooley.

PUBLICATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION CONCERNING EMPLOYEES AND EXPENDITURES OF SENATE COMMITTEES; TERMS OF SENATE PAGES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has two resolutions which he would like to have considered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I wish to call attention to two Senate housekeeping resolutions, so to speak, which require immediate attention.

One of them is Calendar No. 1051, Senate Resolution 213, which provides for repealing the resolution requiring the semiannual publication in the **CONGRESSIONAL RECORD** of certain information concerning employees and expenditures of Senate committees. The resolution which would be repealed was adopted by the Senate in 1949. The same information is now furnished 4 times a year in a separate publication, and then annually in the report of the Secretary of the Senate.

The other resolution relates to six Senate pages who have attained age 17; and it is the desire of all concerned that they be allowed to finish their school term.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1051, Senate Resolution 213.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I should like to ask about the resolutions.

Mr. HAYDEN. The first resolution provides for repealing the resolution which requires publication in the **CONGRESSIONAL RECORD** of certain information in regard to employees and expenditures of Senate committees.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. I wish to inquire about the resolution which relates to pages.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a very simple resolution, and I shall read it:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 14, 81st Congress, agreed to January 13, 1949, is amended to read as follows:

"That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than 14 years of age and who has not completed the 8th grade of school, or is 17 years of age or older, except that those enrolled in the Senate page school who attain age 17 may serve as pages through the session of the Senate in which the page-school year terminates."

There are at the present time, three Republican pages and three Democratic pages who are, or are about to become, 17 years of age. The resolution adopted in 1949 provides that when pages attain

age of 17 they must be removed. This resolution allows them to continue in the service of the Senate to the end of the page-school year.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to know whether they can be appointed at age 17 and can continue in the service until they are 21.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the rule will remain that they cannot serve after they are 17—except if they are already in the service of the Senate, they may finish out the school term. The page school is in fact a high school and those who graduate from it are qualified to pass college entrance examinations.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They can only finish the school term; that is all?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1051, Senate Resolution 213?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 213) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That S. Res. 123, Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 27, 1947, is hereby repealed.

TERMS OF SENATE PAGES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask for the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 1052, Senate Resolution 218, which relates to the terms of Senate pages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 218) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 14, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to January 13, 1949, is amended to read as follows:

"That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than fourteen years of age and who has not completed the eighth grade of school, or is seventeen years of age or older, except that those enrolled in the Senate page school who attain age seventeen may serve as pages through the session of the Senate in which the page-school year terminates."

EDUCATION IN RUSSIA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Forrest Rozzell, who is executive Secretary of the Arkansas Education Association. Recently he visited Russia; and he has written a very enlightening article about education as it is carried on in Russia.

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

[From the Journal of Arkansas Education]
NOTES FROM RUSSIA
(By Forrest Rozzell)

When the AEA Board decided to send me on a trip to the Soviet Union, I immediately began asking myself some questions. Why am I going? What purposes do I have for making the trip? What purposes should I have? Of what value can my experiences be to the cause of education in Arkansas? What

shall I look for? How shall I interpret what I observe? Do I have blind spots, stereotype concepts, or prejudices that need to guard against to help me in being more objective? How important are the details of school organization, administration, finance, curriculum, methods, etc.? As I thought about these and other questions I concluded that three assumptions and their logical implications would provide the guidelines for making the most out of my experiences.

The first assumption was: It is impossible to understand or appraise the educational system of any human society except within the total context of that society; therefore, I would try to observe and learn as much as possible about the political, economic, social, and moral aspects and principles of the Soviet system as a prerequisite to understanding and interpreting what I observed about the Russian educational system.

The second assumption was: Details are relatively unimportant in contrast to the philosophy, purposes, and objectives that motivate and give direction to the actions that are taking place in the schools of the Soviet Union. The important point is not where the Soviet system is now, but rather where it is going. Even though our opportunities to observe political, economic, social, and educational conditions would be limited, we should be able to see, hear, and read enough to draw some reasonably valid conclusions about the great and sweeping changes that have been and are taking place in the Soviet Union.

The third assumption was: Great truths, great ideals, are many times stated in sentences so simple that we lose sight of their greatness. As a result of constant repetition we are prone to permit the utterance to replace the realization. As a consequence a person cannot fully understand and appreciate the culture of which he is a part unless he studies it in relation to or in contrast with other cultures; therefore, out of the trip I hoped to secure sufficient rational knowledge about the Russian culture—including its educational system—to establish points of reference for deeper insights and understanding of American education and its role in the preservation and extension of our great ideas, ideals, and institutions.

This report on my observations and their interpretation should be evaluated in the light of the foregoing assumptions and their logical implications.

RATIONAL KNOWLEDGE, FREEDOM'S FOUNDATION

One of our great ideals is freedom of thought, speech, and conscience—the right to think as one wills and to speak as one thinks. This right can be negated as effectively by a paralyzing fear of criticism as by a paralyzing fear of the Soviet's secret police. It would be easy to make a factually accurate report of my observations and conclusions that would be entirely consistent with the stereotyped concepts of Russia that prevail too extensively in the United States today, but such a report would be unbalanced; and rational knowledge, accurate and balanced, is the only secure foundation for freedom. Security from criticism is neither a Judeo-Christian nor democratic ideal, and no individual or nation that seeks it has ever made, in the seeking, a contribution to the elimination of tyranny of any kind. Unmistakably the basic issue in East Germany, Poland, and the Soviet Union is tyranny—a monolithic, doctrinaire system engulfing every form of human thought and behavior.

What I write is based upon my convictions, now more firmly entrenched than ever, that the basic ideas and ideals of our heritage can compete successfully with any and all others in winning the minds and loyalties of peoples everywhere, provided we do not encrust our ideals with an American ortho-

doxy that stifles their creative force and universal appeal, and provided also that we do not encrust those of other cultures with stereotyped concepts that deny their humanistic appeal.

The big job facing us is to convince ourselves as well as the uncommitted peoples of the world that what free men have to offer in terms of the good life is far superior to that which the U.S.S.R. is pushing. Ignorance of their system can be fatal; ignorance of our own as an example of what free men can accomplish can be equally fatal. In this struggle I am convinced that the Soviet Union cannot win; but we can lose through our failure, because of irrational fears, to counteract Communist doctrines through the intelligent use of factual and authentic knowledge about its aims and methods, its strengths and weaknesses.

POLICY OF SELECTIVE IGNORANCE

I have never been able to understand why anyone in America should object to teaching about communism in our schools and colleges. I have felt that the failure to do so constituted a policy of selective ignorance which is completely incompatible with the philosophy, objectives, and processes of education in a free society. I am now firmly convinced that the failure to teach about the aims and methods, the strengths and weaknesses of communism, both the theoretical kind and the Russian variety, is sheer folly. There is no reason to fear Communist doctrines and methods when there is a free intercourse of ideas, ideals, and processes. I have no fear of the Communist brainwashing our children and youth. On the contrary, I wish every youth and adult in America could visit the Soviet Union and see first hand communism in operation, and no special guardians of our faith would need to accompany them.

By visiting Berlin, both the eastern and western sectors, and Warsaw before visiting the Soviet Union, we had an opportunity to see first hand the Soviet variety of imperial communism at work. The overriding purpose behind every thought, every plan, and every act in East Germany and Poland, the same as in the Soviet Union, is to instill and inculcate Communist doctrines, to develop the Communist state, and to secure its acceptance by the people—all in accordance with the teachings of "Father Lenin." This forthright identification of purpose in East Germany and Poland with the Soviet Union was a surprise to me. While I knew that the influence and power of the Soviet Union were behind what was happening in the satellite countries, I thought that there would be some effort to be subtle about it.

PROPAGANDA AS A TECHNIQUE

Wherever the Communist dictators have the power, symbol-manipulation as a means of changing ideas, attitudes, and actions along predetermined lines—propaganda—is one of its major techniques. But we too use propaganda as a means of mass persuasion; however, the weakness of the appeal of ours may result from our failure to recognize that propaganda always has a setting within a social, cultural framework, without which neither its psychological nor its cultural features can be understood. We do not have a corner, either on slogans and clichés or on ideals and platitudes, but one significant difference is that those of the Soviet appeal to a future hope, while ours appeal to the preservation of the status quo. Reality is always at a disadvantage when competing with hope.

The Communist leaders have usurped for their evil purposes words that throughout history have symbolized the hopes and aspirations of mankind: peace, democracy, liberation, love, happiness, freedom, education. Through suggestion and related psychological techniques these symbols are manipulated within the social-cultural framework

of the people to whom they are directed. On the contrary, our manipulation of these symbols is almost exclusively confined to our own social-cultural framework. As a consequence, we do not make ourselves understood by the uncommitted peoples of the world.

BATTLE FOR LOYALTIES OF YOUTH

One fact that was demonstrated more clearly in East Germany than in Poland or the Soviet Union is that the great battle of our time is for the minds and loyalties of children and youth. In East Germany the Russian dictators know they cannot win the minds and loyalties of the adults of the present but they believe that they can win the children and youth. Thoughtful Germans fear they can also—"Hitler did, why can't they?"

One German, a major in the last war, definitely anti-Communist, told us that his nephew, 9 years old, who lives in East Germany, visited him a few weeks before. His parents are anti-Communists, but he believes that Khrushchev is the greatest leader and defender of the working people in the world today and is doing more to promote world peace than anyone else.

The situation poses the question: Can a free system that is dedicated to the enhancement of universal, individual freedom, dignity, and welfare compete successfully with a totalitarian system that subordinates the individual to the state? The Russians, the people as well as their leaders, obviously believe that it cannot. They think that time is on their side.

CONTRASTS IN EAST AND WEST BERLIN

We were all amazed by the contrasts between the Eastern and Western sectors of Berlin. The impact of the contrasts cannot be fully described. There are, of course, significant material differences such as the vast amount of rebuilding in the West and the shoddiness of that in the East; the difference in the amount and quality of consumer goods and the number of cars; the presence of so many policemen and soldiers in old Nazi uniforms in the East; but the most impressive contrasts were in the number, the attitude, and the looks of the people.

To me, the most discouraging experience of our whole trip was in East Berlin. What is happening in East Germany today convinced me that tyranny over the mind of man cannot be eliminated by force. Force merely replaces one form of tyranny with another form. What we saw in East Germany in 1959 had a sickening similarity to that which prevailed in the 1930's under the Nazi. The basic motives of the leaders, the motivations of the people, the methods employed, and the symbol-manipulations are the same; only "the devil" has been changed. The "American capitalist" has been substituted for the "Jew." Here communism is revealed for what it is—a technique of power, a system of state organization based upon political rather than economic determinism, tyranny.

The vast majority of East Germans are most anxious to keep West Berlin free. It is a symbol of hope for reunification; it provides an opportunity for concrete comparisons between life in the free zone and life in the Soviet zone; it provides a source for merchandise needed by individuals; and it provides a final refuge, if life becomes intolerable in the Eastern sector. Many East Germans do fear, however, that the West Germans are becoming so prosperous that they will forget the 17 million Germans living in the East.

THE YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS

One East Berlin woman to whom we talked has a 15-year-old son whom she wishes to have religious training. While such training is not directly prohibited, the boy cannot become a member of the "Youth Organiza-

tions" if he takes it. The future outlook for any youth outside the "Organizations" is not very bright. East German youth are very much confused and frustrated by the conflicting information they receive from East and West Berliners by word of mouth, by the few newspapers smuggled in from the West, and by radio. There is no way the East German leaders can jam the West Berlin radios without doing the same for their own.

On October 7, the day we left Berlin, in East Germany they were celebrating the 10th anniversary of the founding of the German Democratic Republic. There was a huge crowd in East Berlin, but there should have been; all workers were compelled to attend. In each establishment meetings were held to inform the employees as to what was expected of them. On the day of the celebration all employees met at their place of work and marched as a group in the parade. When asked what would happen to anyone who failed to do so, we were told that he would be called in and asked to explain. If the explanation was not acceptable he would suffer inconveniences.

During our brief visit to East Berlin the party line was evident everywhere. Even then party line was a term of derision to me—something parroted by the people without conviction. After 2 days in Warsaw, the term began to have a different meaning; after 21 days in the Soviet Union, I no longer think of it as a term of derision—while it may be something parroted by the people, they do it with conviction.

POLAND AND THE U.S.S.R.

Warsaw was a city approximately 90 percent destroyed during the war, with a death list of 800,000 people; yet it has done a remarkable job of building, rebuilding, and restoring. The largest building in the city, the one that can be seen from almost every point in the city, is a gift from the U.S.S.R., the Palace of Culture. This, of course, is dedicated to "peace and friendship."

What has happened and is happening in East Germany and Poland was made possible by the ravages of war. This is a point we should never forget. In both places, after the war, the most compelling objective was the satisfaction of the basic needs of the people: clothing, food, shelter. Only the governments, and they were naturally under Soviet influence, had the power and resources to act, and they did. This they did in accordance with Communist doctrines. Because of different circumstances, more obvious force was required in East Germany than in Poland; consequently less has been done in East Berlin than in Warsaw in satisfying the basic needs of the people, particularly the housing needs.

Poland, like East Germany, is a Communist state; the kind that is far different from those operations in the United States that are characterized as communistic in the clichés of some individuals and groups. In Poland, as in East Germany and the Soviet Union, the Communist Party, a self-perpetuating hierarchy, is the Government. Practically everything is under its control: it builds and assigns apartments; it provides jobs, sets hours, wages, and prices; it determines national and foreign policy; it determines and supervises the implementation of educational policy.

PSYCHOLOGICAL MOTIVATIONS

In bringing about the sociopolitical and economic changes that are now and have been taking place in Poland, it appeared to me that the Government is capitalizing on at least four psychological motivations of the people: (1) Their abhorrence of war. The Poles want peace at almost any price so long as their basic needs are fairly well satisfied. Peace is constantly emphasized. (2) Their hatred of the Nazis. With just cause the Poles hate the Nazis. They are constantly reminded of this by plaques and monuments

which perpetuate the crimes and atrocities of the Nazis. This is quite a contrast with the Palace of Culture, which reminds them of the friendship of the Soviets. (3) Their national cultural pride. At first I wondered why a utilitarian state would spend so much time, effort, and money in the restoration of the old town, the palaces that house the university, the art collection, and others. But all of these promote pride in their own national culture. At the same time the former insignificant role and low status of the people is preserved. The restoration is designed to say to them "Yes, we can take pride in our cultural heritage; we can preserve the good in it, but at the same time we can all become a more significant part of it, and we and our children can benefit more from it." (4) Their religious heritage. Approximately 90 percent of all Poles are members of the Roman Catholic Church. In contrast to Berlin, both East and West, practically all the churches of Warsaw have been restored, some by the state. As a result of an agreement between the Vatican and the Polish Government, a definite effort is being made by the Communists to make accommodations to the religious traditions of the people. This effort can lead to unrealistic interpretations in spite of evident seeds of conflict.

Because of these unifying influences, which do not prevail in East Germany except a desire for peace, there is not so much evidence of the police state in Poland as in East Germany. Nevertheless, the tyranny over the mind is just as great, perhaps greater, because there is no counter force such as West Berlin. This does not mean that the Poles are anti-American; they are not. But they are pro-U.S.S.R. And why shouldn't they be with Russia breathing down their necks?

HUMAN FREEDOM FOR HUMAN WELFARE

The U.S.S.R. is a vast and complex land of many nationalities, languages, and cultures characterized by contrasts, commitment, change, control, and confidence. Since 1917, under the rigidly planned and systematically executed control of the Communist dictatorship (always with little or no regard for human freedom and many times by methods which violate every principle of human justice) the Soviet Union has been moving steadfastly toward the perfection of its cultural revolution.

In many respects the results are remarkable. While objective analyses by competent authorities have tended to prove that the same or greater results in terms of human welfare could have been achieved without sacrificing human freedom, the controls of the party over thoughts and communications of all kinds are such that this proposition is now and will likely remain as long as the party is in power, an issue about which the vast majority of the citizens of the Soviet Union are completely oblivious. To them the party is due the credit; not one denies that the party is the government, in fact, they boast of it.

The people have been convinced that it is necessary to sacrifice human freedom in order to secure human welfare. They have no opportunity to learn about the "great American proposition" that human welfare and human freedom are mutually attainable goals, or about the extent to which we have achieved both in the United States. They are not aware of the fact that the "robber baron capitalism" of the 19th century no longer prevails in the United States. Their understanding of the American "system" is a projection of that which the Communist Manifesto was directed against—an understanding based upon almost complete ignorance of the facts of the 20th century. On the other hand, they are aware of the changes that have taken place in the Soviet Union which are making for a better material life for millions of people and holding

out the same promise for millions of others. The extent of the benefits in comparison with the propaganda of "the party" is, to say the least, debatable. While it is evident that a facade has been constructed to impress visitors and natives as well, the fact remains that the progress being made combined with the systematically planned and propagandized promises for the future and the rigid controls that are exercised are such as to retain for the foreseeable future the commitment of the people to the system.

EDUCATION AS KEY FACTOR

The rise of the Soviet Union to its present position of power would have been impossible without the phenomenal development of its educational system. This program of organized education, planned and executed by the Communist Party, is a key factor in understanding what is happening in the U.S.S.R. The leaders have marshaled all the forces of organized education, including many more than the schools and institutions of higher learning, to achieve their purposes and advance toward their ever-expanding goals. It is axiomatic that every human society perpetuates itself through organized and unorganized process of education and learning. If at any time these processes are interrupted for any extended period, the group loses its heritage and perishes. But in the Soviet Union the heritage-preserving role of education has been relegated to secondary status, and no role is left for unorganized learning and education. Education is an instrument of national policy, not to maintain the status quo, except for the leadership of the party, but to change the course of history and the nature of man.

Education in the Soviet Union is extremely broad in concept and in practice. It embraces the entire cultural apparatus, especially those agencies dealing with the conscious induction of ideas, opinions, and values in the minds of both young and old. It includes the schools from the nursery to the graduate schools of the university. For all practical purposes, it includes newspapers and periodicals, books and libraries, as well as radio and television. It includes all agencies of amusement and entertainment, and especially the political and cultural aspects of all organizations, particularly those for children and youth.

INFORMAL EDUCATION

The Soviet Union has an extraordinary program of highly organized after-school activities which are conducted in a more relaxed informal fashion than the school program. This supplementary program which makes learning fun may be an important key to the success of the Russian schools. Participants in these after-school activities are divided into three groups: the Octoberists include children ages 7-10; the Pioneers include children ages 10-15; and the Komsomols (the young Communist League) include young people ages 15-26.

The primary group in this movement is the Pioneers, a mass Communist organization for children who have pledged themselves to be true to the teachings of Lenin. The work of the Pioneers is closely coordinated with the school program: "The basic unit of Pioneer work is the Pioneer detachment in the school and cannot be separated from the work of the teacher." The work in the Pioneer palaces and houses is carried out by full-time employees who have the same qualifications as those who teach in the schools.

We found a school program in a state of flux in response to the law adopted by the Supreme Soviet in December 1958. To understand the Soviet school system, it is necessary to take into consideration the role of the State Planning Commission. This commission determines the immediate and long-range economic goals for the Union and then

determines the resources, material and human, needed to reach these goals. The school program is then structured to produce the predetermined manpower needs.

CHANGING EMPHASIS IN EDUCATION

While the Communists seem never to tire of boasting about their schools, it is now apparent that the system in operation prior to 1958 had not produced the desired results in terms of Communist doctrines and goals. They have found that a 10-year school program devoted to a single academic curriculum is incompatible with the goals of universal education, even in a totalitarian state. In addition to the academic emphasis, which until recently has been almost exclusive in the Soviet general education schools, a drastically new emphasis is now being introduced. In a statement which preceded the enactment of the new school law Premier Khrushchev was quoted in Pravda as follows: "The most important and fundamental defect of our secondary and higher schools is their isolation from life. Our 10-year school at the present time has not solved the problem of preparing young people for life, but prepares them only to enter higher establishments."

"Preparation for life" appears to mean chiefly acquiring the ability and will to do skilled manual labor. Therefore, the 10-year school that has had the acclaim of some critics of American education is being replaced by a compulsory 8-year school which includes labor skills in its program. Students who have finished the 8-year program may (1) continue for 3 more years in a secondary school in which 2 days of the 6-day week must be spent on the job at production training, or (2) he may go to work full-time and continue his schooling for 3 more years in the evening, or (3) he may discontinue school altogether.

Perhaps the single greatest difficulty Americans face in trying to understand the Russian school system is their upgrading of educational nomenclature. They have no vocational training; they have production training. They have no general science; they have various levels of physics, chemistry, and biology; and auto mechanics is applied physics. There are no such subjects as the social sciences or economics in the sense that we use and teach them. Driver training is not a frill, it is production training.

EDUCATION FOR MANPOWER NEEDS

The educational programs of the universities and colleges are also structured to meet the manpower needs as determined by the State Planning Commission. The number of students who are permitted to study engineering, law, medicine, the various sciences, teaching, and so forth, is determined by present and future manpower needs. College students are members of a select group whose future is filled with hope for status in the new order. Competition is keen both to get in and stay in. Tuition is free and students are paid a stipend while attending. If their work is superior, they are given bonuses in the form of added stipends and even paid vacations. However, only about one out of every four students who qualify for admission to college is admitted.

When he finishes college, the graduate is assigned a job, and a resident of Moscow may be assigned a job in Siberia. While he is not required to take the assigned job, if he does not, he will find it almost impossible to secure another.

INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

The business of organized education is regarded far more seriously in the U.S.S.R. than in the United States. The highest authorities pay close and constant attention to it, and they pay more than attention, since approximately 10 percent of the total national income is devoted to education. The

top political leaders of the Soviet Union are dedicated to and use organized universal education as the single most important instrument of national policy. At the same time, however, they rely on professional educators to plan, organize, and administer the educational programs with a minimum of nonprofessional interference, so long as Communist doctrines are not violated.

There is a dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. today in the most imaginative and ruthlessly calculated sense of the term. Undergirded by an abiding faith in the magic of science, it is relentlessly driving to perfect its cultural revolution. There are those who contend that the Communist seizure of power has turned out to be a revolution of method rather than substance. While this judgment may prove to be correct in the course of history, I do not agree as of the present, and it is not so believed by a vast majority of the Russians today.

RUSSIAN SYSTEM AND ETHICAL VALUES

The greatest mistake we could make, I am convinced, is to attempt to write off or seal off the Russian system as solely atheist materialism which will somehow fall of its own shortcomings or from the wrath of God. Even though "religion" has been rejected as a motivation, and "religious institutions," as a source of power competing for the minds and loyalties of the people, are not permitted; even though religious doctrines and faith are being supplanted by Communist doctrines and faith through a systematic plan of indoctrination; in spite of this the Russian system is neither amoral nor lacking in a social ethic.

In terms of human welfare one must admit that in moral and ethical values the current regime has more to offer the people than that against which the revolution, in its inception, was directed. This is evident in the contrasts. One example we saw was a sixth century monastery, high upon a mountain, inaccessible to the people, and a power dam at the foot of the mountain presided over by a huge statue of Lenin. This is only a single example of the contrasts, many of them deliberately contrived, that the dictatorship is using as visual aids to secure acceptance of and commitment to Communist doctrines.

To understand the Russian system one should consider factual observations, even when they might be distasteful. We have, unfortunately I believe, developed a mindset wherein there can be no acceptable morality, ethics, or motivations which do not bear the imprimatur of Judeo-Christian traditions and institutions. I hold no brief for any phase of the tyranny that prevails in the U.S.S.R. today. On the contrary, I detest all of it. I hope, however, that my detestation will not lead me to the uncritical rejection of knowledge essential to logical thinking and sound judgments. Only the devotees of a monolithic system contend that their system is wholly good and that all others are wholly bad. Regardless of extenuating qualifications, this is tyranny. The fact is, no system is entirely good and no system is entirely bad.

POSITIVE MOTIVATIONS

While Communist doctrines as they are taught and observed in the Soviet Union recognize neither the essential dignity of the individual nor the desirability of individual liberty, which to me are all important they do appeal to many compelling, positive motivations. Among these are: peace, friendship, concern for mankind everywhere (the brotherhood of man); a sense of national destiny reminding me of that which the ancient Hebrews felt for Israel; ethical humanism with an emphasis upon human welfare (the good life for all); equality of all as well as equality of opportunity and consideration (all men are created equal); man is master of his own fate; educational de-

velopment as the key to national as well as individual success; appreciation for the cultural arts and skills (this does not apply to the creative arts); forthright recognition of the pragmatic necessity for planning for desired results in a complex world; science holds the key to the supernatural. Before explaining these away on the grounds that in terms of Communist purposes and methods they have entirely different meanings from the ones we attach to them, we should try to understand their appeal to the peoples of the Soviet Union in their current and past environment. When we do, we may understand better what is happening and what needs to be done to offset their appeal.

HOW TO COUNTERACT SOVIET POWER

As I see it, the basic issue posed by the Soviet system—and organized education is a key factor in this system—must be divided into two phases: the immediate and the long-range. The immediate phase is to counteract Soviet power and its potential use for world domination. This is a task for the experts, but not exclusively the military experts who, in our society, are morally obligated to a policy of defensiveness; and defensiveness in the affairs of men in the contemporary world is not a sufficient reason for action. The present potential for human devastation possessed by both the Soviet Union and the United States raises serious doubts as to whether or not military approaches and solutions even in a cold war can possibly be beneficial to either of these nations or the world. The military approach, wherever it is used, inevitably resolves the growing conflict between the private person and the social group—the conflict between the moral individual and the military state—in favor of the latter. We desperately need the counsel of scientists of all kinds, especially the social and political scientists; we need the counsel of economic, educational, and religious experts as well. As a Nation we need help in discovering the practical and moral reasons for being responsible for others—reasons which are more than the parroting of the pat prescriptions of the church and the military establishment—rational, logical, dynamic reasons which emerge in response to the urge of the responsible reforms our liberal arts and religious training call for. We need help in learning the current realities of human conditions throughout the world. We need help in realizing that the ultimate human goal is moral and social solidarity in the family of man in a spirit of responsible freedom rather than in a spirit of monolithic, doctrinaire orthodoxy. There can be no free society without free men, and in a free society the people must ever assume the responsibility for the decisions of their government and the consequences of those decisions.

Whatever is done to counteract Soviet power must take into consideration the long-range phase of the basic issue. This is not one of "isms"; it is not communism versus Americanism; it is not communism versus capitalism; it is not atheism versus Protestantism or Catholicism. Freedom is not the byproduct of any system or "ism." Fundamentally, the long-range phase of the issue is intellectual freedom; the right to believe, to think, to speak, to act, to seek for, to plan, and to use all methods and resources for the universal development of the creative capacities and powers of the mind of man and the free use of these powers to develop, refine, and redevelop those processes and systems—economic, political, social, religious, and educational—that will best meet the needs of man in a changing environment—the fulfillment of the spirit of man. No monolithic, doctrinaire system of indoctrination can do this, regardless of its avowed objectives.

UNIVERSAL FREE EDUCATION, MAN'S HOPE

I am now more convinced than ever that the ultimate hope of man lies in universal free education that is wide enough in range and scope, thorough enough in content, and challenging enough in quality to provide for each individual, within the limits of his capacities, enough knowledge—accurate and balanced—to give a sufficient understanding of the nature of man and his environment that will make it possible to develop and use all necessary and democratic means of controlling man's nature and environment for the good of mankind. But this is becoming an increasingly difficult task because we are living in a rapidly changing, highly complex, and frustratingly confusing world.

The Russian people believe profoundly in the truth of their way of life, and they are supremely confident that their methods provide the only sure means for the final fulfillment of the hopes and aspirations of mankind everywhere. Do we possess as profound a belief in our way of life? Do we have as great confidence in our methods? Are we still dedicated to a proposition? Are the truths of the American dream still self-evident? Are we still aspiring, striving, fighting for what we believe—for the fulfillment of our proud ethical, moral, and political ideals and traditions?

DEDICATION TO DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES

What is desperately needed in America today is a revival of faith in and dedication to freedom, the self-evident truths of the American dream, the absolute necessity of free, universal education, and faith in the dedication to democratic processes. With such a revival of faith and dedication, organized education in the United States would become a key instrument of national policy—policy which is consistent with our ideals, traditions, and purposes. In implementing this policy the Congress of the United States would enact legislation which would allocate to the several States financial support on the basis of an objective formula, leaving the discretion to no Federal officer or agency to determine the amount, and then permitting the already established educational officers and agencies in the several States to administer these Federal funds for educational purposes under State laws and constitutions. We can have a national policy which recognizes the importance of the role of organized public education by granting substantial financial support to it and at the same time do no violence to the principle of State and local autonomy in the control and management of our public schools. To contend otherwise is to deny the effectiveness and reliability of democratic processes.

The best example of the lack of faith in democratic ideals and processes in America today is provided by the persistent refusal of the Congress and the administration to do anything of significance to bolster our lagging, inadequate public education program and to offer as the excuse for their failure the cliché "Federal support means Federal control." By our actions we proclaim to the uncommitted peoples of the world that the people of the United States, the bastion of the free world, can do nothing through their Federal Government to support free public education because in the process the Government of the United States will become a freedom-destroying monster. This is not true. The Congress of the United States can provide substantial financial support for our public schools in a way that will not do violence to any cherished principles at any time that it sees fit to do so. It will do so only when the people of the United States insist upon it.

NO INSURMOUNTABLE PROBLEMS

In the United States, what we decide to do we can do. There are no insurmountable

problems. The Russian people believe that no sacrifice is too great so long as it helps in the furtherance of Communist doctrines and objectives. They have the energy, the drive, the dedication; in contrast, we seem to be drifting in aimless confusion, lacking in courage and a sense of responsibility. We have ample resources—material, human, ideological—to win the struggle for the minds and the loyalties of the uncommitted peoples of the world. What is lacking is the desire, the impulse, the will to act. We need a program, and public education is an essential aspect of any such program, that will tap the vigor and will challenge the faith and imagination of people everywhere, but the beginning must be with the people of the United States. We must accept as the basis of responsible action the implications of our own faith. In the United States, with sufficient concern and conviction on the part of the people, policy and action by the Government will automatically follow, if not immediately, then assuredly after an election or two.

OUR MISSILE AND SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a series of four articles which recently appeared in the Washington Post. They concern our missile and space program. The articles are extremely well written, and, I think, contain information which should be of profound interest to all Members of this body, as well as the public. I believe it is well worth while to bring them together in a consecutive arrangement that is convenient for all to read.

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 3, 1960]
SPACE LAG A PUZZLER WITH ATLASES STANDING BY

(By Edward Gamarekian)

A babel of charges, denials, explanations, and counter charges is expected in Congress when the Senate and House Space Committees get down to a reexamination of this country's space program in the next few weeks.

There is little tangible evidence that the gap between the United States and the Soviet Union is being closed, and some now think that it is actually being widened.

More than 2 years have passed since the launching of the first sputniks and the United States has yet to match what the Soviets did at the very start. Sputnik II, launched November 3, 1957, weighed 1,120 pounds. The largest payloads the United States has placed in orbit are the 440-pound capsules of the military satellite project Discoverer.

The Russians have launched three lunar probes, weighing, respectively, 797, 858, and 614 pounds. Each completed its apparently intended mission, the first passing close to the moon and going into orbit around the sun; the second hitting the moon close to the center and the third going behind the moon to take photographs of the far side.

The largest lunar probe launched by the United States weighed only 39 pounds and it went only one-third of the way to the moon. A 13.4-pound unit was sent past the moon into orbit around the sun.

From the timetable announced by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, this country will not attempt to match the Soviet accomplishments before late 1960. Why is it taking so long?

During the past 2 years the American people were told that this country was behind because it did not have the large rockets needed to send large payloads into space. This reason no longer holds. The 360,000-pound-thrust Atlas missile has been ready for several months.

Although it doesn't have quite as much thrust as the Russian rockets, it can loft comparable and even larger payloads with the right upper stages. Why isn't it being fed into the space program at a rapid enough rate to achieve some notable success? Because the administration says it cannot afford it.

Only two Atlases were scheduled for use in the space program in 1959. One was fired in a reentry test of the Mercury satellite which is expected to carry a man into orbit around the earth in 1961. The other was scheduled for a moon shot but blew up in a preliminary test.

AN UNSPOKEN REPLY

When the Russians made a lunar flight with the camera-carrying Lunik III in the first week of last October, a third Atlas was suddenly allocated for another try at the moon. The 130-pound instrumented payload that was supposed to go into orbit around the moon—something not yet done by anyone—barely got off the ground before electronic trouble led to failure.

The NASA says it doesn't know whether it will use one of its small 1960 supply of Atlases for another attempt. It has only six for its entire 1960 program. Four will be used for suborbital tests with the Mercury capsule. The other two will be used for a new rocket vehicle capable of launching payloads slightly larger than those already sent up by the Soviets.

If the new vehicle succeeds, American prestige may be restored by late 1960—provided the Soviets haven't done something more spectacular in the meantime. If there are some mishaps, our prestige will have to wait until more vehicles are available in 1961.

That is what has some people in this country disturbed. The reliability of a launching vehicle is always low. A million things can go wrong, and there may be several failures before all the bugs are worked out.

To place the responsibility for national prestige on a new, untried vehicle and then gamble on success with only two units is reckless, they argue.

Those who feel that drooping American prestige demands the launching of sizable satellites and space probes at the earliest possible date are bitterly attacking the Administration for not making a greater effort. Charges of "niggardliness" and "no sense of urgency" are being made in many quarters.

An official of the important NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Dr. Eberhardt Rechin, Chief of the Telecommunications Division, put it this way in a recent address in Los Angeles:

"At the present time, one of the most remarkable features of the U.S. position is the almost complete lack of urgency in the space program. The NASA budget is now somewhat less than what the United States pays to ship and store surplus wheat. Our space program costs less than \$10 per year per U.S. adult, or, roughly, one evening's entertainment per year."

QUESTIONS OF BALANCE

The administration is defending its position by arguing that more Atlas missiles cannot be diverted to space projects without upsetting the Nation's defense and that an additional supply of the \$4 million units cannot be procured without upsetting the budget. (The number of Atlases allocated to the military satellite program has not been disclosed.)

The "no sense of urgency" charge is also being thrown at the administration for not spending more on the Mercury man-in-space program and the 1½-million-pound-thrust boosters Saturn and Nova.

The Senate and House space committees are getting ready to give NASA a rough going over when Congress reconvenes. Last session, NASA officials kept insisting that they had enough money and couldn't use any more. They will have a hard time explaining their present plight without admitting that they underestimated the situation.

When NASA is asked if it needs more than the \$800 million being budgeted for fiscal 1961, it will have an even more difficult time explaining that this, too, will be enough. It will have to try, however, on orders from the top.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 4, 1960]
UNITED STATES FAILS TO PARE RED ARMS LEAD—CRITICS OF REGIME NOTE SERIOUSNESS OF WEAPONS GAP

(By John G. Norris)

Ever since Sputnik I roared into the skies to tell the world the United States could be attacked by Russian-based rockets almost without warning, the Eisenhower administration has been trying to explain away the Soviet lead in missiles.

A combination of soothing syrup, secrecy, and Soviet smiles last year blunted the impact of the news that the U.S.S.R. will get a commanding superiority in operational ICBM's during the early 1960's.

But the hard fact of the "missile gap" and all it portends is still there. And events—since Congress went home last summer—make it plain that the Russian lead is widening rather than narrowing, and may be even more serious than administration critics then charged.

These developments include a still unannounced Pentagon upgrading of the accuracy and reliability of the ICBM and some little publicized happenings here and in the Soviet Union that downgrade the manned bomber.

Last winter, Neil H. McElroy, then Secretary of Defense, admitted publicly that if the Russians build all the ICBM's they can and if the United States produces the number it now plans, the U.S.S.R. will maintain a three-to-one lead through the early 1960's.

In explaining this unhappy ratio, he said it stemmed from an administration decision not to try to "match Russia, missile for missile" but to rely on American superiority in Air Force and carrier-based bombers, plus available ICBM's, IRBM's, and Polaris submarines.

Those who argued at that time and since that such a policy was too risky won support from an unexpected quarter yesterday. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, U.S. Army, retired, who, while Army Chief of Staff, contended that the United States had too much "massive deterrent" and too little conventional war strength, confessed that he has "reluctantly" come to accept the "reality and significance of the so-called missile gap."

GENERAL TAYLOR'S WARNING

"Somehow it must be made clear to our citizens that the Nation will face a serious crisis beginning about 1961," he said in a just-published book. "For a period of years thereafter, the balance of military strength will tip dangerously in favor of the Communist bloc unless we take drastic action now."

The clock is ticking but few pay attention. A responsible group, the Johns Hopkins University Washington Center for Foreign Policy Research, warned in a report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently that the United States today is "both open and vulnerable to direction and devastating attack." Everyone yawned.

No responsible officials now in Government speak out in public to inform America of the dangerous drift.

Not one of them attempts to correct the impression given earlier by the administration that Soviet ICBM's were inaccurate. Yet since August, a series of successful American Atlas tests have demonstrated greater accuracy and reliability for ICBM's in general than most top officials anticipated.

The Atlas "CEP"—the "circular error probability" or margin by which it may be expected to miss a target—has been cut from 4 to 3 miles and may be dropped to 2. Considering the terrific blast of a thermonuclear warhead, this means that fewer missiles will be needed to assure destruction of a key target.

RUSSIA ALSO IMPROVES

Intelligence and missile-monitoring evidence of Soviet T-3 ICBM tests lead officials to credit Russia with equivalent improvement in its bigger missile.

No one in Government has said publicly that this increased danger to Strategic Air Command bomber bases has altered the administration position before Congress last year that SAC can be relied on to knock out Russia. But last fall there was an official, though curiously veiled acknowledgement that Russian defenses against B-52s and B-47s had so improved that those SAC bombers no longer could expect to get through to their targets in Russia using long-accepted high level bombing tactics.

SAC spokesmen made the important admission in disclosing new and elaborate plans for alternate "tree top" approach bombing at Federal civil aviation meetings to explain the necessity of reserving air space corridors for such "Braille bomber" training.

It may be that SAC still will be able to do its job, but a recent top level Pentagon evaluation now concludes that the ICBM will achieve equal effectiveness with manned bombers in 1962, earlier than expected. And by 1966, bomber effectiveness may be degraded to limited use only.

Many measures can be taken to prolong the effective life of the U.S. bomber strong cards, but as a result of the administration's ironclad budget ceiling, it has been decided to take an additional gamble on a "bomber gap" on top of the "missile gap."

The administration has—

Canceled production of the missile-firing B-52B supersonic bomber.

Cut production of the B-58A bomber and stretched out production of the few which will be built.

Gone ahead with plans to deactivate B-47 squadrons the B-58's were to replace.

Canceled production orders for a highly sophisticated electronics-counter-measures system for B-52's, substituting some "more modest"—and cheaper—systems designed to help SAC bombers get through the Soviet air defense system.

Virtually dropped the 2,000-mile-an-hour B-70 program, designed to locate mobile or unknown Soviet missile sites. It will be continued only as an experimental plane.

Many of these actions were admitted only after word of the cancellations and cutbacks leaked out from industry.

Even with these cuts, by 1962-63 SAC's bomber force probably will be double that of "SUSAC"—the Russian strategic air force. But by then, the U.S.S.R. may have three to five times more ICBM's than the 200 American ICBM's now ordered.

Besides these "first generation" Atlas and Titan ICBM's now planned, the United States is working on a second-generation, solid-fueled Minuteman ICBM. But it will be 1964-65 before a major force of 600 to 700 Minutemen can be in service.

By then, if Minuteman can be made mobile and/or a sizable number of U.S. Polaris submarines are on station and there

is no war, the Nation's major trouble may be over. For truly secure deterrent nuclear force would solve many problems.

POLARIS A YEAR AWAY

But the United States will not have its first Polaris craft operational for another year and can have only 9 of the 16-missile subs in service by late 1963. But no more are being laid down this year or funded in the 1961 budget.

Moreover, Russia is presenting an ominous submarine-based missile threat. NATO's Atlantic commander, Adm. Jerauld Wright, said recently that there is conclusive evidence the Russians will have a significant ballistic missile sub threat against the United States within a year and a dangerous one in subsequent years.

American officials are confident that the Soviet subs, at first, will be greatly inferior to the Polaris nuclear craft. But numbers could count.

In other missiles, Russia is way ahead of the United States. The Soviets have several hundred medium range missiles of 600- to 1,200-mile range, plus some of 1,800 miles and well over a thousand with 300-mile range or better. Most of them are mobile.

In contrast, the U.S. picture is dismal. Forty American-built 1500-mile Thors are becoming operational in Britain. Turkey recently agreed to accept a squadron of 10 IRBM's, but Italy—the only other U.S. ally which will accept this fixed base, "soft" missile—has done little to install the 20 American IRBM's it agreed to take last March. Some dozen 200-mile U.S. Army Redstone ballistic missiles are in Europe.

Last winter, McElroy told Congress that Russian IRBM's did not figure in the American-Soviet missile comparison, as the U.S.S.R. "had not risked" moving them into the Red satellites, where they could reach American SAC bases in Britain, Spain and Morocco. Now the Pentagon admits to clear evidence that mobile Soviet IRBM's are in East Germany. It has not yet corrected the public record on this, however.

CRASH PROGRAM OUT

As to an ICBM defense, the Defense Department again last fall turned down urgent Army pleas to start crash construction of the Nike-Zeus, while continuing its development. This means no ballistic missile defense at least until the middle sixties, although ICBM radar warning stations should be ready by early 1962.

In face of all this, what is the administration doing?

There are some plans, but mighty little cash so far to finance them.

An Air Force plan to put some 60 Atlas or Titan ICBM's in dispersed, underground sites during the next 3 years has met tentative administration favor. So have preparations for an around-the-clock B-52 air alert to assure that a surprise Russian missile would not destroy all of SAC's retaliatory force on the ground.

Proposals to put more Atlases on "soft" sites and 1,200-mile Polaris missiles on surface warships have been rejected. The Pentagon cannot see where the extra billions to pay for the limited number of additional "hard" ICBM's and air alert is coming from out of the ironclad \$41 billion budget, much less to try to bridge the missile gap.

As a result, the once all powerful American ability to wreak massive retaliation on an aggressor is fast declining.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 5, 1960]

SOVIET ARMS GAIN LAID TO U.S. POLICY—ARMY CUTBACKS HIT AMERICAN POTENTIAL FOR LIMITED WAR

(By John G. Norris)

At a meeting of the National Security Council in July 1957, the then Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson declared that the Nation's basic military policy was to "maxi-

mize air power and minimize the foot soldier."

Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, then Army Chief of Staff, who reports the incident in a just published book, said his words were accepted by all present as a "correct if colloquial" description of the Eisenhower administration's military strategy.

Wilson was arguing for a further reduction in the Army, which has suffered a cut in divisions from 20 to 14 and a slash in manpower from 1,500,000 to 870,000 since General Eisenhower became President.

Some reduction from the Korean war level was expected, of course, but Taylor and his predecessor, Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, left office embittered over the way President Eisenhower treated their service. They believed a million-man Army to be essential—925,000 at rock bottom—but were most incensed over what they considered "starvation" in weapons modernization funds.

For the Eisenhower "bigger bang for a buck" program provided precious little for Army conventional warfare capabilities. (Hindsight shows that the Army might be better off today if it had not put so much into the Jupiter IRBM, later given to the Air Force. But where would the U.S. space program be today without the Jupiter rockets?)

The Army's frustration over this starvation was heightened by a succession of annual Moscow May Day parades showing off a wide variety of new Soviet Army weapons. During the 1950's, in fact, the Red army has remedied almost all of its wartime weaknesses.

During this time Russia also has cut army manpower to about 2,500,000 men but, with many fewer service troops than the United States, it has retained 175 active combat divisions.

Some of these—like America's 17 Army and marine divisions—are under strength, but the Soviet Union's tough, 3-year draft has produced several million young and ready reservists to fill up their ranks quickly.

Russian conscripts get longer, tougher training than American draftees. The Soviet GI, noncom, and junior officer are less able to exercise initiative than their U.S. counterparts. But U.S.S.R. difficulties in maintaining mechanical and communications equipment which American experts expected reportedly have not shown up in maneuvers.

Because of its modernization, the big Red Army is more powerful today than ever. Strong in armor and cross-country mobility, the Red army and its integrated air force is well prepared to fight either an atomic or conventional war.

As a result of the "minimize the foot soldier" policy, however, the U.S. Army is in a relatively weaker position today vis-a-vis Russia than was true 7 years ago. This is the case with respect to U.S. conventional war capability in general.

Unless Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev really meant what he said about drastically cutting the Red army—and the skeptics are legion—this situation may grow worse. For despite a slight increase in Army weapons modernization funds after the retirement of Secretary Wilson and of Adm. Arthur W. Radford as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff there is talk of another large Army cut in 1962.

ARMY RELIES ON TAC

The Army, of course, is not the only American instrument of limited warfare. It relies on the separate Air Force Tactical Air Command for airlift and close air support; but TAC has not fared very well, either, under the Eisenhower administration's emphasis on massive deterrent forces.

The Navy and Marine Corps, however, represent a major exception to the increasing Soviet conventional warfare lead—the one bright spot in an otherwise dismal picture.

American seapower surpasses that of Russia. The combination of the Navy's aircraft

carriers, amphibious ships and integrated Marine ground-air forces provide an effective way of dealing with many cold and limited war situations. But other potential trouble spots are inaccessible by sea and the Soviet Union has built large submarine and land-based air forces to oppose the American Navy.

Furthermore—and this gets to the heart of the Pentagon infighting over strategy—the Marines are not big enough to fight a sizable limited war.

PENTAGON'S POLICY

The Pentagon rationale for cutting the Army is found in the oft-repeated statement that the United States will never fight another Korea. This reflects current policy that the United States will employ its tactical atomic weapons or even bigger nuclear bombs to make up for its lack of manpower and conventional firepower in anything more than a small brushfire.

The fallacy of this stand, many believe is that American decisionmakers might well shy away from use of nuclear weapons—as at Dienbienphu. For the Soviets may well have as many tactical A-weapons as the United States, if not more. This is a field in which the Pentagon has lagged so much that Atomic Energy Commission Chairman John A. McCone had to prod the military a year ago into listing its requirements.

This lack of superiority in tactical A-weapons and the disinclination to use them could mean a greater likelihood of nonnuclear limited war, either between allies or satellites of the two major world powers or with one or the other directly involved.

It is here that the relative capacity of conventional or dual-purpose American and Soviet weapons becomes important. For one thing, both have been arsenals for their respective worlds.

U.S. armor—more important today than ever before—probably suffers most by comparison with the U.S.S.R.

The Red army is numerically stronger in tanks—unit for unit—than the American Army, and with over 100 tank or mechanized divisions in being, many times stronger overall.

Qualitatively, Soviet tanks are superior. Russia's chief battle tank, the T-54, has much greater cruising range than the current American Patton, yet is 12 tons lighter. The T-54, though slightly inferior in fire control and ammunition, outguns the Patton.

A not-yet-operational replacement for the Patton—the M-60—will have much greater range and a good, new British gun, but is disappointingly heavy. The Army is utilizing what is essentially the old Patton chassis to save money rather than designing a completely new tank. Some experts question whether it will be much superior to the 9-year-old T-54.

STORY OF A FAILURE

The story of the Ontos tank-destroyer flop—another attempt to build a cut-rate weapon—is illuminating. It is especially so because outgoing Defense Secretary Neil H. McElroy, in his final news conference, cited the Marine Corps' Ontos as an example of American progress in conventional arms.

This couldn't be further from the fact. The Ontos (the word means "the thing" in Greek) sounds and looks impressive. It was developed by the Army in the pre-Korean economy days when its recoilless rifles—beefed-up bazookas—seemed like a cheap alternative to a costly postwar tank program. After the Defense Department Weapons System Evaluation Group rejected Ontos for many reasons, the Marine Corps took it over simply because nothing else was in sight for beachhead use. Already, however, the Marines are evaluating West German and French replacements for the still in delivery Ontos.

In infantry and artillery weapons, the Soviet Union has produced a whole new

family to replace inferior World War II types. It has exported many of these weapons to its satellites and even to some Arab nations it has been courting. American forces, and most of the Allies too, are still equipped with pre-World War II Garand rifles and field artillery—and World War I-type machineguns and automatic rifles.

EFFECTIVE BUT TOO HEAVY

American light arms now in the hands of the troops are effective but overly heavy. U.S. artillery is good but largely still truck-towed rather than tracked and self-propelled. Soviet small arms are lighter though of shorter range. And the Russians have more self-propelled artillery, probably still inferior, however, as to fire control.

To move ahead of the Soviet Union in light weapons and artillery, the United States has developed an improved light arms family and an excellent new series of self-propelled aluminum-light mounts for its artillery.

The new M-14 rifle and M-60 machinegun are in limited production only. There is no production money at all for the new artillery mounts or automatic rifle. It will take 6½ years to fill initial Regular Army needs alone for the M-14 rifle under current production.

There are bright spots in the U.S. Army weapon picture. Concentrating its money on the newer weapons, the United States probably is technically ahead in battlefield missiles such as the good Lacrosse, but the Soviet Union has more such missiles and more of them on mobile mounts. With the Hawk, the United States is technically ahead in protection against low-flying planes. The Soviets rely on large numbers of new rapid-firing guns. In armored troop carriers, the United States has better but fewer weapons.

RUSSIAN GAINS IN AIR

The picture in the air, as far as conventional forces are concerned, is equally if not more dismal.

In tactical air, the Soviet Union has built far more fighters, better adapted to rough fields, than the United States has built of its more sophisticated craft. Russia is exporting them.

In airlift, the Russians are bringing in much bigger helicopters, big global T-114 turboprop transports and other craft while the United States is concentrating on plush jet airlines for the commercial trade.

CONVENTIONAL FORCES

In a look at the rival Soviet and American conventional forces, this is apparent:

The Soviets have modernized the Red Army and its tactical air force all along the line, avoiding the American concentration on perhaps more exotic new weapons, like missiles, recoilless rifles, and battlefield radar "seeing eyes," while letting lag basic improvements in tanks, artillery and other conventional arms.

The result is an ever increasing disparity in conventional forces—and in an age in which the psychological bar against the first use of nuclear weapons is growing, not diminishing.

The Soviet motto seems to have been well put by one Russian officer who reportedly declared: "There is too much at stake—the future of communism—to economize on the Red army."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1960]

U.S. IMAGE ABROAD—WE CAN STILL RIGHT UN-

HAPPY BALANCE

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

A nation's ability to influence the course of world affairs, even its ability to survive, is dependent both on the reality of power and on the public image others have of that power.

The first three articles in this series have pointed out a central feature of the Eisenhower years—the massive decline in U.S.

military power and the para-military power of space science in relation to the rising military power of the Soviet Union.

Shifts in the military power balance are inevitable and have occurred throughout history as capable men in one nation or another have produced new weapons or other elements of force. The power pendulum swings back and forth.

On the basis of the evidence in the preceding articles there is no reason to believe that the United States cannot right the balance, not to the extent of the early post-World War II years in which it enjoyed a nuclear monopoly, but at least to the extent of creating both an adequate massive deterrent and a flexible conventional warfare capability.

SKILL NOT LACKING

It is evident enough that it is not technical skill that is lacking in the United States to do these things.

The problem in Washington is one of attitude. It is an attitude which attempts to comfort those at home who are alarmed at the military slippage by talking about "balanced forces" and about not competing with the Russians missile for missile.

It is an attitude toward the other free nations of the world which the United States professes to lead in the East-West struggle, an attitude in which budget balancing and the sanctity of the dollar appear supreme.

It is an attitude of annoyance on the part of President Eisenhower as expressed in answer to a press conference question about a Soviet claim of ability to hit any point in the world, precisely and accurately, with an ICBM having an H-bomb warhead.

"They also said," he snapped, "that they invented the flying machine and the automobile and other things. Why should you be so respectful of this statement this morning, if you are not so respectful of the other three?"

It is an attitude which often still seems not to have comprehended the meaning of the first Soviet sputnik.

Millions of words have been written about the totality of Communist efforts, embracing not only military but psychological, economic and political tactics in the East-West struggle. Yet the night that first sputnik soared around the earth, one of the then military service Secretaries confessed that in earlier intra-administration arguments over American plans for a satellite he had said that he never had heard of any more damned foolish idea. The night of Sputnik I he expressed total amazement at world interest in the accomplishment.

PRESIDENT'S COMMENT

As recently as last November, during the shilly-shallying over military or civilian control of space work, the President could comment that "for the life of me, I cannot see any reason why we should be using or mis-using military talent to explore the moon."

Most important, the attitude in Washington has created an image around the world of a United States fast declining in military power and space science—and therefore in diplomatic power with which to enforce its will and its hopes and expectations.

In such a context it is no wonder that much of the world believes Nikita S. Khrushchev won his invitation to the United States by nuclear blackmailing this Nation over Berlin. All the talk from Washington about the invitation being part of a new Eisenhower peace offensive cannot counter such an interpretation.

The simple fact is that much of the world now believes Khrushchev's talk about military superiority. All the Pentagon releases piled as high as the Washington Monument and all the fine words from the White House will not rub out the impression that this administration has accepted a second-best military-space status for the United States.

What so often counts is not only the facts but what people think are the facts.

AMERICANS UNEASY

That Americans are uneasy, in many cases downright alarmed, about the state of the Nation's military defenses is evident. That there is an uneasy stir in the land is also true.

The United States today is powerfully armed. If war should come tomorrow, America's Armed Forces doubtless would give an excellent account of themselves. Much fine work is being done by various arms of the administration to improve the defense posture. Many, many men work beyond the call of duty to help protect and defend the Nation.

Still, the image of America is not a happy one. The President, by his recent three-continent tour and by his other often eloquent statements about the American desire for peace, has done much to counter the Communist-inspired picture of a warmongering United States.

But that is only part of the solution. The other part is to create a reality and a consequent worldwide image of strength on which American diplomats can count when they meet the Communists across the conference tables. This requires both more military preparedness and a greater leap into the age of space.

The administration's proposals for the final Eisenhower year are about to be made public. From what is known in advance they will not substantially alter the present pace in either field. Perhaps the Congress can do something additional but in an election year there is likely to be more sound and fury than action.

The result, as many public officials both in and out of the administration are saying today, is that the President who enters the White House a year and 2 weeks from today will face tasks of heroic proportions. Hence the choice of that man by the voters this November 8 will be supremely important for the United States and the free world.

CRITICISM OF SETTLEMENT OF THE STEEL STRIKE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, lest it be thought that the settlement of the steel strike was unanimously approved, I wish to raise one small voice in dissent.

This is by no means the first time in this administration that the high phrases and principles enunciated by the Chief Executive have finally resolved themselves, when it came to the practicalities, into something considerably lower.

In his column of January 5, Walter Lippmann characterized the settlement as "a political fix." I am very glad to be able to quote this eminent journalist, who is a master of English prose, rather than try to find descriptive words from my own more limited vocabulary.

It will be recalled that the President repeatedly and emphatically denounced any possible settlement which would result in price increases or would be inflationary. Yet there is not the slightest assurance that this settlement will meet the President's specification. On the contrary, the only speculation is when the increases will occur. There seems to be some tentative arrangement, based upon the fact that the wage increases will not become effective until December 1, that noticeable price increases may not occur until about that time, or, perhaps, after the second Tuesday in November—a date to remember for other reasons.

The very reliable Wall Street Journal said, on January 5, that there is an unwritten understanding with Vice President Nixon and Labor Secretary Mitchell that the companies will forgo any general price increase for several months, possibly through 1960. But I hazard a prediction that the anxiety of the steel companies to maintain their honored tradition of continuous and unremitting price increases, with or without excuse, will overcome their not quite equal anxiety to contribute to the welfare of the Republican Party and its candidate. There are about as many ways to increase steel prices as there are to skin a cat, and some of these can be used without equivalent outcry. I predict "adjustments" and "definitions" and "reclassifications" of the multitudinous steel products. As the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], has pointed out, steel prices were increased to the small buyer even before the strike, by changing the method of computing quantity discounts.

If one believes, even to the slightest degree, the claims made by steel company executives during the long negotiations, postponement of price increases after this settlement would represent a great sacrifice. This, if it occurs, ought to be classified, under the Corrupt Practices Act, as a campaign contribution to the Republican Party. But in the long run, the \$1 billion estimated cost of the settlement will surely be paid by the general public, in the form of increased prices throughout the economy, with something extra added for the steel companies.

Another high-sounding principle of the President which was swept under the rug was his determination to rely on free collective bargaining. If anyone believes that this settlement was achieved by any such means, he ought to be disillusioned. The settlement was achieved by political maneuvering. Spokesmen of one party, controlling the executive branch, threatened negotiators with what another party, controlling the Congress, might do. Another bitter fruit of divided government.

Another great problem swept under the rug is that of providing adequate machinery for dealing with such strikes. What of all the agonizing about the deficiencies in our labor-management laws to handle such paralyzing conflicts? It has gone by the board, perhaps all too soon to return again when the national economy is next brought to its knees by another such combination of labor-management power.

What about our competitive position in world trade, the concern of the administration over our imbalance of payments, the crucial problem which impels us to impose Buy American policies on our development assistance program, the concern which impels us to increase interest rates to prevent gold and dollar outflow? How is this great problem ameliorated by the steel settlement? There was already concern that in some industries we were pricing ourselves out of world markets; and although there was undue concern about our balance of payments, the one industry most vulnerable was the steel industry.

In November 1959, the Commerce Department published an analysis of changes in U.S. shares of export markets for manufacturers, 1954-1958. I emphasize that it was an analysis of percentage shares of individual regional markets for exports, rather than dollar amounts of exports, so that the study reflected U.S. exports in terms of aggregate world trade. The study determined that the overall U.S. share had indeed been reduced, but that the supposition of general decline was unsupported. The general decline was explained by serious losses centered in a few items—most notably motor vehicles and steel.

In the same period, 1954-58, steel imports doubled. Automobile imports increased several times over.

Last year the steel companies asked for tariff increases on steel wire, and were turned down. It will be interesting to see what new tariff protection they ask, and what they receive, again at the expense of the consumer.

Inexorably, in spite of increased steel ingot capacity of 26 percent between 1953 and 1958, and in spite of increased efficiency, the price of steel moved upward: \$3 a ton in 1954, \$7.35 a ton in 1955, \$8.50 a ton in 1956, \$6 a ton in 1957, \$4.50 a ton in 1958—during the recession. Prices of finished steel rose 34.1 percent between 1953 and 1958, as against 8.3 percent for all commodities.

Upward moved profits—from \$9.07 per ton in 1953 to \$17.46 per ton in the first half of 1959.

Labor's wages went up from a minimum of \$1.57 in 1954 to \$2.03 in the Nixon settlement, not including cost-of-living increases of 17 cents an hour.

All this, the increased wages and the increased profits, came out of the pockets of the general public, in the form of higher costs.

There was an opportunity for statesmanship in the steel strike. Industry could have resisted further wage costs with a promise to reduce its exorbitant prices and profits. Our capitalistic system is rationalized, at least in part, upon the theory that the consumer shares the benefits of increased labor productivity and capital investment in the form of more and better goods at lower costs. But instead, we have a triumph of political expediency over statesmanship. The beneficiaries are big labor, which gets a substantial wage increase, big business, which undoubtedly will receive higher prices, and the Republican Party, which will enjoy the political fruits—all of these at the expense of the unsuspecting public.

Let me close with a quotation from the President's state of the Union message on inflation:

We must prevent inflation . . . to prevent steadily rising costs and prices calls for stern self-discipline by every citizen. No person, city, State, or organized groups can afford to evade the obligation to resist inflation, for every American pays its crippling tax.

Mr. President, there have been many searching criticisms of this strike settlement. Among these are two columns by Arthur Krock, the distinguished scholar and writer of the New York Times,

I ask unanimous consent that two columns, one of January 6 and one of January 7, 1960, be printed in the Record as a part of my remarks.

In order to complete the data, I also ask unanimous consent that a table of wage increases and two articles, one by Peter Edson and one by Walter Lippmann, appearing in the Washington Post of January 7, be included in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TO MR. TRUMAN IT MUST SEEM
LIKE YESTERDAY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 6.—Since neither the Eisenhower administration nor a visible majority of Congress is prepared to challenge the basic monopoly power of an industry-wide trade union, it is obvious that any Government-impelled strike settlement accepted by industry and labor must inevitably be a capitulation to most of the striking union's demands. Therefore, if the judgment is sound that the steel-strike settlement longer deferred would have been even more costly for the industry, then the compliments for their successful intervention now being lavished on Vice President Nixon and Secretary of Labor Mitchell are merited chiefly on the consideration that "it might have been worse."

But if and when the new inflationary prod of the settlement is registered in subsequent labor contracts and in the higher price level usually incident to increases in the cost of steel, American consumers may see more plainly that they are being constantly exploited by the politicians and the labor leaders who combine to maintain the laws by which big unions control the labor supply of nationwide industry. And so long as this power, which no other economic group possesses, continues to have the sanction of law, settlements of nationwide strikes will always be political and prouning.

This fact has often been demonstrated since organized labor was uniquely exempted from the antitrust laws. But apparently the population at large, which is the victim of this arrangement, doesn't know how to engender the pressure on both major parties that would produce an equitable system. Or the American people require the shock of currency inflation of the postwar European disaster type and the rising unemployment that would be the consequence of successful foreign competition in the world markets before they will move effectively to protect themselves from the alliance of politics and big labor.

The impotence of the unorganized consumers against this combination has been promoted by its bipartisan nature. This Republican administration has been as one with its Democratic predecessor in declining to attack the root of the union labor monopoly—the immunity from the antitrust laws by which the steelworkers, for example, were able to shut down a nationwide industry by withdrawing its labor force. No sooner had their strike settlement been reached when Secretary Mitchell announced the administration would seek no new power over strikes that paralyze the economy. And this is the second time (the first occasion was in 1956) in President Eisenhower's tenure that Government pressure has been applied to the steel industry for capitulation to the union.

"In the current settlement," commented Iron Age, "the union won about everything it wanted except a complete carbon copy of the 1956 package. . . . The steel firms . . . settled for about one-half that cost. . . . [Hence], if there is a price increase, as expected, it will be a moderate one. . . . The thing that hurts most is that twice Government pressure has come from a strong

[sic] Republican administration. And most painful of all: the steel industry could have had a cheaper settlement last July when Mr. Nixon offered to lend a helping hand to both sides."

The Vice President has this justification to cite for the compliments he is receiving. And also according to Iron Age, Nixon's first effort to settle the strike early last July only missed by an eyelash. But the odds against the industry were insuperable: the union's legalized control of its labor supply, subject only to the temporary restraint of a Taft-Hartley injunction; and the prospect, which finally materialized, that the administration would follow the pattern of intervention, bound in existing circumstances to be pro-union, which the Republicans assailed President Truman for applying.

Suppose, after a long abstinence from effective action and instead of intervening himself, Mr. Truman had turned the job over to his political heir-apparent and to a Cabinet member who wanted to be Vice President. And suppose, after these officials had ended a strike, the latter had immediately announced the administration would abandon all its huffing and puffing about new laws to strengthen public power to sustain the economy. Republican shouts of a political deal would have shaken the heavens. What's the big difference?

THE STATE OF THE UNION AND GEORGE MEANY (By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 7.—President Eisenhower in his constitutional message to Congress today verified the prediction of Secretary of Labor Mitchell that, with the steel strike settled, the administration would propose no new legislation in the labor-management field. According to some behind-the-scenes workers in the steel dispute, the President's omission of any such legislative recommendations also verified a provisional forecast to this same effect conveyed by Vice President Nixon and Secretary Mitchell to the companies and the union—the proviso being that these principals would agree on terms.

But even more significant was the fact that President Eisenhower's substitute for legislation was approximately the proposal formally made to him in November by President George Meany of the AFL-CIO. This proposal was that, prior to the development of nationwide labor disputes into a strike status, there should be periodic joint management-union talks "under White House auspices * * * to develop guiding lines for joint and harmonious labor-management relations." And President Eisenhower today adopted it as his entire 1960 labor program in the following words:

"One of the lessons [of the steel strike] is that the potential danger to the entire Nation of longer and greater strikes must be met. To insure against such possibilities we must, of course, depend primarily on the good commonsense of the responsible individuals. It is my intention to encourage regular discussions between management and labor outside the bargaining table, to consider the interest of the public as well as their mutual interest in the maintenance of industrial peace, price stability, and economic growth."

This formula, if it can be called that, leaves totally undisturbed the legalized power of a nationwide union to paralyze the economy indefinitely by withdrawing the entire labor force of a nationwide essential industry. It continues to leave the Government with only the ineffective device of an 80-day Taft-Hartley interruption of such strikes, after which the union may again withdraw the entire labor force. And it maintains union domination of the so-called collective-bargaining table inherent in this monopoly of the labor market, a domination

which generally compels an acceptance by industry of most of a union's demands when Government stands aloof, and always when Government intervenes.

Nevertheless, a Republican President has accepted the AFL-CIO position that the industrywide strike problem be left wholly to the workings of the good will, the good commonsense, self-discipline and responsibility of the parties, although these factors have been conspicuously absent in past disputes between big labor and big business. And, when one party has a power monopoly denied to the other by law, it is quite confiding of the President to base labor policy on the hope that the first will cease exploiting this power to the utmost when it passes under the lintel of the White House.

But that was the arrangement on which the steel union was induced, and the industry was compelled by Government to agree on terms that, the President remarked comfortably, percentage-wise were "lower than any prior settlement since World War II." And, since the only Democratic criticism is that the union might have taken less if the administration had wielded its club and offered its sugar earlier, the people have no political recourse.

The claim of the AFL-CIO to the origin of the administration's new labor policy is thoroughly established in the record. At the University of Wisconsin, November 1958, its general counsel, Arthur J. Goldberg, proposed "a labor-management assembly, modeled after the United Nations * * *, as an instrument for bringing together (under the auspices of the Government) the leading figures in American industry and the leading figures in the American trade union movement for a periodic examination and discussion of the issues which affect us all and in which we find so little common ground."

Secretary Mitchell was viewed as blowing cold on this at the time. But when Meany formally laid the plan before President Eisenhower a year later, the President made it unanimous by answering that this was just what Mitchell "repeatedly had called for."

STEEL PRICES AND WAGES

PITTSBURGH, January 4.—Here is a table showing the increases in steelworkers wages and steel prices at the dates of successive contracts since the Steel Workers Organizing Committee—now the United Steelworkers of America—negotiated its first contract in 1937:

Year	Strike length	Minimum pay	Hourly increase	Steel price increase per ton
	<i>Days</i>			
1937	-----	\$0.625	\$0.10	-----
1941	-----	.725	.10	\$11.00
1942	-----	.78	.055	-----
1946	26	.965	.185	5.00
1947	-----	1.09	1.16	5.00
1948	-----	1.185	1.13	9.34
1950	-----	1.36	1.16	5.50
1952	59	1.435	1.16	5.00
1953	-----	1.52	.085	4.00
1954	-----	1.57	.05	3.00
1955	12	1.685	1.15	7.35
1956	34	1.82	1.105	8.50
1957	-----	1.89	.21	6.00
1958	-----	1.96	.07	4.50
1959	116	-----	-----	-----
1960	-----	*2.03	*4.07	-----

* Denotes hourly increase which was included in "package" spread over the various job classifications, and not exactly matched in the minimum pay rates.

† Hours.

‡ The strike lasted from July 15 until Nov. 7, 1959, when workers returned to the mills under a Taft-Hartley injunction. But the labor settlement was not reached until Jan. 4, 1960.

§ Includes reported but unannounced wage increase of 7 cents an hour effective Dec. 1, 1960.

Minimum pay and hourly increase figures do not include a total of 17 cents an hour that workers received between 1956 and 1959 in cost-of-living increases under the last contract signed in 1956. The cost-of-living increases brought the 1958 base pay to \$2.13 an hour.

The composite price of steel was estimated at \$160 a ton last June.

STEEL UNION REAL VICTOR

(By Peter Edson)

All the cheering over Vice President Nixon's and Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell's "great victory" in settling the steel strike drowns out and is in complete contradiction to what President Eisenhower said all last year about the dangers of inflation it involved.

Close study of the contract terms as finally announced shows that the real victor was United Steel Workers Union.

But the steel companies didn't do so badly in the deal either. For they are now completely free to raise prices as much as the traffic will bear—with Government blessing.

This is the one thing they lacked—up to the final week.

Steel management in the past has always been free to raise prices to cover wage increases—and then some. So what you have is big business and big labor as usual, without change.

As far back as last May—before the strike—President Eisenhower was telling his press conferences: "I would again insist that the whole 175 million of us ought to make clear that we are concerned about this matter and this is not something where we are standing aside and seeing ourselves hurt."

He said this repeatedly but it did no good.

After the strike and the injunction which sent the steelmakers back to work, in his nationwide broadcast December 3, before leaving on his 3-week mission to 11 foreign countries, the President called for around-the-clock bargaining to see that the public interest is as carefully protected as the interests of stockholders and employees.

There wasn't and it wasn't.

In his press conference the day before, the President had declared that "I do believe that the day we abandon free and collective bargaining, it is going to be a sad day for the United States."

A case can be made that free collective bargaining was abandoned when Vice President Nixon and Secretary Mitchell intervened—with obvious White House approval. So this must be a sad day for the United States. While they did not dictate the terms of settlement, they created the atmosphere which made settlement possible.

Management and labor were scared into settlement by fear of what Congress might do if they didn't agree. What they came up with was a face-saving formula that may have the delayed-action effect of an inflationary time bomb.

Management originally proposed a 1-year wage freeze. It got what appears on the surface to be an 11-month freeze—no outright wage increase until December 30, 1960.

But company assumption of all health and welfare costs gives the employees the equivalent of an immediate 6 cents an hour increase in take-home. So there's no freeze.

Labor asked for a 15-cent-an-hour increase in each year of a 3-year contract. It settled for 7 cents an hour and up increase in each of the last 2 years. So the total take-home increase is 20, instead of 45 cents.

This again looks good on the surface. But when the fringe benefits are included, it looks different. The union turned down management's original offer of a 24- to 30-cent an hour package increase. It got a 39- to 41-cent package.

So no matter how you slice it, it still looks inflationary. The bad news will come later. For almost every steel industry source now concedes prices will have to go up.

—
INGLORIOUS ENDING
(By Walter Lippmann)

The steel strike has been called off in a way which leaves the public without any means of determining whether the result is just or unjust, wise or unwise. It is evident that the companies lost the strike. But there does not exist any impartial and dependable report on the issues which enables anyone from the President down to know whether the companies have conceded more than they could afford to concede. For the President has steadfastly refused to countenance official factfinding as the basis for a settlement. As a result, no one really knows what the Nixon-Mitchell settlement means.

The President, so he said last July, has been acting on the notion that there must be no Government intervention because "we have got thoroughly to test out and use the method of free bargaining." We have now had the test. What happened in the test? What happened was that the Government intervened in the person of the Vice President. He used the carrot for the union and the stick for the companies. He coerced the companies into yielding not all but most of what the union was fighting for. Moreover, it would appear, he induced them to agree that they will not raise steel prices until after the election. The strike was not settled by free bargaining. It was settled by a political fix.

The President, whose mind has no doubt been on other things, seems never to have realized that in this struggle the process of free bargaining was exhausted very early in the day—almost certainly by July when the strike actually began. It was evident from the beginning that the two great monopolies were committed to a test of power, not to a process of bargaining. The test was which of them could hold out the longer against the other.

In July when the strike began there were reasons for thinking that the companies were the stronger. Their customers had large stockpiles. Labor unions were unpopular as a result of the McClellan exposures. The public was opposed to another round of wage-price increases. And there was some question whether Mr. McDonald was in solid control of his union. But as time went on the balance of power began to favor the union chiefly because, I imagine, it was increasingly evident that if Congress had to intervene to settle the strike, it would not be very tender with the companies. It is significant that the Nixon-Mitchell intervention succeeded because they were able to threaten the companies with the certainty of congressional action.

So we have come to a crude and embarrassing ending to an inglorious and mismanaged policy. I have reason to know that it is denied in official quarters that the strike could have been settled any earlier. But I think it is arguable from the record that a settlement on the Nixon-Mitchell terms could have been had at any time. All that was required was to give labor the carrot of the concessions and then to do to the companies what Mr. Nixon did to them, to use the big stick of a threat of special legislation in Congress leading to some kind of compulsory arbitration.

If the President had realized that the period of free bargaining had ended even before the strike began, the threatened strike could have been handled by measures which were rational, which protected the public interest, and enlightened public opinion. By July there should have been an official factfinding report on the issues and official recom-

mendations for the settlement. When that report had been debated, and a predominant public opinion had been formed about it, the next step would have been to enforce the findings by calling on Congress to grant the power to do so.

Presumably, it would not have been necessary to go so far as to call Congress into special session or to use the powers if Congress were called and the powers were granted. The Nixon-Mitchell deal shows that the threat to do all these things would probably have been sufficient.

In acting in this fashion the administration would have stood on the solid basis of an impartial report, and this report would have had to deal with the crucial question that Mr. Nixon has left up in the air. This question is whether or not the concessions to labor are inflationary in that they justify and require a rise in steel prices. If the report had found that the concessions were inflationary but that some smaller concessions would not be, the union would have been forced by the threat of compulsory arbitration to accept the lower terms.

All in all, we can be glad that the strike is not to be resumed. But there is nothing else to be glad about.

—
ESTABLISHMENT OF WISCONSIN NATIONAL MORaine PARK—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the preservation of our natural heritage—particularly the areas of historical, scientific, biological, and scenic significance—is a continuous challenge before the country.

Our increasing population, growth of industry, mushrooming of cities—all of these make ever-greater demands on our resources, and threaten to wipe out the remaining vestiges of our natural out-of-doors.

Consequently, it is essential that, wherever possible, efforts be made to prevent unnecessary deterioration of such lands, particularly when they contain topographical features of particular significance.

In Wisconsin, for example, we have a moraine area approximately 500 miles long which contains unique, glacial-produced formations.

Recognizing the historical significance of these features, the State of Wisconsin has established the Kettle Moraine State Park.

Because of the overall importance of the area, however, the inclusion of more of the moraine area into a national park now seems advisable.

To accomplish this, I have introduced a bill, S. 894, to establish an Ice Age National Park.

I am happy to point out that the proposal has received broad-scope support from a great many of our citizens and organizations in the State. Among these has been the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Wisconsin. Not long ago the department adjutant-quartermaster, Edward J. Schmidt, forwarded a resolution adopted by the VFW, urging enactment of the legislation to establish a national park. As an example of the wide support for the proposal, I request unanimous consent to have the resolution by the VFW printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION 59-25

Resolution supporting establishment of Wisconsin Moraine National Park

Whereas a bill has been introduced in the 86th Congress of the United States calling for the creation of a national park in Wisconsin from the meandering glacial moraines located in some 26 counties of the State, the nucleus of this area being the Kettle Moraine State Park; and

Whereas the last of the four great glaciers was called the Wisconsin Glacier because in no other place in America did the glacier leave clearer evidence of its existence; and

Whereas this natural feature of our State should be perpetuated in the form of a national park; and

Whereas Wisconsin does not have a national park; and it is proposed to create the Ice Age National Park from this area; and

Whereas this moraine area has no economic value because of the very thin topsoil and underlying gravel, but is ideal for recreational purposes, such as skiing, hiking, camping, and so forth; and

Whereas as this proposed park, 500 miles long, about one-fourth mile wide, and totaling 125 square miles or 70,000 acres, will enhance the recreational, scenic, and business aspects of this State; and create parkways, waysides, trails and shelters across Wisconsin; and

Whereas it is well established that recreation areas must be set aside now to take care of the needs of our increasing population: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Department of Wisconsin, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, duly assembled at its 38th annual convention at Wausau, Wis., during the period June 24-27, 1959, that we go on record to enthusiastically support the Ice Age National Park proposal, that we urge all posts and auxiliaries to write to their respective representatives in Congress expressing support of such a national park in Wisconsin, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and WILLIAM PROXMIER, and to all Wisconsin Congressmen.

Adopted at the department convention, VFW, at Wausau, Wis., June 24-27, 1959.

SERMON BY MOST REV. LEO F. DWORSCHAK AT FUNERAL OF LATE SENATOR LANGER, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the sermon delivered by the Most Reverend Leo F. Dworschak, auxiliary bishop of Fargo, at the funeral of our late and esteemed colleague, Senator William Langer, was one of the most powerful and soul searching I have ever heard. It is a sermon which I am sure every Member of the Senate would like to read. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

SERMON AT THE FUNERAL OF THE HONORABLE WILLIAM LANGER, ST. LEO'S CHURCH, CASSELTON, N. DAK., NOVEMBER 14, 1959, BY THE MOST REVEREND LEO F. DWORSCHAK, AUXILIARY BISHOP OF FARGO

Bereaved mourners and kind friends, in this solemn hour we have offered the holy sacrifice of the Mass for a Christian soul. It is here that the democracy of the church is made manifest. She performs this same rite

for all her children as they pass from time to eternity, from this world to the unending hereafter. For poor and rich alike, for the famous and the obscure, her prayer is the same, her essential offering is the same. For in death, which has been described as the great leveler, we are all one in our need.

We have offered the holy sacrifice for William Langer. Beyond that it actually is of little moment now to his soul that we should speak at any length in praise or blame of his character and his life's achievement. In the end death came to him quite suddenly. But it did not find him unprepared. After the passing of his beloved wife he seemed to have a premonition that his own step into eternity would also have to be made soon. He strengthened himself spiritually by receiving the sacraments of the church, and in correspondence with the pastor of this parish as recently as October 30 made it plain that the consolations of his religion gave him the strength to face the prospect of meeting his Creator soon without hesitation and without fear. Hence he now stands in no need of the praise of men. If he has gained for himself God's praise, he needs no other.

And yet, before the last blessing of the church is performed over his mortal remains, we will do well to pause a moment and dwell on just one thought suggested by his career. In my opinion, the most striking facet of his character as a public servant was his unshakable adherence to his convictions. There were times when he stood almost alone on an issue and no consideration of practical politics nor pressure from others could induce him to recede from the stand he had taken or to compromise what he considered just and right. I did not always share his convictions; but he did have positive convictions and steadfastly refused to compromise them for reasons of political expediency or personal gain. In an age when expediency rather than principle is so often made the supreme law of statesmanship, business practice, and personal conduct, it is a refreshing experience to see an example of unshakable faithfulness to conviction and loyalty to the truth as he saw it.

We are reminded of the scene described in the 18th chapter of St. John's Gospel. Jesus stands before Pilate to be judged by him. The Roman governor seeks desperately to extricate himself from an awkward position by questioning the accused in an effort to wring from Him some admission that would justify either a sentence of death or an acquittal—anything to get off a bad spot.

The subject of kingship is mentioned, and Pilate eagerly follows it up with the question, "Then You are a King after all?" Jesus replies, "You are right. I am a King. For this purpose I was born, and for this purpose I came into the world—to give testimony to the truth. Only he who is open to the truth gives ear to My voice." With a sneer, Pilate says to Him, "What is truth?" and returns to the balcony to face the multitude.

There is an undertone of tragedy in Pilate's question. Here he was in the presence of Him who had said: "I am the way; I am truth and life." (John 14: 6.) For a brief moment he had a brush with immortality. But he turned away; he was not open to the truth. He was not at fault for having asked the question. He was at fault because he refused to wait for an answer. In our generation a growing number of people go a step farther. They say there is no answer.

That viewpoint was spelled out quite clearly and concisely in June of 1951 by the late Chief Justice Vinson. "Nothing," he wrote, "is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes, that a name, a phrase, a standard has meaning only when associated with the circumstances which gave birth to the nomenclature. To those who would paralyze our

Government in the face of impending danger by encasing it in a semantic straitjacket we must reply that all concepts are relative."

These words were a part of the decision in which the Supreme Court upheld the conviction of 11 top-flight Communists. If the principle enunciated by Mr. Vinson in those two sentences were universally adopted and carried to its logical conclusion by the people and the Government of the United States, it would, in my opinion, do more harm to this Nation than all the activities of all the Communists on either side of the Iron Curtain. Deny the possibility of absolute truth and absolute values and you destroy the basis, not only of our Government but of our very nature as free beings.

Our Founding Fathers established this Nation upon the principle that certain absolute and self-evident truths are the foundation upon which our right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness rests. If human language can have any meaning at all, the Declaration of Independence means just that. If there are no absolute truths or values, there can be no justice and we can have no inalienable rights. A nation is powerful and its citizens are truly free in the degree in which they possess and are loyal to the truth. That is what Our Lord meant when He said: "If you make my teaching your rule of life, you are truly my disciples; then you will know the truth and the truth will make you free." (John 4: 31-32)

Denial of the truth or the possibility of discovering it goes contrary to every instinct of our nature. In the last analysis truth is reality. It simply is fact. And facts are absolute. When a fine china teacup falls off the table and is shattered, that is a fact. You could conceivably mend it; but you could not change the fact that it had been broken. No process of reasoning or sophistry can change or nullify objective truth or fact. It makes no difference whether the truth pertains to the physical, intellectual, or spiritual realm. In every case truth is reality. Truth is divine because truth is the essence of God's nature.

There is something rigidly inflexible about truth. Let us say that a hostess sets the table for dinner. She arranges two places on each side. No matter how loudly she may protest that there are no absolutes, she will not be able to seat five guests so long as she has only two places on each side of the table. If she wants to seat the fifth guest she must bring up another chair. That is the force of logic and the tyranny of truth. It is basically as simple as that. Such an objective and immutable quality is found in every truth, be it scientific, ethical, or theological.

There are timid souls—and in this respect our generation is becoming more timid by the hour—there are timid souls who fear the truth precisely because objective truth is rigid, unchangeable, eternal. They fear that adherence to truth implies a degrading slavery or subjection which destroys our dignity as free, intelligent beings. To them subjection of any kind is an insult to our hope of being our own masters. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

It is true, of course, that many men are slaves. Probably many more today than in ages past. Some are slaves because they are victims of brute force; but more are slaves because they are victims of their own cowardice or selfish desire for security. A slave, in Aristotle's definition, is a man whose choices are made for him by others. He may even enjoy comfort and security beyond a free man's wildest dreams, like the slave of a wealthy merchant in ancient Athens. But he is a slave nonetheless because his choices are forced upon him by a cruel master or by the tyranny of circumstances.

But there are forms of subjection which are not degrading, a subjection which is the fulfillment of our dignity as man. There

is the subjection of a creature to his God, of citizen to valid authority in the state, of child to parent. Those are forms of subjection which nature itself demands in the hierarchy of values for the perfection of the human individual. The most perfect, the noblest of all human beings in the end will be he who was most completely subject to God, he whose life was most nearly in conformity with the divine will of the Creator.

In matters of truth, the mind which is more subject to reality is the more perfect mind, the more accurate interpreter of objective reality. Surely we are not degrading the dignity of the child when we teach him the inflexible logic of the multiplication tables. We are not degraded by the law of gravity, even though he suffers injury who tries to ignore it.

Neither do we do violence to the hopes and aspirations of a free man if we insist that he conduct himself according to the moral law implanted in him by the Creator. The laws of physics, of logic, of ethics—each is an element which the Creator used in weaving the fabric of what we call human dignity. The pattern of conduct proposed to man in the divine plan may be likened to a road map. When we are on a journey the map guides us to our destination. It does not shackle our freedom.

In one sense truth may be tyranny. It is eternal and immutable, and as such places some limits on our freedom of action. But these are rational limits which spring from our nature as intelligent beings. To defy those limits is to invite disaster. Dostoyevsky summed it up perfectly when he said: "To begin with, unlimited freedom is to end with unlimited despotism."

One of the most tragic episodes in the Korean war was the treasonable conduct of some of our men who had been taken captive by the Red army. These men were spoken of with derision by a large sector of the American people. But such condemnation was unfair to them. Their conduct was not so much a crime on their part as an indictment of the society which failed to impart to them an understanding of objective truth and laws of morality, and instill in them unshakable convictions regarding the foundations upon which our democratic society rests. If there is no such thing as objective truth, if there are no absolute moral values why should a man refuse to compromise the principles of justice and decency in face of death by torture or starvation. In such circumstances no man can remain strong without the support of firm convictions. In fact, such support is necessary for every man whether soldier or statesman, politician or captain of industry, farmer or day laborer.

Hence if there is any thought that the life and career of William Langer would inspire in us, it is the importance of loyalty to our convictions. There may be other roads to wealth or fame or pleasure. There is no other road to happiness and freedom. With that thought we sum up our tribute to the memory of William Langer.

To you, members of his family and his official household, who knew him best and therefore loved him best, we extend our sympathy in this hour of bitter pain. May yours be the comfort of all good Christians who trust in the everlasting mercy, and through your tears look meekly up to Christ, the God of all consolation.

William Langer will long be remembered by us, and never forgotten by Holy Mother Church. Until time shall be no more she will number him among those countless souls for whom she prays unceasingly: "Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon them. May his soul and the souls of all the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace. Amen."

STEPS TAKEN BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE GATES TO PREVENT INTERSERVICE DISPUTES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an article which appeared in last Thursday's New York Times describing the steps taken by Secretary of Defense Tom Gates to head off interservice disputes.

Mr. Gates has announced his intention to participate actively in the decisions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff whenever there is in fact, or appears to be imminent, a disagreement among the heads of the military services as to a matter of their joint policy.

Secretary Gates' plan should be widely acclaimed. It has been recommended for many years by leading authorities in the field of military organization. It is a direct, concrete step toward greater civilian control of our Military Establishment, and will bring our Nation's chief defense policymaker into the important daily decisions of our military chiefs.

Knowing Mr. Gates well, I can say to the Senate that his decision will undoubtedly go a long way toward resolving some of the time-consuming, bitter, and wasteful interservice quarreling which has marred our defense organization in the past. Because of Mr. Gates' familiarity with the problems of the military services and because of his long experience in the Defense Department, and his keen understanding of our Nation's defense needs, his personal contributions with the Joint Chiefs of Staff will, I know, add much to our military decision-making process and will further insure the formulation of sound policies for our Nation's security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two news articles on the subject be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

GATES ACTS TO NIP POLICY DISPUTES OF JOINT CHIEFS—DEMANDS THAT DIFFERENCES BE REPORTED SO HE CAN SIT IN ON SESSIONS

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, January 6—Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., announced plans today to intervene swiftly when the Joint Chiefs of Staff failed to agree on military matters.

The Defense Secretary disclosed that he had issued a memorandum to the chiefs demanding that he be informed as soon as there was an inkling of policy differences among them.

He said he would sit with the chiefs in formal session, rather than wait for them to present their differences to him through the chairman.

If necessary, he continued, he will quickly advise President Eisenhower whenever the chiefs are unable to resolve their disputes, as has often happened.

RETURNS FROM MEETING

Secretary Gates referred to the new piece of paper upon his return from a 2-day meeting at Atlantic Fleet headquarters, Norfolk, Va., with the chiefs, the service secretaries, and field commanders from all over the world.

He shrugged off most efforts to elicit comment on criticisms of the United States de-

fense readiness. But when asked about one of these criticisms made in New York today by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, retired Army Chief of Staff, the Secretary snapped:

"I guess I am not as wise as General Taylor."

The specific charge that prompted Secretary Gates' acid rejoinder was that the Soviet Union was 2 years ahead of the United States in long-range ballistic missiles.

There were other demands today for the strengthening of U.S. defenses, indicating a point of major interest for Congress this session. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican, of Connecticut, who is a member of the Armed Service Committee, said this country's defenses must be "impregnable" until "an effective, controlled disarmament is negotiated."

PROPOSED BUDGET CRITICIZED

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, and a member of the Appropriations and Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committees, said the proposed defense budget "falls to make needed increases" for military programs.

In discussing his memorandum, which was issued last week but made public only today, Secretary Gates emphasized that he wanted to do all in his power to perfect the Joint Chiefs and preserve them as a body because "I believe in it."

The Secretary thus confirmed that his memorandum dealt with one of the major criticisms of the Pentagon. General Taylor, in his book, "The Uncertain Trumpet," called for an end to the Joint Chiefs and their replacement by a single chief.

General Taylor said that from 1955 to 1959 there were at least 23 split papers presented to the Secretary of Defense by the Joint Chiefs.

General Taylor also complained that the chiefs only infrequently had access to the President and almost as infrequently had the opportunity to discuss problems at length with the Secretary of Defense.

Some notable differences among the Joint Chiefs have concerned the size and deployment of ground forces, the amount of investment in strategic nuclear power, the structure of a proposed Middle East Command, the extent of authority of the Continental Air Defense Commander, the need to establish a unified strategic command to take over all strategic weapons, and the proper investment in certain types of air defense weapons.

Secretary Gates, in his memorandum, called attention to the existing responsibility of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs to keep the head of the Defense Department informed on matters before the military body, including divergencies.

"It is logical to assume that occasional divergencies in view will continue to be experienced within the Joint Chiefs of Staff," he went on.

"In view of the fundamental nature of matters which come before the Joint Chiefs of Staff for study, such divergencies are understandable. It is important, however, that such problems be resolved promptly in order that orderly planning may proceed and, where required, prompt action taken.

CONSULTATIONS URGED

After requesting in the memorandum that he be promptly advised of "any issue on which a difference of opinion is developing," the Secretary pointed out his intention for himself or deputy to meet with the Joint Chiefs when they discussed the memorandum in a formal session.

"I would like to emphasize," Mr. Gates said in his memorandum, "that the above procedure should not be interpreted as precluding any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from bringing to my personal attention any matter affecting the Joint Chiefs of Staff or a single service."

This appeared to refer directly to some of the complaints of General Taylor and other high Army officials in the past.

"I look upon such discussions as matters of the highest priority within the Department of Defense and will gladly make time available in my schedule for such meetings regardless of any schedule I may have."

Secretary Gates told newsmen that, as Deputy Secretary, he had undertaken such consultations with the Joint Chiefs but that the new memorandum had made it a formal requirement.

THE GATES' MEMORANDUM: SECRETARY CLEARS WAY FOR DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The memorandum announced in Washington yesterday by Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., may influence an expected congressional debate on defense reorganization.

Several Congressmen have urged further changes in the Pentagon. Some would abolish the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Others would create a single Chief of Staff over all the services. Some would merge all the services. Support for these proposals, never likely to be strong in an election year because of lack of voter appeal, may be considerably weakened by Mr. Gates' announcement.

The memorandum, which requires that the Defense Secretary or his deputy sit with the Joint Chiefs whenever differences develop among them, will tend simultaneously to strengthen the Joint Chief and civilian control.

URGED FOR SOME TIME

The simple procedure ordered by Mr. Gates had been urged for some time by high-ranking officers in the Pentagon and other experts on defense organization.

Neil H. McElroy, former Secretary of Defense, who retired last month, occasionally attended meetings of the Joint Chiefs during the last part of his regime. But the procedure was not regular, either in his case or in that of any other Secretary of Defense.

Some observers believe that Mr. McElroy and other Secretaries postponed or compromised decisions when there were divergencies between the services, or made decisions on the basis of inadequate firsthand knowledge of the problems involved.

The procedure that Mr. Gates has now required, that he is known as a hard worker, and the importance he attaches to intimate face-to-face meetings with the military chiefs would seem to insure that the new Secretary will have all the facts necessary to make decisions.

MAKES IMPRESSION

This, in itself, represents a strengthening of civilian control at the top level. Moreover, Mr. Gates' implicit recognition of the desirability of some divergencies in strategic thought sets him squarely in opposition to those who advocate a single military "party line," or a single military chief for all the services.

Some officers were particularly impressed by the Secretary's emphasis on his accessibility to all the service chiefs at any time.

Thus, the memorandum is being hailed by some officers as a milestone for the immediate future in the evolution of Defense Department organization.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to concur in the observations which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and to say I think a most progressive, forward step has been taken by a very

capable Secretary of Defense in determining that he will sit in on decisions when controversies develop, because it emphasizes civilian control over the Military Establishment, for one thing, and it will have a rather chastening effect when differences may arise from time to time. I noted with great satisfaction that this step was taken.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his contribution. I may add that as the Senator knows and I know, when a fire starts it is much easier to put it out when it is small, and before it gets too big and spreads; and I hope the action the Secretary has announced he will take will have a comparably salutary effect.

ROCKET TESTS IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, we shall not improve our position in world opinion by protesting to the Russians against their making rocket tests over lonely spaces in the Pacific while we do the same thing.

If my understanding of the situation is correct, what the Russians propose to do is what we have done. Moreover, it is what we have asserted our right to do even when the Japanese protested. The area involved, as I understand, does not embrace any islands mandated under the United Nations. It is open, uninhabited ocean. The notices Russia has given are similar to those we have given to guard ships and planes against accidents.

I have just returned, Mr. President, from a 31-day trip around the world, during which I made 18 stops at overseas points. If travel does anything for a man, it exposes him to as many tides of world opinion as wash the shores of the places he visits. Moreover, it makes him realize that there are many people in the world, and that the United States is not the only country with pride and honor.

Nor can we be indifferent to what happens elsewhere. I visited the lower house of the parliamentary body in India the day Prime Minister Nehru replied to critics of his China policy.

He reminded them that China and India are big powers and that a military conflict between them would hardly be a police action; that a little war between them would not stay little; that war between India and China would engulf the world.

We sometimes forget that India, with 400 million people, and China, with more than 650 million, comprise half the population of the world. Aroused, modernized, mobilized, their manpower and their resources would be impressive and would be complicating for every major power on earth. It gave this member of the U.S. Senate pause for reflection to hear parliamentarians in New Delhi debate issues on the basis of war involvement for the United States.

Mr. President, at a later date I hope to review some of the matters which came to my attention in countries visited, where I went over both military and economic aid programs to the extent that time permitted. At this time, however, I merely wish to point out that

there are many people in this world, and we do not impress them by seeking to deny for other countries privileges we assert for ourselves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was interested in what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota had to say about the freedom of the seas. It is true, of course, that the high seas are free to all nations, but the use of that freedom in an arbitrary fashion to the detriment of other nations is irresponsible and provocative.

The recent Russian announcement of the intention to use the Pacific for a missile testing range is arbitrary. Hence, it is both irresponsible and provocative.

It is arbitrary because—

First. No known prior consultation was taken with nations whose interests are deeply involved in the Pacific.

Second. A large section of the ocean was set apart, close by missile-measurement, to islands which are the property of or the responsibility of other nations.

Third. The nations of the world were brusquely advised to stay out of the area.

Fourth. No ships or planes have been provided to patrol the area in order to warn the unwary away from the danger zone.

Fifth. No consideration has been given to nations whose fishing and transportation industries may be damaged by the arbitrary interference.

Sixth. Other areas—the Arctic, for example—are available for testing. These are remote areas of little economic importance, areas of minimal interference with the rights of others.

Seventh. The test, coming as it does at this time in an ocean of great significance to American security and commerce, is bound to be interpreted as casting doubt on the peaceful professions of Mr. Khrushchev. It is, to say the least, to use a Russian phrase, not in the spirit of Camp David.

Eighth. The arbitrary setting aside of an unpatrolled area in the Central Pacific by the Russians is not in the same category as our use of similar areas for testing. In those cases, we acted only after attempting to get agreement on international control of weapons. Moreover, we used areas for the tests close to territories under our control, and we patrolled them. And when damage was done to others, we paid for the damage. These tests, finally, have not been resumed for 18 months. We are trying now to obtain a multilateral ban not only on such tests but on all nuclear tests.

Ninth. Nor is the Russian-announced missile test similar to the Canaveral range tests. The latter are far from the vital interests of the other missile powers. These tests can, in no way, be considered provocative. They were in process long before the spirit of Camp David came into being. Moreover, the Canaveral range operates with the approval and cooperation of nations whose territories neighbor upon it.

I have before me a magazine entitled "Aviation Week," containing an article entitled "Space Technology," in which is shown the location of the tracking stations in the Caribbean and the South Atlantic. It is my understanding that

agreements have been reached with every foreign country having a direct interest in the matter. The area has been placed in little danger, although there have been, if my memory serves me, test missiles which have gone off their course. Those countries did not receive a notice only 8 days before the missile tests were supposed to start. There was no arbitrary action.

No consideration is given to the feelings of this country; to others who have regular navigation routes; to the feelings of the Japanese, who have fishing rights. No consideration is given to the feelings of the people who occupy the general area of that vast expanse of the South Pacific.

If international law is deficient in this respect, I think it ought to be corrected, so that regulation can be applied to all nations which have a vested interest in international law, in the waters of the world.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I simply wish to say to the Senator from Montana, I did not know until after I had prepared a part of my statement this morning that the Senator had made any statement on this subject. My remarks were prompted by the statement which I saw the other day which was attributed to former President Truman.

After reading the morning newspaper, I called the State Department earlier today to find out the facts. I was told that so far as they had been able to determine the facts, what the Russians are proposing is what we did in the Pacific—what we did and asserted our right to do after the Japanese had protested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The time of the Senator has elapsed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional minute.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are not conducting any experiments of this nature of which I am aware in the vicinity of the Kamchatka Peninsula or the Bering Sea.

So far as this particular incident is concerned, I would have hoped that the Soviet Union would have discussed it with the nations which have a vital interest in that area of the world. It appears to me that what the Soviet Union is doing is setting aside something on the order of 27,000 square miles—an area in extent, I believe, approximately 200 miles wide and 300 miles long—and saying, in effect, "This is Mare Nostrum. This is our sea; and here we are going to carry on these tests."

If we are to have international comity, and if we are to have summit meetings to consider these matters, then I think we ought to get together ahead of time and, if need be, call a special meeting of the United Nations, at which meeting there could be devised some means of working out an agreement to regulate and to control international waters, except for the littoral of the countries

concerned. Or, if there is to be a summit meeting, we could make this one of the top items on the agenda for consideration at that time.

There is obviously a need for some international regulation of the use of the high seas by all nations for any purpose of this kind; that is, the testing not only of nuclear devices but of missiles as well.

The rights of all nations become involved in this matter. The destruction of fish, the inconvenience to transportation affects all, however limited or indirect the effect may be on some. If these tests are to go on, the need is for them to proceed in a regularized fashion so as to minimize the inconvenience to others, so as to reduce their provocation, so as to avoid damage to others and to provide compensation for it when it occurs by accident.

SCHEENECTADY UNEMPLOYMENT HEARINGS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have just returned from Schenectady, N.Y., where on Friday the Senate special Committee on Unemployment Problems held hearings on economic conditions in the Mohawk Valley area. These hearings were highly successful, and I am hopeful that they will provide guidelines for Congress in dealing with unemployment problem areas throughout our land.

The Mohawk Valley is a fine area, with a proud cultural and historic heritage. Its economy is diversified. There is found there an excellent and highly skilled labor force. The valley has a pleasant climate, and many wonderful recreational and cultural assets. At the moment, unemployment in the area is high, but certainly not critical.

The people of the Mohawk Valley are by no means discouraged. They are working hard to solve their present difficulties. Cities throughout the valley have cooperated closely with the New York State Department of Commerce in the Department's efforts to attract new industries to the State. Furthermore, they themselves have organized intensive programs of self-help to revitalize their economy and to attract new industry into the area. Their efforts are meeting with heartening success. The economy of the valley is moving forward. Employment is on the rise. Optimism is the spirit of the day. Although much hard work remains to be done, I am confident that the people of this area will be fully successful.

As an illustration of the worthy efforts being made on the part of the people of the Mohawk Valley, I call attention to the work of the Schenectady industrial development program. This program has a very unique and certainly appropriate name—GUTS, Inc. Spelled out in action, GUTS means "Gear Up for Tomorrow in Schenectady." This is an attitude which I greatly admire. It allows no room for defeat or lethargy.

Mr. President, I salute the leaders of GUTS and the many men of action from other communities throughout the valley for the fine work they have devoted

to the strengthening and rebuilding of the economy of the Mohawk Valley.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by Mr. Lewis B. Harris, its general chairman, describing the work of GUTS, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GUTS, INC.—"Gear Up for Tomorrow in Schenectady" is a communitywide self-help movement with the objective of creating economic opportunity for Schenectady citizens by—

(a) Making existing businesses so outstandingly effective that they capture a share of America's growing markets.

(b) Attracting new businesses to Schenectady.

A specific GUTS goal is 10,000 new jobs by 1963.

GUTS is different from efforts of thousands of competing communities in that the responsibility for creating economic opportunity is not relegated to a few affluent citizens or institutions but is in fact a cause being vigorously pursued by business, government, clergy, labor, education—everybody, demonstrating the truth of the GUTS slogan "150,000 people with a purpose."

GUTS is carefully organized with specific responsibility assignments and thorough orientation of all individuals assigned to GUTS positions so that they precisely know their own responsibilities, the overall organization objectives, and the relation of their own assignments to the other positions in the organization.

The community spirit and purpose is seen in the fact that in the traditional American spirit of community "barn raising," all local services, materials, facilities, and human effort required by GUTS are being provided at no charge. The GUTS office pays no rent. Its staff are all volunteers. Ads and commercials are run free by local newspapers and broadcasters. Its brochures are prepared and printed free. Prospective employers, when in Schenectady, pay no hotel fees. Their meals, transportation, and entertainment are provided at no charge, and so on.

GUTS believes and Schenectady County intends to demonstrate that in the final analysis the success of a business depends not on technology or location, but on people—skilled, intelligent, outstanding people who are enthusiastic about their jobs and their employers—people who expect to be well paid and intend to be worth it.

In a country in which the traditions which made it great are all but forgotten, GUTS represents a return to the old values; 150,000 people are reaffirming their belief in making their own opportunities; in working skillfully, intelligently, enthusiastically in preparing themselves and their community to make the maximum contribution to businesses who see their opportunity in the community's energy.

Many businesses apparently have been finding newer, industrially speaking, sections of the United States more attractive than the older sections of which Schenectady is an example. We believe that in such action they will find themselves on the same road they are hoping to avoid but simply at an earlier place in time—a road characterized by self-seeking groups who will relentlessly pursue their partisan interests without concern for others or the total system of which they are a part.

What is needed is a new road entirely different from the one habitually followed of late. This new road is characterized by cooperation and a demonstration that individuals and groups can find a way to develop and pursue a common purpose without sub-

ordinating individual and group purposes and losing individual and group freedoms.

All new roads must begin somewhere. It is GUTS' contention that the start of a new road which emphasizes America's treasured values is to be found in Schenectady.

GOOD NEWS ON CANCER RESEARCH

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an article written by William L. Laurence and published in the New York Times of Sunday, January 10, 1960, contains heartening news on the progress of research on cancer being conducted by the Sloan-Kettering Institute of Cancer Research. In his excellent analysis of a report published by the institute, Mr. Laurence states:

The evidence so far suggests that the Sloan-Kettering scientists are on the road to an anticancer vaccine.

Mr. President, this is wonderful news. The American people can be proud of the fine work being done by scientists of the Sloan-Kettering Institute, and of many other similar research organizations, to find a means of curing and preventing one of man's most dreaded diseases. Undoubtedly, a great deal of hard work lies ahead in the battle against cancer. In this light, we must consider the good news from Sloan-Kettering as an indication of the need to dedicate our maximum effort and the fullest possible resources to this great battle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Laurence's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SLOAN-KETTERING INSTITUTE REPORTS ON 2 YEARS OF CANCER RESEARCH (By William L. Laurence)

The Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, one of the world's major centers dedicated to the search for means to control mankind's second greatest killer, made public its biennial report last week. It contains a general picture of research in progress, based on more than 700 scientific reports published by the institute's staff during the 2-year period from July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1959.

Among the liveliest projects in current cancer research is the quest for means to stimulate the body's natural defenses against invading cancer cells.

When bacteria or viruses attack the body a multitude of defenses are summoned. All of the known forces that the body calls into action in its own defense are components or products of a group of related cells found in the spleen, liver, bone marrow, and lymph nodes, known collectively as the reticuloendothelial system, or RES.

ANTIBODY REACTION

The best known products of this system are antibodies, special protein molecules shaped specifically by the body to react with a particular foreign material and immobilize it. Other defensive elements include white blood cells with various functions, such as the phagocytes which eat up offending particles and the fibroblasts which wall them off, and defense-promoting chemicals such as complement and properdin.

Scientists in the solid tumor section of the institute's experimental chemotherapy division have been studying the effects of cancer growth on the vital defense network of the RES.

The test subjects are mice implanted with sarcoma 180, a vigorous, rapidly growing, readily transplantable mouse cancer. During the first few days of the cancer's growth, the report states, RES cells multiply in visible numbers, "apparently responding to the threat of the growing cancer." Other invaders, however, are handled more swiftly and efficiently during this period. Then, as the aggressive tumor continues to grow, the tide turns. The defense system, exhausted by the unequal struggle, begins to break down and finally fails completely. Bacteria, always present in the body, but ordinarily held in check, begin to multiply and finally take over. In these animals, as in cancer patients, infection is often the direct cause of death.

If, before the RES is exhausted, it is given a sudden boost, "it may be able to overcome the cancer implant," the report says.

The most effective booster tried so far is *Bacillus Calmette-Guérin* (BCG), which has been used for years to stimulate resistance in children exposed to tuberculosis. BCG injections, the report states, "have produced 100 percent recovery from sarcoma 180 implanted in laboratory mice." Studies are now in progress of animals with spontaneous cancers, to discover whether these have the same effect on the defense system and whether stimulation of the defenses can slow or stop their growth.

PLANTED IN EGGS

A technique has been developed in the embryology section of the experimental chemotherapy division for planting fragments of human cancer on the membrane of the fertilized egg. Depending on the type of cancer, the cells may spread throughout the embryo and young chicks may be hatched with widespread human cancer. Most of the chicks die within a few weeks, but some survive; as these mature "something within their bodies begins to destroy the cancer."

Similar studies are being carried out on cancer defenses in the rat. When untreated rats are injected with minced human cancer, the foreign cells are rapidly destroyed in the rats' bodies. Blood and tissue samples were taken from the animals 7 days after an injection with a type of human cancer now grown widely in laboratory animals and test tubes by methods developed at Sloan-Kettering. Fresh human cancer tissue was exposed to these blood and tissue samples for 1 hour and then implanted into rats pretreated with cortisone and X-ray.

"Ordinarily, in rats so treated," the report states, "injected human cancers will grow—hundreds are grown this way every week—but these human cancers do not. They had been killed by antibodies manufactured in the body of the rat."

BROKEN CELLS

In a second group of experiments, the human cancer cells were broken by grinding and then separated into five fractions containing different cell components by whirling in the ultracentrifuge. Each of the five fractions was injected into a different group of animals, but blood samples from only two of the five groups were toxic to the cancer cells. These blood samples not only killed cells in the test tube but, when injected into animals, killed cancer cells planted in them 2 or 3 days previously.

These two active anticancer fractions are the only two containing fragments of a canal-like system known as the endoplasmic reticulum, a network believed to connect the cell's outer membrane with the nucleus and other key chemical control points. "Do these canals, and perhaps the membrane itself, contain some specific substance that spells 'foreign' or 'cancer' to the body and signals it to mobilize its defenses?" the report asks.

What may turn out to be the most significant studies of all are those of cancer defenses in man, which in many ways parallel those going forward on laboratory animals. Human cancer cells were implanted in two groups of volunteers: healthy inmates of the Ohio State Penitentiary; and advanced cancer patients from the James Ewing Hospital of the city of New York.

"In the healthy men," the report states, "the cancer implants promptly evoked a strong defense reaction. There was some initial growth but within 4 weeks all the cancer had been destroyed. In contrast, in the patients with advanced cancer, the implanted cancer cells grew vigorously. Clearly, healthy persons have a resistance to implanted cancer that is weak or lacking in patients with advanced cancer.

"Second implants of cancer cells were made in both groups of volunteers. In both, the cells were rejected with greatly increased vigor. Thus, additional resistance could be induced to implanted cancer, just as it can to a viral or bacterial invader.

SECOND IMPLANT

"When cancer cells of different types were used for the second implant, the reaction was less vigorous than with the same type, but more than that seen on the initial implant of cells. This was particularly interesting and important information; it meant that the resistance is partly specific for the particular type of cancer, but all cancers so far tested (the total is now seven) do share some common resistance-evoking factors.

"Even when killed, the cancer cells retain these factors, just as killed or inactivated virus particles, as in the Salk polio vaccine, may evoke resistance to disease carried by the live virus. Injection of the killed cancer cells produces no characteristic nodule under the skin and no inflammation, but when a second implant is given, the rejection response is as prompt and vigorous as if the first had been made up of living material."

The defense-evoking factors shared by the cancer cells were "clearly not present in the normal cells the investigators were able to study, but the studies are not yet adequate to permit generalization," the report states. The evidence so far suggests that the Sloan-Kettering scientists are on the road to an anticancer vaccine.

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the adjournment of Congress a number of citizens of my home State of Kansas conferred with me regarding the matter of an additional Federal judge for the district of Kansas.

There is pending on the Senate Calendar an omnibus judgeship bill which includes an additional judge for our district, and I sincerely hope that we may get early action on it.

The U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas for many years was presided over by a single district judge. Authorization in 1945 for an additional temporary judicial position expired within a year, because of the death of Judge Helvering. An additional permanent judgeship was finally authorized in 1949. However, the business of the district has continued to expand, and in April 1954 the Judicial Conference of the United States recommended the creation of a third judgeship for the State. This recommendation has been renewed annually for the last 5 years.

Since 1941, the number of civil cases commenced annually in the district of Kansas has tripled. In that year 291 civil cases were filed compared with 954 in 1959, as is shown in the table from which I shall presently quote. For the last 9 fiscal years the civil caseload has risen almost steadily, and the backlog has also increased, but at a somewhat lesser rate. This is due not only to the hard work of the resident judges, but also to the use of visiting judges from other districts who have been sent in to handle the large volume of business. The civil cases filed, terminated, and pending at the end of each year for the last 9 fiscal years has been as follows:

Fiscal year	Com-menced	Termi-nated	Pending on June 30
1951.....	554	578	336
1952.....	555	505	386
1953.....	661	584	463
1954.....	792	665	590
1955.....	736	798	528
1956.....	800	787	541
1957.....	727	775	493
1958.....	940	880	553
1959.....	954	948	559

The civil caseload of 477 cases per judge commenced in this district in the fiscal year 1959 was the second largest nationally, and compares with the national average of 215 such cases. Diversity of citizenship cases and habeas corpus proceedings instituted by petitioners in the Leavenworth Penitentiary are important factors in the business of the district. Habeas corpus cases on the average do not require much time for hearing, but often the decision of the constitutional questions involved and the writing of opinions are burdensome. On the other hand, the diversity cases weigh heavily upon the time of the judge because a considerable proportion of these cases reach trial.

In addition to this heavy civil caseload the district has a slightly heavier than average load of criminal cases. Excluding the immigration cases which occur only in volume in the 5 districts touching the Mexican border, and which by and large require very little time per case for disposition, the criminal caseload per judgeship of 139 cases in Kansas is larger than the national average of 108 criminal cases. The criminal caseload has remained at approximately the same level for the past 3 years.

While population per judge is by itself not the sole criterion of the number of judges needed in a particular district, it is a factor which should be taken into consideration. Kansas, with 2 district judges, had an estimated population in 1959 of 2,140,000. The population of other States having three judges is as follows:

Estimated population, July 1, 1959

State:	
Wisconsin.....	4, 010, 000
South Carolina.....	2, 417, 000
West Virginia.....	1, 965, 000
Oregon.....	1, 766, 000
Arkansas.....	1, 744, 000
Delaware.....	454, 000

The population of Kansas was less than that of two of the States listed and larger than that of four of these States.

The State of Washington, with a population of 2,823,000, has 4 judges; and Oklahoma, with a population of 2,276,000, has 5 judges.

There can be no question in my mind that the workload in the Kansas Federal court district is such that in the interest of those who have suits pending before that Federal district court and who are entitled to early decision of their cases an additional district judge should be provided.

PROPOSAL THAT THE SECRETARIES OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE BE MADE UNDER SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am informed that yesterday my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], said on the TV program "Meet the Press" that the Secretaries of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force should be made Under Secretaries of Defense—to strengthen the organization of the Department of Defense, and to contribute to the security of our country.

I call to the attention of my colleague and old college classmate, Senator SYMINGTON, and to the attention of the Senate the fact that on February 3, 1958, and again on September 15, 1959, I introduced in the Senate bills to accomplish what he proposed yesterday; that is, to make the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Under Secretaries of the Department of Defense. Senate bill 2728 is now before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and I am hopeful that the interest of the Senator from Missouri will be shared by other members of the committee, and that they will seriously consider it. I must say that the proposal has attracted interest in many quarters, as evidenced by editorials previously placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the Congress and throughout the country, there is much talk about the inadequacy of our defense structure. Many seem to be looking for some magic solution, or rely solely on the expenditure of billions of dollars. I point out that the bipartisan Hoover Commission report of February 28, 1949, on the Organization of the Department of Defense, and the letter of former Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett to President Truman on November 18, 1952, as he went out of office, and the reports of the Rockefeller Commission in 1953 and 1958 pointed out the divided authority between the Secretary of Defense and the three Department Secretaries, and stated that unified authority of the Secretary of Defense should be assured.

The Hoover Commission recommended, as my bill proposes, that the service Secretaries be made Under Secretaries of Defense for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

I recall that there served on that Commission, in addition to Mr. Hoover, former Secretary of State Acheson; the Commission was truly a bipartisan one. In addition, Senate bill 2728 would give authority to the Department of Defense to centralize procurement now divided

wastefully between the departments. More important, it would give authority to the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, now Dr. York, to take charge authoritatively of the functions of research and development, now split between the three Departments, with resulting duplication and waste.

The present organization has been described as a "federation," with the Departments exercising autonomous power, and with the Secretary of Defense often limited to the function of coordination—when he ought to be in charge. It is obvious that the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, although patriotic and able men, must be champions of their services, if they are to have their support; and, as civilians, they must rely in great part on the information supplied by the military services they represent. This division of authority might have been tolerated years ago; but today, when the defense budget approximates \$40 billion and may go higher, and when, more important, the very security of our Nation and the prospect of peace depend in great measure upon an effective defense structure and upon rapid progress in research, the people of the Nation cannot tolerate duplication in research, waste in procurement, and the split interests of the military departments.

I welcome the support of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]; and again, I ask the Committee on Armed Services to consider seriously this proposal, which I have advanced now for 3 years.

Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

DR. OMER CARMICHAEL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on September 11 a little over 3 years ago, President Eisenhower said:

I think Mr. Carmichael must be a very wise man. I hope to get some advice from him because he pursued the policy that I believe will finally bring success.

The President did meet a few days later with Dr. Omer Carmichael, then serving in his 11th year as superintendent of the Louisville, Ky., city school system. While this recognition of his work was one of the highest honors bestowed on Dr. Carmichael, it was typical of him that he had said: "I've never sought honors nor do I want them. I just want to do a good job."

In his quiet but firm and supremely able way, Dr. Omer Carmichael did an outstanding job in whatever tasks lay before him—of which the desegregation of our schools was but one among his efforts to provide the best education possible for the children in his charge.

Now Dr. Carmichael is dead. But the life of the community he helped to shape will continue to do honor to his perseverance and resolution of character, to his sense of duty, and to his calm nobility—just as his work will go on in the finest of living memorials, the daily work of the hundreds of men and women who owe, in part, their education to him.

At this time, I know the people of Kentucky extend their sympathy to Mrs. Carmichael, and to their three children. I wish to pay my own respects to a man whom I knew as a conscientious, thoroughly professional, and warmly human educator—a man of spirit and purpose.

Dr. Carmichael was born on a cotton farm at Hollins, Ala., in 1890, and financed his own education at the University of Alabama, where a cousin, Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, later served as president. His degree in mathematics, his knowledge of Latin and Greek, his experience as a teacher, his work as a superintendent of schools in Alabama, Florida, and Virginia, gave him broad background for his 14 years of service as superintendent of the Louisville schools.

On the day the Supreme Court announced its decision in the Brown case in 1954, Omer Carmichael said:

It will be my purpose to implement that decision with no effort to sidestep—no effort by subterfuge or sharp practice to defeat the purpose of the Court.

And while his accomplishment of quiet desegregation of the Louisville public schools may be recognized by the Nation as his crowning achievement, Kentuckians will also mourn a fine educator, a valued adviser, and a good friend—a man of principle who held the respect of his city, his State, and his country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial regarding Dr. Carmichael, from today's Louisville Courier-Journal.

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

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Jan. 11, 1960]

OMER CARMICHAEL: A DEDICATED ORDINARY MAN

Omer Carmichael would have been the last person to wish to hear himself described as an extraordinary man. Indeed, he typified the ordinary man at his best; the decent, unassuming, conscientious American who so often confounds the skeptics by rising to meet a challenge, moral or physical, with bravery and an unswerving instinct for the right thing to do.

It was thus that Mr. Carmichael, until 1954 a good but unremarkable superintendent of a good but unremarkable public school system, rose to meet the challenge of integrating the white and Negro schools of Louisville. Most of his fellow superintendents, many of them, it is true, lacking the consciousness of public approval and support that Mr. Carmichael knew could be counted upon here, retreated in confusion and postponed the inevitable day of reckoning.

Omer Carmichael met the challenge simply and directly. Immediately the Court's decision was made known, he announced: "It will be my purpose to implement that decision with no effort to sidestep, no effort by subterfuge or sharp practices to defeat the purpose of the Court."

For 2 years thereafter, he talked, explained, listened, and prepared. The result was that Louisville's integration of schools, when it came, was a model for the Nation. It was quiet, dignified, without ugly incident. And the one man to whom most credit accrued was the superintendent of schools.

This was not the only accomplishment of Omer Carmichael's career in Louisville. Our school system steadily improved under him.

The lot of the teacher, the education of the student, have advanced in the years he spent here. But the story of school integration in Louisville will remain his accolade. Here was a southerner by birth and upbringing, who realized at once that the habits and prejudices of a lifetime could not be allowed to stand against the law of the land. A good man has left us, and he is sincerely mourned.

PRESERVING PADRE ISLAND AS A NATIONAL SEASHORE: A PLACE OF TRANQUILLITY AND NATURAL BEAUTY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an excellent editorial in the New York Times of Sunday January 10, 1960, serves to remind us that soon the Senate and the House will have an opportunity to act on legislation designed to preserve several national seashore and park areas, and that the time in which to preserve these areas is short—the need critical.

Among the projects under consideration is S. 4, a proposal to establish a national seashore area on Padre Island—a 117-mile-long island with a beautiful sand beach stretching along the coast of Texas in the Gulf of Mexico.

Last month in considering the Padre Island Park proposal, Texans from all walks of life were highly pleased to have the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs subcommittee staff, hold public hearings in Corpus Christi. They did an unusually outstanding job of gathering the facts. They inspected the island from the air and heard testimony from more than 40 witnesses.

Among those who testified was the Honorable Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service. He has since informed me that the hearings constituted one of the most overwhelming endorsements for a park project he ever has attended.

The editorial in yesterday's New York Times correctly points out that "only legislative action can assure the preservation of the best such areas—like Padre Island—which still exist." The editorial also states the challenge to us as a people. Are we to be less mindful of our natural heritage than were those of the boss-and-corruption-ridden 1870's and 1880's, when the park system was started and Yellowstone preserved?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial from the New York Times of January 10, 1960, entitled "Room To Breathe."

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

ROOM TO BREATHE

When Yellowstone was established as the first national park in a remarkable burst of prescience by the 42d Congress in the unlikely year 1872, the American domain seemed to be limitless, stretching over thousands of uninhabited miles and untouched country. Yet in the decades since then almost all of the great wilderness has disappeared, the forests have been cut, the rivers polluted, the mountains defaced, the grasses burnt, the game decimated, the long, clean, white miles of ocean beach contaminated and exploited.

This has been the sorry story of our country's physical development—inevitable, perhaps, but nonetheless destructive of so much of the natural beauty and inherent recreational and spiritual values that belong to the American land. Now the forces of expansion and destruction are increasing their pressures with spectacular speed and intensity on the little that remains of untouched tranquillity and natural peace in the open spaces of America.

Only legislative action can assure the preservation of the best of such areas that still exist. Years of investigative and survey work by public and private agencies have determined where they are: the upper Potomac, Cape Cod, several places on the Great Lakes, an island off Texas, two or three spots on the Pacific coast, the Cascade Mountains of Washington, the Great Basin of Nevada, and so on. The National Park system must be expanded to include such areas, and a national wilderness system must be established by law to insure their permanent preservation. The legislation is prepared; we are confident that public sentiment is behind it.

The exploiters are, as usual, a major stumbling block. Will the 86th Congress of 1960 be more timorous, more subject to pressures of special interests, more reluctant to take bold affirmative steps for the public good than that old Congress in the corruption-ridden, exploitative days of 1872?

RAVENSWOOD, W. VA., POSTAL FACILITY IS DEDICATED; AUTOMATION AND POLITICAL PATRONAGE DISCUSSED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege on Saturday, January 9, 1960, to participate in dedication ceremonies for the new U.S. post office facility at Ravenswood, W. Va. The gathering was presided over by the Honorable John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., a former U.S. Senator from West Virginia, and chairman of the Greater Ravenswood Chamber of Commerce dedication committee. Also present was another former U.S. Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable Chapman Revercomb. These West Virginians are, of course, well known to many of my colleagues.

Walter J. Purdy, a member of the chamber of commerce dedication committee, delivered the address of welcome in the stead of Mayor Pearl O. Milhoan, of Ravenswood, who was unable to attend. The program chairman was introduced by Ravenswood's acting postmaster, W. James Blackburn.

Kenneth L. Rabidoux, Assistant Director of the Post Office Department's Real Estate Division, spoke as the official representative of the Department, and told those who attended the dedication event that the new Ravenswood Post Office "is one of approximately 3,000 built by private enterprise and leased to the Department under the unique commercial leasing program initiated by the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield." And he said that "12,000 more of the Nation's 35,000 post offices must be replaced because of obsolescence and deterioration, in order to make this Nation's postal service fully adequate to meet the future postal requirements of its citizens."

Mr. Rabidoux had earlier pointed out that "last year Americans mailed 61 billion pieces of letter mail and over one

billion parcels. Combined, these figures represent two-thirds of the world's mail and represent an increase in volume of 120 percent in 20 years," he said, and remarked that, in order to keep ahead of this continuing growth, a gigantic overhauling of postal facilities has been initiated. Then he pointed out that in "the massive overhauling" are provisions for mechanizing the handling and distribution of mail in the so-called "gateway" post offices. Mr. Rabidoux called the "metro-mail" coordinated program still another breakthrough in mail handling.

Representative KEN HECHLER, of the Fourth West Virginia District, the other scheduled speaker on the dedication program, declared that "political patronage, political jobs, and political influence ought to be cleaned out at all levels of government, and I'm going to do my best to see that it is done, whether in the post office or the taking of the census or anywhere else."

Stating that "the only place where political appointments should be made is at the very highest level of government, where policymaking positions should be filled by those who are in accord with the program of the elected executive," the diligent and capable Representative further asserted:

Postmasters ought to be taken out of politics, postal employees should be promoted on merit, and if I have anything to say about it I'm going to put a stop to these political hacks running around with pieces of political litmus paper to stick in the mouths of Government employees.

I also advocate that in West Virginia the 1960 census be taken by unemployed West Virginians instead of by "political hangers-on." At a time when West Virginia has the highest rate of unemployment in the Nation and thousands are suffering, it would make a lot of sense to award these census jobs to those in need, instead of based upon "political pull" dictated by a political boss (the Republican State chairman) in Clarksburg, W. Va.

What large business would survive today, Representative HECHLER asked, "if its president insisted all employees belong to his own lodge or graduated from his own school and belonged to his church? Honestly, ability, and efficiency are not confined to one political party. America was founded as a land of equal opportunity and if we forget that fact we may become a second-rate power."

The Ravenswood High School Band, under Director James F. Porter, provided music for the event, while Reverend Walter Elwood, pastor of the Ravenswood First Presbyterian Church, and Rev. Paul Bell, pastor of the Ravenswood First Baptist Church, prayed the invocation and benediction. The color guard for flag-raising ceremonies was furnished by Ables-Rayburn Post No. 118 of the American Legion.

Ravenswood, situated along the beautiful Ohio River—one of our country's most important inland navigable streams—is a progressive and rapidly developing community, the principal industry of which is the large Kaiser aluminum facility nearby. Kaiser's Ravenswood Reduction Works and Rolling Mill afford employment for more than 3,000 in the production of primary aluminum sheet, plate, circles, foil and building products. This enterprising

organization has brought growth and stability to the economy of the Ravenswood community, and has been a most timely and welcomed addition to the West Virginia industrial complex.

The Greater Ravenswood Chamber of Commerce has been aggressive and diligent in developing the potential of its area of influence and representation, and Ravenswood's interests are likewise well represented in the State legislature by State Senator Paul R. Moore of that city, and Delegate Wayne W. Hughes. Both Senator Moore and Delegate Hughes were present for the post office dedication ceremonies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

WE MUST HAVE THE B-70 WEAPONS SYSTEM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, within recent weeks, while Congress was in the adjournment period, the Department of Defense announced that in response to a Presidential budgetary directive, the development program for the B-70 bomber has been "stretched out" and "cut back" to the point where it no longer represents any serious attempt to develop and produce this bomber as a weapons system.

I rise to question the wisdom of this decision, to suggest in fact that it is a blunder which may have the gravest consequences to our national security, and to urge that the decision be reversed.

At the present time, and throughout the first half of the next decade, the Soviet Union possesses and will possess a commanding superiority in operational ICBM's, the intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Last winter, the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. McElroy, admitted that if the Soviets produce missiles at what we believe their capability to be, and we produce those we now plan to, the Soviets will maintain a lead of approximately three to one throughout the early 1960's.

In addition to this, we know from the accuracies we have achieved with our present ICBM, the Atlas, that it is possible to pinpoint a target many thousands of miles away with almost incredible precision.

The President of the United States mentioned that the other day in his state of the Union message. It is a fact that we have even greater precision than the President stated in his state of the Union message.

We have absolutely no reason to believe that the Soviets are behind us in this field. We must assume that it is possible for them to achieve a circular error probability at least as good as that which we can achieve.

This accuracy, without revealing any classified materials, is such as to convince me that the Soviets soon could pinpoint an attack on Vandenberg and the other missile bases we have built and are building and completely obliterate them all in the first strike, leaving us without any retaliatory strike force in the missile category after that first blow.

What I am saying is that while the President of the United States was calling attention to our accuracy in the missile field, we have to assume that the Russians have the same accuracy. If the Russians have the same accuracy they can knock out the Vandenberg Base on the first strike, and they can knock out the missile bases being built in Wyoming and in other places, because the Atlas sticks up like a church on fire.

Until we develop and have operational a large force of ICBM's which either are mobile, or can be hidden, we will not have that indestructible missile retaliatory strike force which is the keystone of our security.

We are working on such missiles now, but they are not yet perfected.

And until the time when we have an operational force of sufficient Minuteman missiles in service with a number of them operating from mobile bases, and until we also have a fleet of nuclear submarines fitted with operational Polaris missiles at their stations, we must depend upon the manned bomber capable of delivering nuclear bombs to potential enemy targets as a major part of our deterrent force. In fact, many authorities believe we will always need to maintain manned aircraft as part of our total deterrent force.

Currently we depend on the B-47 and the B-52, and we may count on their capabilities being improved in the years ahead by such advances as air-to-surface missiles and improved electronic countermeasures. We are building a handful of B-58s.

But we also know that a large portion of Soviet scientific and military effort is devoted to defense against the manned bomber. We have every reason to suspect that such are and will be the improvements in their defenses that year-by-year effective penetration by these aircraft will become more and more difficult, until at some point they will cease altogether to be an effective deterrent.

I have reason to believe that our present bombers are becoming less and less useful because of the greater perfection in the Soviet defenses.

If we are to maintain the manned bomber as part of our deterrent force, we must have a long range supersonic bomber with cruise and target speeds of at least mach 2.5 and a range of more than 7,000 miles. We must have the B-70.

The B-70 will have a cruise and target speed of mach 3, triple that of the B-52, cutting target time from continental U.S. bases from 8 to 12 hours to 2 to 3 hours, at an altitude of 80,000 feet, compared to only 50,000 for the B-52. A B-70, or a squadron of B-70s in the air over the North Pole could deliver payloads to Soviet targets, such as Moscow, in 20 minutes. The B-70, according to the most reliable information which I can gather, would be at least four times as effective in penetrating defenses as the B-52, can be operated from existing B-52 bases with an equal reaction time, and can be employed on airborne alert.

The B-70 will make obsolete Soviet defenses designed to counter present supersonic aircraft. The very knowledge that

we are seriously developing such a weapons system will enormously complicate the Soviet defense problem. It will complicate it in at least two ways—by forcing diversion of scientific manpower to a new and presently unnecessary task, and by forcing an expenditure of rubles to defend against the B-70 far larger than the amount it will cost us to develop and build it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Missouri, who has a very broad fund of information on this subject.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from California for his remarks with respect to the B-70 airplane. I had hoped to stay and listen to all of the Senator's address, but unfortunately have an engagement uptown. However, I did want to listen to as much of his discourse today as possible.

It is true, is it not, that if this B-70 program goes through as now planned by the administration, in effect the plane is being written off?

Mr. ENGLE. I should say that the B-70 is being "scrubbed" as a weapons system. I shall point out later in my remarks that it is intended to build a prototype, but that that project will be stretched out. What I am saying is that we need the B-70 now, because we shall need it during the period of time when we shall not have an indestructible retaliatory missile capability.

The President said the other day in his state of the Union message that we can hit within a 2-mile circle. We can do a little better than that. So can the Russians—now or soon. That would knock Vandenberg Air Force Base flatter than a fitter. Anyone who knows anything about intercontinental ballistic missiles must be aware that after the first strike we would have nothing left in missiles.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is true therefore, is it not, that today the U.S. Air Force does not have under research or development a single airplane?

Mr. ENGLE. I think that is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I never thought I would see the day when that statement would be made on the floor of the Senate.

I congratulate the Senator upon his address and hope our colleagues will carefully read the able exposition he is giving today of this serious problem.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank my distinguished colleague from Missouri.

Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I wholly concur in the statement which he made on a television program last night, with respect to the reorganization of the Defense Department.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very grateful to my friend for saying that.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to my friend and colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The answer which the junior Senator from California has just given to the junior Senator from Missouri must be measured, it seems to me, beside the fact that, as I understand, not one plane was flown in World War II which was not already on the drawing boards when World War II broke out. I ask the former Secretary of the Air Force if that is not true, if the Senator from California will yield for that purpose.

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. To my knowledge, the statement of the able Senator from Tennessee is entirely correct.

Mr. GORE. The timelag, then, between the actual effectiveness of a plane and its completion on the drawing board raises a very serious question for the early 1960's, so far as modern, efficient, comparable air power is concerned. Is that true?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There can be no question about it.

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Tennessee that if we went to work on the B-70 we could have it in inventory and in operation by 1964. That is about when we shall need it.

What I am saying is that today we do not have a bomber which can be sure of penetrating the Soviet defenses. The capability of the B-52 and the other bombers to get through is limited. So the President of the United States says to us, "We can drop an intercontinental ballistic missile into your hip pocket." We certainly can; and so can the Soviets. The Atlas, sitting like church steeples on Vandenberg Base and in Wyoming, or wherever else they may be, would be knocked as flat as the country around them; and we would not have a thing to strike back with that we can depend upon to get through. We are scrapping the B-70.

I referred to some of the assets of the B-70. I said it would complicate the problems of the Soviets in two particulars. It would require them to divert some of their scientific manpower into that field. It would require them to divert money to perfect their defenses against the B-70, which would make obsolete their present defenses against the present type of manned bomber.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Senator from California to say that at the present time we do not have an American bomber that can penetrate the Russian defenses.

Mr. ENGLE. No. What I said was that it is becoming more and more difficult for our bombers to get through, that they are becoming less and less useful. Within a very short time the competence of present bombers to reach their targets will be under very grave question.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad I raised the question, for two reasons. I think the statement I made is the statement of a correct impression which I believe the Senator's language left in the RECORD.

I am glad to raise the question for that reason.

I raise a second question. Do we know whether or not Russia at the present time has bombers which can penetrate our defenses?

Mr. ENGLE. I think we do; and I think we know that some of them could get through. But I will say also that some of us believe that the Russians have spent more time and money on air defense than we have. There is no defense now against an ICBM. No one has designed a defense against the intercontinental ballistic missile. There is no way to stop it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from California for this speech, because I think we find ourselves in a somewhat paradoxical situation, in which we, as Senators, owe a duty to educate the American public.

We all know that the ultimate goal is the goal of disarmament. But the paradox, I think, is that in order to assure our best chances for disarmament, we shall have to put ourselves in such a position that Russia will recognize that she has everything to lose and nothing to gain by a continuation of the mad armament race. I have taken that position for several years in the Senate. Not so many years ago the Senator from Missouri and I were 2 of 11 Senators who voted for defense expenditures which we insisted were necessary. Subsequent events proved us to be right.

So I think the American people need to face up to the fact that we have the responsibility for placing our air defenses in such a situation that they will be conducive to a real foolproof, inspection-proof, complete disarmament, a program which in my judgment is the only hope for peace.

The paradox in this situation is that if we continue the kind of armament race in which we are now engaged in we shall end up in a nuclear war.

The text is, Where is the stopping point? I happen to think that we cannot reach the stopping point until we can first demonstrate that we have missiles that can penetrate the Russian defenses, and until Russia understands—as I believe we had better understand, too—that if two great powers continue in this mad nuclear armament race, we may lead mankind to disaster.

Mr. ENGLE. I agree with the senior Senator from Oregon. A further paradox is the citation of the accuracy we have with our missiles, by the President in his state of the Union message, as an evidence of our strength, when actually, if we turn the case around, and realize that the Soviets must have the same kind of accuracy, what it boils down to is that until we can harden the bases for the Atlas—and that will be attempted—or until we can get the Minuteman, which can be put on a railroad train and shuttled around, so that there will be no way to catch it, the Russians have the capability of knocking out our missile bases. We have wondered why it would not be possible to keep secret the location of the missile bases. In a country like ours it is not possible, because too many

people are working on them. Everyone knows where the Vandenberg Base is. Everyone knows where excavation is in progress for the bases in Wyoming. All the Russians would have to do would be to zero one or two of their continental ballistic missiles on several of our bases, and the retaliatory force of America, so far as the ICBM is concerned, would be wiped out. That is why I am saying, with respect to the B-70, that with the decreasing capability of the present bombers, it is necessary to the defense of America to have a supersonic bomber.

It is true that an ICBM, even though it cannot be recalled, may be destroyed in flight, provided that the gear to accomplish this does not malfunction, but at least the missile and its warhead are gone forever. A series of planned false alarms preceding a real attack could conceivably find us without missiles because, substantially they had been expended in vain.

The B-70, unlike an ICBM, is recallable. Its mission can be aborted. This characteristic permits us to launch the B-70 on less than conclusive information, but still withhold the ultimate decision pending the receipt and evaluation of additional information. The presence of B-70's at 80,000 feet on airborne alert over the Arctic, only minutes away from enemy targets at mach 3 speed, would make it possible for us to evaluate more carefully actions taken by the Soviets, while still remaining poised to strike an almost instantaneous retaliatory blow in the event of attack.

Moreover, the B-70, as a manned aircraft, is a recoverable weapon, which a missile is not, and can be used over and over again in subsequent strikes against residual targets. Furthermore, a manned aircraft has the power to discriminate between targets; to seek alternate targets in the event primary targets have already been destroyed; and can be employed in the role of reconnaissance to assess the effectiveness of initial strikes and provide the essential data for planning subsequent operations.

Even this is not the full story of why we need the B-70.

The B-70 could also be employed in low-level attacks at nearly mach 1; it could be used as a satellite interceptor; it could be used as a recoverable booster for launching high payload space vehicles.

The B-70 could be a first-rate military transport, capable of delivering material to any point on earth in only a few hours.

The B-70 could be the prototype, and the experimental design which will pave the way for the 2,000-mile-an-hour commercial transport.

If the United Nations ever acquires a world police force, the force to put out the brush fire wars before they become major conflagrations, the B-70 would be the ideal global police cruiser.

Now where do we stand at this moment with regard to the development and production of this remarkable aircraft?

The brief announcement made by the Air Force on November 30, while Congress was in adjournment, spoke of the B-70 program "being reoriented to a

prototype aircraft program" and that this so-called reorientation involved "deferral of major subsystem development."

What this means in plain English is that the program to develop the B-70 as a weapons system has been gutted.

When I talk about a weapons system, I refer to the composite, that is, the airframe—the bird itself—plus the necessary electronic equipment for bombing, navigation, and any other activities.

What is now proposed is that we build exactly two "bare bone" vehicles, and absolutely no matched subsystems involving radar, navigation and bombing, air data, electronic countermeasures, mission and traffic control, and power pods.

In other words, we propose to build two airplanes and then fit them out with gear designed for planes of only one-third their speed, which will cut the B-70's capability practically to the point where we might as well not have it at all.

In my opinion, this decision is one more example of how this administration is willing to gamble our very national survival in an attempt to balance its budget. In the fiscal year 1961, this decision will save about one-fiftieth of 1 percent of our defense spending. In return for this relative pittance, we are trading away at least one, perhaps several, year's development time on a weapons system which might well be the critical factor in our deterrent force, years of precious time which all the money in the world cannot buy back for us once they are gone.

No one hopes more fervently than I that the day will never come when it will be necessary to use a nuclear warhead, whether via missile or manned bomber.

But we do not advance the cause of world peace, nor the cause of successfully negotiating with the Soviet Union on steps toward that peace by refusing the advantages which our technology offers us.

Mr. President, I say this decision virtually to eliminate the B-70 as a weapons system is absolutely wrong. I call upon the Congress to make it clear to the administration that full-scale development of the B-70 and all its essential subsystems be continued full speed, properly funded, even if this involves some reorientation of priorities by this administration.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senator from California for the fine comments he has made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Ironically, I am about to make an address pertaining to the subject of disarmament, which I believe is the most important problem that faces the world today.

I could not concur more heartily with the Senator from California when he points out, as he has so ably done on the floor of the Senate today, that, so long as peace rests on a balance of de-

terrents, we must maintain an adequate retaliatory force. I believe that the case he has made for the B-70 bomber is one that makes it incumbent upon the administration to come forward to justify, if it can, the decision it has made to scrap this weapon.

I should like to say also that, in addition to the serious situation which may confront this country in the next 2 or 3 years, the Senator from California has made a case for the B-70 bomber as a supplementary weapon which could be useful in the United States even after the missile gap has been closed.

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct; because there is still need for reconnaissance; it is still necessary to go forth to see what the situation is. We will have to have airplanes with which to do it. The B-70 could do it.

The F-108 was scrapped. I regretted that action very much. It too could have been used for reconnaissance as well as a fighter. The B-70 certainly can be used for reconnaissance. And the B-70 would still be a very useful airplane, with which America could maintain its lead in the field of aviation. We initiated that field, not the Russians. I certainly hope that we will not see the Soviets produce the first supersonic commercial airplane. One of these days there will be commercial airplanes which will fly at 2,000 miles an hour. We are likely to have subsonic commercial airplanes when that time comes, if we are not careful. Therefore, the building of the B-70 is necessary and beneficial to America beyond the point in time that I have made, in the decade of the 1960's.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to add one other comment, which seems to me to be very important. It is this: One of the greatest dangers, it seems to me, confronting the world is the possibility of an atomic war being started by accident. The Senator from California in his address has alluded to this possibility.

It seems to me that the B-70 airplane might contribute to a lessening of this possibility if it were available in numbers to be used as the first arm of American retaliation. As the Senator has so well pointed out, such an airplane could be recalled from its mission, whereas missiles could not be recalled. Thus a miscalculation, which led to the use of missiles, in the absence of an alternative, could very well cause an atomic war by accident, which would be the ultimate folly.

So I commend, again, the fine statement which the Senator from California has made. I think it has contributed much to our understanding of this very sensitive, important problem.

Mr. ENGLE. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Idaho. I would say, in concluding, that the problem of whether we ought to build a B-70 weapons system is a question of priority inside the Defense budget. What I am asserting today is that that weapons system does have the priority which warrants its building, because for a while we will have nothing else to initiate a retaliatory strike if war starts.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CONTROL PROBLEMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 694) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems.

NEW PROPOSAL TO PREVENT A DEADLOCK IN THE GENEVA NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With the Senator's permission, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CHURCH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, tomorrow in Geneva, Switzerland, representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union will resume their negotiations for a treaty covering the controlled cessation of nuclear weapons tests. These negotiations have been going on with brief recesses for some 14 months. A treaty has not been signed, but significant advances toward a treaty have been achieved.

My purpose in speaking today is to assess the possibilities for a test ban agreement. I also wish to inform the Senate of a proposal I have made to the Secretary of State regarding a possible way to prevent a deadlock in the negotiations.

We must recall, before discussing the details of the nuclear test ban negotiations, what is their purpose. Why have we been laboring so long and so patiently for an agreement?

First and foremost, I believe it is because of the desire of the United States to make concrete progress toward the goal of controlling and reducing the world's armaments. We know that another world war would be fought with weapons of hideous destructiveness. The possibility is extremely slim that any nation could survive a nuclear war without large portions of its population dead, maimed, or otherwise afflicted with the scourge resulting from high doses of radioactivity.

Knowing what another war would be like, the major nations of the world, nevertheless, continue to invest something over a hundred billion dollars each year in producing, developing, designing,

and testing weapons of war. They continue to produce these weapons because the world is divided into rival blocs separated by distrust, suspicion, and fear. No nation wishes to reduce its arms unless it is convinced that its rivals are also reducing theirs. The test ban negotiations, therefore, represent an effort to make a significant start toward the eventual but cherished goal that man may live in peace, relieved from the burden of expending vast sums and devoting enormous energies upon massive and unproductive armaments.

Another vitally important reason exists why negotiations continue for an agreement to end tests of nuclear weapons. This is apart from the need to progress toward effective arms control measures. As all of us are well aware, nuclear weapons tests produce radioactive fallout which can result in a serious health hazard. We know, at the very least, that past tests have already inflicted genetic damage upon a part of the living. Morally we have no right to bequeath disfigurement upon future generations, if this can be avoided. Moreover, the hazard from fallout will grow as newcomers, like France, add their part to the spread of nuclear tests.

The Geneva test ban negotiations, in short, have a dual function. If successful, they start the world a first step along the road toward reducing the burdens and the dangers of heavy armaments, while at the same time they free the world from the health hazard posed by further contamination from radioactive fallout.

STATUS OF THE GENEVA TALKS

The extent of progress in the Geneva test ban negotiations may be measured by looking at what has been accomplished and what remains undone. What are the points of agreement and what are the points of difference?

The three nuclear powers have agreed to 18 parts of a treaty. Many of these are purely procedural. Others, however, represent solid substantive accomplishments toward the drafting of a successful and adequate treaty.

But we must frankly admit that the issues that remain constitute the toughest obstacles to the completion of a treaty. These issues are primarily political, although some important ones are technical.

Last February, in a letter to the Secretary of State, I listed the three main roadblocks the Soviets were then placing in the path of a treaty:

First. They were demanding a veto power over the operations of the proposed international control commission.

Second. They were insisting that the requisite control posts be self-operated; that is, dominated by nationals of the countries within which the posts are located.

Third. They were calling for complicated procedures that would easily frustrate prompt action by the commission in dispatching inspection teams to make necessary on-the-spot investigations of subterranean disturbances suspected of being nuclear in nature, or of preventing these essential at-site investigations from occurring at all.

It is gratifying that the Soviets have come a long way since that time toward removing the first two of these roadblocks. On a number of items, they have receded from their demands for a veto; on others, they have made contingent offers to withdraw the veto demand.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. I was not aware that the Soviets had come a long way in that respect. It seems to me that their suggestions have more form than substance. Would the able Senator from Idaho mind spelling out just how the Russians have come a long way?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes; I shall be happy to indicate to what extent the earlier roadblocks have been eliminated or reduced during the months between the time when I last spoke on this subject and the present time.

A year ago the Russians were demanding the right of a veto on a broad spectrum, in regard to different matters. For example, the Russians demanded the right of veto on any revision of the treaty or its annexes or the adoption of amendments thereto. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit me to do so, I should like to go down through the whole list and compare the Russians' position then with their apparent position now.

As to the first item—namely, revision of the treaty or its annexes or the adoption of amendments thereto—the Russians have now indicated their willingness to rescind their demand for a veto. Accordingly, the proposed International Control Commission could recommend treaty revisions or amendments, not subject to any veto, although any actual revision of the treaty or amendment to the treaty could not be placed into effect without the full concurrence of the three contracting powers. This is not a matter of major importance, but it is one place where a previous demand for a veto on the part of the Soviets has been rescinded.

Second, a year ago the Russians demanded the right of veto against any accusation which might be made by the Commission against any nation, for a violation of the treaty. Now the Russians have removed their demand for such a veto; and I take it that their new position is that such accusations can be made whenever it is felt they are warranted, and that they can be made without being subject to veto on the part of any of the signatory powers.

Moreover, it has been established by the negotiations that any signatory to the agreement has the right to withdraw unilaterally from the agreement upon the detection of any violation. That is one of the grounds for rescinding the agreement.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield further to me?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. That would then vitiate the agreement. So in one respect I say that, as I have followed the development

of the negotiations, I find some difficulty in measuring the so-called concessions which the Russians advertise they are going to make with what they have actually said and the positions they have actually taken.

I will not impose further upon the Senator. I know he is making an important speech to which I am listening with great interest; but I did want to indicate that, as I have followed these negotiations carefully, I have noticed the pattern of a press statement by Mr. Tsarapkin, the chief Soviet delegate, suggesting great concessions. But when one reads the fine print of the actual position taken in the negotiations, it is a little difficult to find the two meaning the same thing.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should like to go on with the fine print, because I think it is important to read now into the RECORD, inasmuch as the question has been raised, the extent to which the position of the negotiating parties seems to have changed on the matter of a veto during the past year.

To continue, a year ago the Russians were demanding the right of veto over the appointment of the administrator. I will say with respect to this matter that their position has not changed, though ours has. In the interim, we have indicated that we feel that the matter of the appointment of the administrator is one upon which all three of the negotiating powers ought to agree, and that the administrator should be selected unanimously, provided the incumbent administrator remains until a new administrator has been selected.

A year ago the Soviets were demanding a veto with respect to the adoption of a decision to dispatch inspection groups for onsite investigation of any event suspected of being a nuclear explosion. This went to the heart of the reliability of the inspection control system. At the time of my speech to the Senate last year, this was the main reason why it appeared that the negotiations were deadlocked, and that we would soon have to abandon our efforts to reach agreement.

Since that time, however, the Russians have made a contingent offer. They have indicated that if the nuclear powers could agree upon a quota of onsite inspections that could be made in a given year, which would furnish them with some assurance that they would not be overrun with inspection teams—and now I am expressing this proposition in terms of their argument, not mine—then they, in turn, would withdraw their demand for a veto over the right to dispatch inspection teams into Russian territory.

A year ago, the Russians were demanding a veto over revision of existing methods, and approval of new methods, for observation and for types of apparatus to be placed at control stations.

The Soviets have since receded from that demand, contingent upon whether an agreement can be reached in later negotiations with respect to such new equipment as should be installed.

So I think that in these matters important changes have occurred in the course of negotiations.

Since I have gone this far into the list of particulars, I think I should add the final two particulars with respect to which significant changes have been made.

On January 30 last year, the Soviets were demanding a veto with respect to the determination of location sites of the control posts and of the routes for control aircraft flights. From this position they have now indicated they will recede if the location can be predetermined by the governments, while, on our part, we believe any such determination must be subject to review and approval by the control commission.

Finally, last year the Soviets were demanding a veto over budgetary, financial, administrative, and economic matters connected with the control organization's activities, including matter relating to the recruitment and dismissal of the supporting and auxiliary personnel.

Now, with respect to the budgetary matter, the Soviets have receded from that position and have agreed to withdraw their demand for veto if the nuclear powers in turn will agree on the composition of the control Commission and budget adoption by a two-thirds vote. This becomes very complicated and I think, in this particular, their change of position is not so great as one might be led to believe.

But I do think the total list does indicate that a significant change of position on matters of importance has occurred in our negotiations during the last year.

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

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, the proposal which the Russians advertise as a great concession, and which they wish the world to interpret as a great concession, is that, instead of a veto, the Commission be composed of three Iron Curtain members, three members from the free world, and a neutral member, but that all decisions be subject to a two-thirds majority vote. If the Senator will use his mental arithmetic and find that a two-thirds majority of 7 is 5, he will see that what the Soviets propose is not a matter of substance, but of form; they still would retain a veto.

Mr. CHURCH. I could not agree more fully with the Senator; but I want to point out this relates only to the matter of budget determination of a control Commission, and not to all the activities of the control Commission. My understanding of the present position of the Russians is that, in determining the amount of the budget, they want to have adoption by two-thirds vote, which I concede gives them a veto power. However, that veto power relates to only one function of the Commission, namely, the determination of the annual budget. Therefore, the point ought not to be extended to the other matters and powers of the Commission which go to the heart of the Commission's reason for existence.

So, although I agree with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee when he raises this question I also wish to emphasize that it relates only to the establishment of the Commission's budget.

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

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I concede that, but I also wish to suggest to the able Senator that it is typical of the clever moves of the Soviets to advertise a concession and claim they have made a concession when in fact what they suggest is no concession at all.

Mr. CHURCH. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I am fully mindful of the wily ways of the Russians. I think our negotiators at Geneva are mindful of them, too.

I would be the last ever to propose that the United States should become a party to any treaty which did not give us full assurance of protection. I am sure that we will not enter into a treaty which contains pitfalls of that kind.

In the course of my address this afternoon I expect to look at the present status of our negotiations in an objective way, and appraise very carefully the Soviet position. My purpose is to suggest a possible proposal which the United States might make should all else fail at Geneva, in the hope that we can accomplish at least a part of the objective we had in mind when we went to Geneva.

So, Mr. President, if I were to summarize the changes which have occurred in the position of the Soviet Union in the course of the past year, I would do it in this way: It seems to me that on a number of items the Russians have receded from their demands for a veto, while on others they have made contingent offers to withdraw the veto demand.

On the question of staffing the control posts, the Soviets have offered to accept our proposal, in the main, provided that we accept their offer on the budget and the composition of the control Commission.

On the third roadblock, that of the need for a certain amount of onsite inspection, little progress has been made. It was in this area of the negotiations that the hope for rapid progress toward the drafting of a comprehensive treaty, that is, a treaty covering the cessation of tests in all environments, received a setback last month. A technical working group of scientists from the U.S.S.R., United States, and United Kingdom, which met to discuss the question of the detection and identification of underground tests, failed to reach agreement on all the items on its agenda. The purpose of the technical working groups was threefold:

First. To review all new data regarding the detection and identification of underground events;

Second. To consider possible improvements in technics and instrumentation in the control system; and

Third. To determine the criteria by which an unidentified event might be selected by the control Commission for onsite inspection.

Although the scientists did reach agreement on possible improvements in techniques and instrumentation, they did not reach agreement on the other important questions. The scientists, for

example, could not agree on the criteria to distinguish earthquakes from explosions for the purpose of eliminating the former as being subject to inspection. Without such criteria it is difficult to see how an agreement with respect to onsite inspections can be reached.

Unfortunately, it was not only the lack of technical agreement that hurt the prospects for a treaty. The Soviet scientists accused their American colleagues of bad faith and questioned their integrity. These unwarranted accusations have added to the difficulty of reaching reasonable solutions to these vexing problems.

PROPOSALS FOR CONSIDERATION

If the scientists and the diplomats of the three nuclear powers fail to reach agreement on the question of inspection for possible underground nuclear tests, what course should the negotiations then follow?

Of one thing I am sure. The United States cannot pack up its bags and go home without first exhausting all reasonable possibilities for agreement. We must be certain that if failure comes the guilt must rest with the Soviet Union.

Accordingly, I have written to the Secretary of State, outlining my views as to the course the United States might follow if the failure to reach agreement on the problem of inspection produces a deadlock.

Last February, when it looked as though the conference was deadlocked, I urged the United States to attempt to salvage something of value from the negotiations by calling for a suspension of all further nuclear tests in the earth's atmosphere, enforced through an international control system sufficient to detect any violations.

I wish to say at this point, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee had previously made a proposal calling for our unilateral suspension of atmospheric tests. This proposal was very similar to mine, except that I hoped such an atmospheric ban could be reached by agreement among the three nuclear powers, and could be enforced by an international control system.

Last year it was my pleasure to discuss at length on the floor of the Senate with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee his proposal and mine, and, with respect to the position we then took, we found ourselves very much in accord.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator for his generous reference.

I would hope that any stoppage of tests made by the United States would be concurred in by other countries.

In view of the fact that the United States was the first nation to conduct nuclear tests, was the only power to use a nuclear weapon, and conducted more tests than any other nation, I thought that our moral and political position in the world would be strengthened by a forthright, dramatic act on the part of the President of the United States, taking the position that, whatever other powers did, the United States was not

only willing to stop contaminating the world atmosphere but had stopped doing so, and by inviting other powers to join for a given but extended period of time.

I still think there is great merit to this position, and I suggested it to the President by telegram only a few days ago when the subject was under consideration at Augusta. I think it has merit now because of the propaganda "pitch" of Mr. Khrushchev for total disarmament, which everyone desires but which all reasonable men know, in the context of the world tension today, is unachievable and, therefore, impractical and political.

I learned in a recent visit to many countries that the Russian leader had achieved an image of peace of which I was unprepared to learn. I think there would be a great merit in having the President of the United States take the initiative in a dramatic way, by calling a halt for an extended period of time to the kinds of tests which contaminate the world's atmosphere and the kinds of tests which can be detected no matter by what power conducted.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was very much impressed by the arguments advanced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee last year, as I continue to be impressed by those arguments.

It was for that reason that I proposed last year that the United States take the initiative at Geneva to seek a ban on atmospheric tests in the hope that we could salvage that much out of the negotiations, and in the hope that the Soviet Union might agree to such a ban on the tests which contribute most to the contamination of the air, and which could be policed by control stations already in existence on either side of the Iron Curtain.

Such a ban, I then said, would curtail further poisoning of the air, while we continued to seek acceptable ways to police a ban on tests in other environments.

Moreover, I wrote to Mr. Herter, who was then Acting Secretary, that the commencement of an international control system to detect atmospheric nuclear explosions is the sine qua non of man's progress toward any feasible disarmament. This is so, even though a control system for such tests is much less complicated than a control system for a comprehensive ban.

On April 13th, the President, by letter to Chairman Khrushchev, said that the United States was prepared to consider a ban on atmospheric tests. He said:

Could we not, Mr. Chairman, put the agreement into effect in phases beginning with a prohibition of nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere? A simplified control system for atmospheric tests up to 50 kilometers could be readily derived from the Geneva experts' report, and would not require the automatic onsite inspection which has created the major stumbling block in the negotiations so far.

This, of course, was essentially the proposal I had made in February. I was gratified that this was so, and, although the Soviets rejected the proposal, that they reacted to it by making

the important concessions I have previously mentioned.

Notwithstanding that progress was made in the remaining months of 1959, we find the conference again in a position very similar to that which existed 11 months ago. Once more, the prospect is for failure or stalemate at Geneva, unless something is done.

The same concern, which caused me to make the proposal I did in February, has moved me to write once again to the Secretary of State. In a letter which I sent to him Friday, January 8, I broadened my proposal for a staged test ban agreement. I added two important modifications which I felt were dictated by the present status of the negotiations.

We must continue, I told the Secretary in my letter, to strive for an agreement which would end all nuclear weapons tests, not only those in the air, in the water, and above the air, but those underground as well.

However, should it develop, upon the resumption of the conference, that this objective cannot now be achieved, owing to continued Russian refusal to accept our new criteria for a control and inspection system upon which all might safely rely for the detection of underground tests, and the conference is deadlocked thereby, I urged that the United States make the following two-part proposal:

(1) That the three powers agree to a suspension of all further nuclear weapons tests in the air, in space, and in the water, to be enforced by an international control system sufficient to detect and report any violation; and

(2) That the three powers concurrently agree to jointly conduct a series of underground nuclear explosions, which will add no further contamination to the air, but which may form the basis for fashioning a mutually acceptable detection and inspection system with which to police a subsequent ban on underground nuclear weapons tests.

I suggested that such joint underground tests might well be conducted under the auspices of the United Nations, and that qualified observers from all interested countries might be invited to participate.

As I wrote the Secretary, I think such a proposal would have great advantage for the United States and the world. First and foremost, by immediately banning the tests which poison the air and the water, we would erase a grave anxiety.

Additionally, we would establish the first international control apparatus for the enforcement of the suspension agreement. Although the system would be simpler than that required to detect underground tests, and the onsite inspections to which the Russians object so strongly would not be necessary, nevertheless we would have, as to the air, space, and water ban, a functioning harness within which to bind not only the present members of the nuclear club, but also the oncoming nations developing atomic technologies of their own. In this the negotiating parties would seem to share a common interest.

I believe, moreover, that the series of joint underground tests could represent

the best hope for solid progress in achieving a ban on underground nuclear weapons tests, with a workable international control system to enforce it. The proposal for a ban limited to air, water, and space tests, while this joint exploration on the nature of underground test detection proceeds, could prove to be a mutually acceptable forward step toward our goal.

My suggestion for joint tests stems from the realization that in the science of seismology areas of uncertainty exist. The tests to be jointly conducted would advance the general knowledge about the problems of identification and detection of underground tests. I cannot help but feel that the lack of ample data concerning underground tests might well be the underlying reason for the inability of the scientists to reach agreement now upon the requirements for a reliable detection system. We have conducted only four or five underground nuclear tests, and the Soviets have never indicated that they have conducted any. A heavily instrumented series of underground tests, in the Soviet Union and in the United States, and at other points on the globe, would certainly yield resulting data of significant importance.

It may be that the Russian negotiators will rebuff the suggestion for joint underground tests. But it is well to remember that the Russians were a suspicious people long before the Communists came to power. The czars maintained their own Iron Curtain. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], rightly said, following my mention of this fact to the Senate last March, than an understanding of this puts the matter in perspective and gives us more hope for the future than if we attribute all difficulties simply to the present regime. We cannot know, in any case, that the Soviets would rebuff the proposal unless we make it.

The United States has always been dedicated to the cause of peace. We are answerable to our own trust. We ought not anticipate failure as a reason for abandonment of new proposals even before making them.

My proposal, I repeat, is an alternative to stalemate and deadlock. Perhaps some unexpected move by the Soviets will change the situation. But there is little that can change the fundamentals of the situation—the need to make a start toward disarmament, to end the threat of further contamination by fallout, and the desirability of extending knowledge in the matter of identifying underground disturbances.

Mr. President, good conscience commands that we do our utmost at Geneva.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to Secretary Herter be included in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

JANUARY 8, 1960.

HON. CHRISTIAN HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On Tuesday next, January 12, the Geneva negotiations for a

treaty to end nuclear weapons tests will resume. Although the resumption is not auspicious, and prospects for success seem gloomy indeed, there is cause for hope in the progress already made, and more reason than ever for not permitting impatience or frustration to jeopardize continued efforts toward agreement.

The unresolved issue remains inspection. The inability of the recent technical conference of scientists from our country, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union to reach agreement on such matters as the significance of the Hardtack data for the detection of underground nuclear tests, and the criteria to determine when the source of a signal registered at a control post can be investigated by a mobile inspection team is, of course, a formidable obstacle to successful negotiations.

Last February, I wrote to you urging that the United States, without slackening its efforts for an end to all nuclear tests, seek a limited ban on atmospheric tests to stop pollution of the air.

Such a proposal was made to the conference at Geneva following the Easter recess. Although the suggestion was rejected, the Soviet Union made significant new concessions which enabled the conference to continue to move forward.

I still believe that the United States must do everything in its power to prevent the test ban negotiations from ending in a stalemate. They are not only important in themselves. Their outcome has significance for the entire future of disarmament. If the United States and the Soviet Union cannot agree to end their tests of nuclear weapons under effective inspection safeguards, then upon what can they agree? Surely almost any other disarmament proposal would have even less likelihood of acceptance than a ban on tests of nuclear weapons.

Therefore, it seems to me that we must continue to strive for an agreement which would end all nuclear weapons tests, not only those in the air, in the water, and above the air, but those underground as well.

However, should it develop, upon the resumption of the conference, that this objective cannot now be achieved, owing to continued Russian refusal to accept our new criteria for a control and inspection system upon which all might safely rely for the detection of underground tests, and the conference is deadlocked thereby, I would urge that the United States make the following two-part proposal:

(1) That the three powers agree to a suspension of all further nuclear weapons tests in the air, in space, and in the water, to be enforced by an international control system sufficient to detect and report any violation; and

(2) That the three powers concurrently agree to jointly conduct a series of underground nuclear explosions, which will add no further contamination to the air, but which may form the basis for fashioning a mutually acceptable detection and inspection system with which to police a subsequent ban on underground nuclear weapons tests.

I think such a proposal would have great advantage for the United States and the world. First and foremost, by immediately banning the tests which poison the air and the water, we would erase the grave anxiety.

Additionally, we would establish the first international control apparatus for the enforcement of the suspension agreement. Although the system would be simpler than that required to detect underground tests, and the on-site inspections to which the Russians object so strongly would not be necessary, nevertheless we would have, as to the air, space, and water ban, a functioning harness within which to bind not only the present members of the "nuclear club,"

but also the oncoming nations developing atomic technologies of their own. In this, the negotiating parties would seem to share a common interest.

I believe, however, that the series of joint underground tests, which might well be conducted under the auspices of the United Nations, and to which qualified observers from all interested countries might be invited, could represent the best hope for solid progress in achieving a ban on underground nuclear weapons tests, with a workable international control system to enforce it. The proposal for a ban limited to air, water, and space tests, while this joint exploration of the nature of underground test detection proceeds, could prove to be a mutually acceptable forward step toward our goal.

I cannot help but feel that the lack of ample data concerning underground tests might well be the underlying reason for the inability of the scientists to reach agreement now upon the requirements for a reliable detection system. We have conducted only four or five underground nuclear tests, and the Soviets have never indicated that they have conducted any. A heavily instrumented series of underground tests, in the Soviet Union and in the United States, and at other points on the globe, would certainly yield resulting data of significant importance.

I respectfully submit these suggestions to you, Mr. Secretary, as a possible proposal to present to the Russian negotiators. I do so with the conviction that we must continue to demonstrate to the world that if the test ban talks fail, the Soviet Union must bear the guilt.

Sincerely,

FRANK CHURCH.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to my good friend the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the able Senator upon his learned address and upon his dedication to the cause of peace, which must be based upon international understanding and confidence.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. I wish to say that in the matter of the Geneva negotiations we have shared a common interest, and that the counsel and thinking in this matter of the Senator from Tennessee have always been of great importance to me.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FOR BOULDER CITY, NEV.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, January 4, 1960, is a date of lasting significance to Nevada, for it marks the emergence of Boulder City as a municipality within the framework of our State, and its severance as a federally controlled city.

Laid out by the Bureau of Reclamation as a model American community, Boulder City owed its existence to the construction of the great dam on the Colorado River.

Since 1932, it was administered by the Federal Government; yet there was a growing demand upon the part of the residents for home rule. Along with my colleagues in Congress, I was privileged to assist in legislation which paved the way for the transfer of the city from its Federal status to local control.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the many outstanding citizens of Boulder City who worked long and faithfully for the goal of municipal freedom. At the same time, I believe it only fitting and proper to commend the Bureau of Reclamation for the outstanding job it did both in administering the affairs of the bustling community of 4,000, and in co-operating wholeheartedly in the orderly transition of government.

At this juncture, in my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the remarks made at Boulder City's inaugural ceremonies by the Honorable Grant Sawyer, Governor of Nevada, and Robert Broadbent, mayor of the new city, along with appropriate editorials which appeared in the Boulder City News and the Las Vegas Review-Journal, and a news story published in the Las Vegas Sun.

There being no objection, the remarks, editorials, and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. GRANT SAWYER

Mayor Broadbent of Boulder City, Acting Regional Director West, Federal, State, county and city officials, and Mayor Broadbent of Ely, I welcome this opportunity of celebrating with you this long awaited moment—as Boulder City takes her place alongside her sister cities in Nevada.

Also I bring warm greetings from one of you who shared the difficulties and long wait involved in bringing home rule to Boulder City. I am speaking of Dick Ham, who is now executive director of the department of employment security and is busy in Carson City preparing his department's legislative program for the coming session and, therefore, unable to be here with you tonight.

Too many people in this Nation take the right of self-government as a matter of course. There can be no danger of this in Boulder City. This day marks the end of a 20-year effort to remove this city from Federal control and give it incorporate status. And this day marks the beginning of a bright future for this city, as you yourselves guide its destiny. The story of this transitional period is well known to you here, but permit me to trace the progress of this effort.

Boulder City started as a tent community in 1931 with the beginning of construction on Boulder Dam. Growth was rapid but controlled and the guiding hand of the Bureau of Reclamation is evident in the modern, well-planned community in which you live today.

It was some 20 years ago that Government officials realized Boulder City had outgrown its role as a construction and operating camp. It was agreed that the city should be turned over to the people for self-government. The machinery was put in motion with the approval for studies of the transitional problem.

In 1949, Dr. Henry Reining, Jr., then professor of public administration and political science at the University of Southern California, was engaged to make a survey and submit specific recommendations for a solution. His report a year later was the basis of an order issued by the Secretary of the Interior in 1951 which administratively separated Boulder City from the Boulder Canyon project. The Boulder City Act of 1958, under which incorporation has been achieved, generally followed Dr. Reining's recommendations.

That act provided an orderly method for the Federal Government to relinquish ownership and control of certain properties in the community not required for continuing Federal activities in the area and permitted you to establish self-government under Nevada law.

Director West has informed me that the Bureau has disposed of all its residential properties within the city, totaling 179 housing units. These units, appraised by FHA at \$1,225,000, were sold to Federal employees who were priority purchasers. This property is being placed on the Clark County tax rolls.

He also told me the Bureau of Reclamation is transferring ownership of the 33 square miles of land provided by the Boulder City Act to the incorporated city. This land also will be placed on the Clark County tax rolls.

I note also that Boulder City has been the recipient of nearly \$3 million worth of electrical, water, and sewerage systems, municipal buildings, streets, sidewalks, and curbs, parks and parkways.

In short, Boulder City is ready to do business. It begins, not as a municipal infant crying for recognition and struggling for success, but as a community that has added much to the lore of Nevada and whose citizens have helped make the State what it is today.

With your incorporation, you hold a trust and a duty—to yourselves, your city, your State and your Nation. Some may think it absurd that Boulder City, a community of less than 4,000 persons, has any great part to play in national or world affairs.

But our freedom is not based on the masses, it has its roots in the individual. If America cannot solve its problems on a community level, how can it hope to solve the problems of the world.

From the individual's faith in his own worth, to his voluntary role in his own free community, to his own community's service to his nation, and to his nation's dedication to the common cause of all free men—thus is the force of the faith of freedom steadily raised to a higher power.

We can serve freedom elsewhere only as we practice it in our own lives.

We cannot speak of a common law for all nations of the world, unless our own laws faithfully serve the needs, and guard the rights, of our own citizens.

We cannot speak of equality, both of men and nations, unless we advance the flag of social equality in our own community. We cannot be aghast at poverty in distant lands, if our own citizens are in want.

We cannot hope to spur economic progress and prosperity in the world unless such a State as Nevada can itself help to lead America toward new horizons of equal opportunity for all our citizens.

We cannot pretend to help inspire new nations in the way of freedom if our own schools do not give our own youths the chance to become enlightened citizens.

We are called upon to conduct ourselves like free men with the will and the wisdom to make freedom work. We do this not simply by what we say—but by how we live. This is your challenge. I know you can meet it.

I mentioned education, the value of which cannot be overemphasized. America must work, perhaps hardest of all, on the field where the future can be won or lost: in our schoolrooms. We must attack the problems of juvenile delinquency.

Perhaps in this field the rest of the Nation can look to Boulder City for guidance. The rate of juvenile delinquency here is one of the lowest in the Nation. In Boulder City, youth is not hidden or apologized for, it is proudly displayed.

A crash-emphasis on education hit the country following the Soviet Union's achievements in rocketry. We heard a spate of alarms calling for more mathematics, scientists, and technicians.

But Boulder City didn't wait for sputnik to call for emphasis on education for its young people.

Mr. Elbert B. Edwards, your widely known high school principal, reports the percentage of Boulder City High School graduates going on to college tops 70 percent.

Nevada has seven young men in the selective Air Force Academy. Four of them are from Boulder City—Mike Hyde, David Lyon, Scott Wood, and Roger Likens.

In any National Merit Board or National College Board test, Boulder City is sure to be represented at the top levels. And in the area of education, all eyes will be on Boulder City with the construction of the new experimental educational facility—a multipurpose building designed to meet the needs of all school districts. It will be the only one in the country. Now in the hands of the architects, the building is the result of millions of dollars put into research and engineering by the Ford Foundation, and contributions by the New York and Stanford educational facilities laboratories.

From education in the schools, we proceed to education in government. In this your city officials are the instructors and the pupils. I could take the time to point out the good qualities of your new officials and how the future of the city is safe in their hands, but I won't. One of the blessings of a small community is that you intimately know your candidates and have a solid basis for their election. You know what kind of a performance to expect from them.

To Mayor Broadbent, City Manager Curtis Blyth, Assistant Mayor Dr. Thomas White, Councilmen Morgan Sweeney, Albert Franklin, and Joe Manix, City Attorney Alvin Wartman, and all the others, I offer as advice, in a purely nonpartisan way, the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He said:

"New ideas cannot be administered successfully by men with old ideas, for the first essential of doing a job well is the wish to see the job done at all." I know these men have the wish to see the job done and I feel sure new ideas will always find a welcome at city hall.

This is a happy time in Boulder City. It's a new year for a city with a new look. Right now things look rosy and the future's problems are faint. You've won a long, hard struggle for independence, but the time for rest is far distant. Your real struggle lies ahead. Things which are minor and a matter of routine will present problems here because you'll be encountering them for the first time.

Your municipal path won't always be smooth. Mistakes will be made in the natural course of things. Lack of mistakes too often means lack of progress.

You are fortunate in that many of the mistakes open to you have been made before and you will have the chance to profit by the missteps of others.

There will probably be times when you wish you had never heard of home rule. When this time arrives, I advise a look at the words of James Gould Gozzens, who said:

"Every day is a miracle. The world gets up in the morning and is fed and goes to work, and in the evening it comes home and is fed again and perhaps has a little amusement and goes to sleep. To make that possible, so much has to be done by so many people that, on the face of it, it is impossible. Well, every day we do it; and every day, come hell, come high water, we're going to have to keep on doing it as well as we can."

On behalf of the rest of the citizens of the State, I bid Boulder City welcome to its rightful place. Congratulations to Nevada's newest city.

REMARKS BY ROBERT BROADBENT, MAYOR

It is an honor, as mayor of Boulder City, to be privileged to accept the contract to effectuate the Boulder City Act of 1958, on

behalf of the city council and citizens of Boulder City, Nev.

By accepting this contract, we, the citizens of Boulder City, are embarking on the challenging road to self-government. The responsibilities and duties and operation of local self-government we accept under the laws of the State of Nevada, the county of Clark and the Boulder City charter.

Many have contributed greatly to bring about the realization of Boulder City, incorporated. Our appreciation and sincere thanks are extended to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, and Mr. Arleigh West, the acting regional director of region 3, for their fine cooperation, assistance, and the advice they have given in the months in which we have been so diligently working on the transfer of Boulder City.

Our city manager, city attorney, city clerk, and the members of the many boards and commissions appointed by the city council have worked hard—with untiring effort—to help make it possible for us to take over the operation of our city today.

Each individual in Boulder City has contributed toward our goal. It is they who make our city what it is and what we hope it will be.

Digressing briefly, I should like to personally and publicly thank my wife and family, and the wives and families of all who have been required to be away from the responsibilities of home, for so many, many hours during this transition period.

We, the officials of our city, are grateful for our fine citizenry and with honor and humility solicit full and continued cooperation to the end that we may enjoy through our united efforts an honest, forthright, economical city administration capable of expanding with the growth of our community.

Boulder City has been unique among her city sisters. It is our sincere desire that this uniqueness will be added to in the future.

We have all the basic needs for growth and development—fine people, good resources. With diligence and united effort, Boulder City will be Nevada's city of dreams come true.

[From the Boulder City News]

MORRY'S STORY

(By Morry Zenoff)

This newspaper today records for posterity Boulder City's first official day of freedom—January 4, 1960—and the signing by its mayor, Robert Broadbent, of the city's own declaration of independence.

From 2 p.m. Monday when the little band of city officials gathered in Arlie West's conference room on the hill, there to observe Broadbent's actual signing of transfer documents—until 9 p.m. that evening, when some 300 interested citizens crowded into the grade-school gym to witness solemn ceremonies celebrating the occasion, it was one series of historic happenings.

Every phase of it was photographed by Government and private photographers—and the best of the shots were collected and engraved and included in this freedom edition—which some day for sure will be studied by your children and your children's children, and ours too, as a symbol of democracy in action in the 20th century.

Every word spoken officially from script was collected by our staff and set up on the linotype machines, then placed in pages, locked up and printed on the pages you're now reading.

The newest laws of the city, passed by special council action minutes before midnight of the transfer date—January 4—are contained, too, in this souvenir edition under legal notices—detailing to the populace the law of the land which is now and forevermore in effect.

No longer will the will of the minority rule; no longer must the citizenry rush to

Washington to seek favor or license; no longer must a community turn to the hill for regulation or interpretation.

Today, the laws of the State of Nevada and a charter written by the elected representatives of the community, and ordinances drafted by an elected city council—these all run the city—through home rule—by majority vote, by citizen control.

At every step of Monday's thrilling walk to freedom—familiar faces were evident everywhere—the oldtimers who came before us (12 years ago) and the newtimers who came here since us—all taking in every word, each experiencing the fine fresh air.

Those who fought against home rule and incorporation now stood shoulder to shoulder with those who fought for it—a fine symbol indeed of what the future will offer in the way of unified work toward the common goal of all—a continued beautiful Boulder City.

The speakers of the day—from the Governor, through Dr. Henry Reining, to the mayor—all were as thrilled to be taking part in our day of history as were the spectators in watching and listening to them play the roles given them.

It was a wonderful day for everyone who lived it. It will be a wonderful city now—for those who live in it, or near it.

Surely, none will forget January 4, 1960—emancipation day for Boulder City, Nev.

[From the Las Vegas Review-Journal]
WELCOME TO THE FAMILY

Nevada welcomed a strapping teenager into the family of cities this week when the erstwhile Government community of Boulder City severed its ties with the Federal control and branched out on its own as a true Nevada city.

Boulder City was established back in 1931, when the Government began the task of constructing Boulder Dam. It was laid out by the Bureau of Reclamation as the "model city" and it became just that when it was completed around 1932. Since that time, until January 4, 1960, it was operated as a Government community with the citizens having little to say about its government.

Now, the burdens of government have been taken over by the citizens of the city. They have elected Robert Broadbent as the community's first mayor. From now on the problems of growth will be in the hands of the new mayor and his city council.

In the decade which is just starting, it is probable that many changes will be noted in the operation of Boulder City. Undoubtedly it will grow much as the other cities in southern Nevada have grown. It has all the potentials of becoming a recreational city and for establishing some light industry in the area around the city's fringes.

Growth has been almost completely stymied by the Government restrictions which were clamped on Boulder City. For many years property in the community could only be secured on short-term leases. None could be purchased. Recently longer term leases were developed and, as a result of this move, more and more construction was done.

Now, with all restrictions removed, it is entirely possible that capital can be enticed to make investments in the sector. Every indication points to a decided building boom in Boulder City.

As with all growing cities, there will be problems to be faced. While the liquor and gambling issues probably will not be raised in the immediate future, they are bound to come and there will be some bitter fights resulting. Other issues will be raised which will see the city split down the middle. It has happened in Las Vegas, North Las Vegas and Henderson and undoubtedly will occur in Boulder City.

The citizens of Boulder City must have faith, not only in the future of the community itself, but its elected officials as well. The latter are going into a very complex job and, being human, they probably will make mistakes. However, they all are respected citizens of Boulder City and will have the future of the city at heart. Unless they get too far off the deep end, the citizens should give them tolerance, cooperation and confidence. Theirs will be a tough job. They will have to set the policies upon which the future will be built. If they build solidly, which we believe they will, the future of the city is assured.

Operation of the city as a civic entity rather than under governmental control, will be a tough transition. We are confident, however, that the people of Boulder City will be able to make the bold step.

We welcome Boulder City into the family of Nevada cities, and hope the future continues as bright as it is now.

[From the Las Vegas Sun, Jan. 5, 1960]
GALA CEREMONY BEGINS BOULDER HOME RULE
(By Laura Bell)

BOULDER CITY.—With high hopes for a bright future and every promise that the hopes will be fulfilled, Boulder City was launched on the American way of home rule at ceremonies in the elementary school gymnasium last night.

For the 29 years of its existence up to yesterday it was under Federal control as headquarters for Hoover Dam.

The Federal Government represented by A. B. West, region 3 director of the Bureau of Reclamation, signed over the pretty little model community to Gov. Grant Sawyer of the State of Nevada and Mayor Robert Broadbent, youthful first mayor of the new incorporated city.

West extended the best wishes of Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton and Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy, whose schedules did not permit them to be present for the ceremony.

He also noted that Senators ALAN BIBLE and HOWARD CANNON and Congressman WALTER BARING had sent word that they were unable to attend because of the beginning of the new session of Congress this week.

"Many of you have joined with the Department of the Interior, your Members of Congress and State and local officials in working diligently many years for this day on which we officially sever Boulder City from Federal apron strings," he said.

The complicated and controversial problem was not easily solved and took many years of effort, he noted; but said he was convinced that the efforts which culminated in passage of the Boulder City Act of 1958 will pay off bountifully.

"We of the Department of the Interior feel that the Federal Government is turning over to the incorporated citizenry the finest little city in the world," he said.

Accepting the contract for the State of Nevada, Governor Sawyer commented on the beauty and high quality of Nevada's newest city and said the State was proud to accept such an addition.

Governor Sawyer welcomed Boulder City to her rightful place alongside her sister cities in Nevada.

"Though many people in this Nation take the right of self-government as a matter of course," he noted, "there can be no danger of this in Boulder City" because of the 20-year effort to bring about home rule.

Boulderites were warned by the State's chief executive, "With your incorporation, you hold a trust and a duty—to yourselves, your city, your State and your Nation. Some may think it absurd that Boulder City, a community of less than 4,000, has any great part to play in national or world affairs.

"But our freedom is not based on the masses, it has its roots in the individual. If

America cannot solve its problems on a community level, how can it hope to solve the problems of the world?"

Residents were advised not to expect perfection from their new city officials since mistakes will be made in the natural course of things.

"Lack of mistakes too often means lack of progress," Governor Sawyer observed.

Mayor Broadbent noted that, in accepting the contract, the citizens are embarking on a challenging course.

The responsibilities and duties and operation of local self-government we accept under the laws of the State of Nevada, the county of Clark and the Boulder City charter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PARTY POLICY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, many scholars and students of government have written and spoken upon the operations and responsibility of our two-party system. This concern of the party system arises from the fact that it is only through the operations of the two-party system that the mass of our people have a meaningful choice and method of giving direction and mandates to their government. It would follow, then, that the policies of our two major parties, the manner of their formulation and execution, and the responsibility of the parties and their agencies are of vital concern to all citizens.

Party policy, both of the majority and the minority, is surely a matter of vital concern to all Members of Congress and to the people of their constituencies.

Almost from the beginning of the organization of government under the Constitution, the democratic process in the United States has been characterized by the formulation of public policy and the molding of public opinion through a strong two-party system. Almost throughout our history the Congress has been led by a majority party, but with a strong and challenging opposition from a minority party. Third parties have had little success and surely play no significant role now.

Like many others, I have been concerned with the formulation of the policies of the Democratic Party in the U.S. Senate. I have expressed this concern in speeches on the floor of the Senate and in other ways. It seems to me that a method of formulating party policies in the Senate that is representative of and responsive to the majority will of the Democratic Senators is necessary to a responsible performance by the Democratic Party.

That is particularly true now, when the President of the United States is a member of the Republican Party. Unless the Democratic Party in Congress

has some orderly way of formulating legislative policy, the only organ I know of which undertakes from time to time to announce party policy to the country is the advisory committee to the Democratic National Committee, most members of which do not hold an office to which they have been elected; whereas in the Senate there are 65 Members who have been chosen as the nominees of their party in their respective States, and who have been elected by the people of their States to this responsibility.

This subject has been a matter of legislation. It has been a matter of frequent debate in the Senate. I debated the matter in the Senate last year. It is a matter of public interest. It is surely a matter of interest to every Democrat in the United States. More than that, it is a matter of concern to every citizen, because it goes to the heart of the responsibility of the party and of the operation of the two-party system, in which all people, as I have said, have a concern.

I say these things in a general way, Mr. President, because I am concerned with a current interpretation of the purpose and role of the Democratic senatorial policy committee, by some, that this committee is merely an arm of the Democratic leadership of the Senate. I do not accept this interpretation. It does not comport with the purposes for which the policy committee was created. It neither comports with democratic procedure nor complies with the principle of responsibility of an agent to a principal.

In my view, the Democratic policy committee is, or should be, an agent of the conference of Democratic Senators.

The Senate Democratic policy committee should represent all the Democrats in the Senate, not merely one. The Democratic policy committee of the U.S. Senate should operate in the study and in the formulation of policy, working with all the Democratic Senators. It should be elected by the Democratic Senators. This goes to the heart of democratic procedure within the Democrat Party.

One can understand, then, Mr. President, why at the conference of Democratic Senators last Thursday, I found it impossible to accept the dictum that the Democratic policy committee is "an arm of the leadership."

Perhaps it would be helpful to review briefly the history of the Democratic policy committee, the purposes for which it was created, and the manner of its creation. The Democratic policy committee had its genesis in the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. It was this committee, which was headed by the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., and then Representative, but now Senator, A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, which recommended the Reorganization Act of 1946, by the terms of which Congress now operates. The committee held long hearings on the problems of the Congress in the manner in which it could be more representative of, responsive to, and more effective in implementing the public will and party policy.

I should like to read two sentences from the recommendation of this committee.

Recommendation: That both the House and the Senate establish formal committees for the determination and expression of majority and minority policy. The majority and minority policy committees in both Houses would be appointed by their respective majority and minority conferences.

From this, Mr. President, it is perfectly clear that the Monroney-La Follette committee recommendation which gave birth to both the Republican and Democratic policy committees in the U.S. Senate did not envision the policy committee as a mere "arm of the leadership." Quite to the contrary, the report clearly recommends the establishment of majority and minority policy committees which would meet at frequent intervals "to formulate the overall legislative policy of the two parties." Moreover, as I have already said, it recommended that these committees be appointed by their respective majority and minority conferences. Perhaps it would be appropriate to read the entire section of the joint committee report with respect to this particular subject. That I shall now do.

MAJORITY AND MINORITY POLICY COMMITTEES

Strong recommendations were made to your committee concerning the need for the formal expression within the Congress of the main policies of the majority and minority parties. These representations called for some mechanism which could bring about more party accountability for policies and pledges and announced and made in the national platforms of the major political parties.

These recommendations were based on the theory that in a democracy national problems must be handled on a national basis. Only through the expression of the will of the people by their support of political parties on the basis of their platform pledges can the majority will be determined. Likewise the minority viewpoint is also expressed in support of the minority platform.

No one would claim that representative democracy as we know it today could exist without majority and minority parties. The 435 voices of the House and the 96 of the Senate would be confused babel of conflicting tongues without party machinery. Instead of unorganized mob rule where the strength of varying viewpoints cannot be measured or determined, party government furnishes a tug-of-war in which the direction and strength of opposing viewpoints can be more or less accurately measured and weighed.

Under the American party system there are always two main groups, each checking the other and offering the choice of alternative courses of action. Around these two groups Congressmen can rally and express themselves, helping in party caucuses to determine the policy for their group.

Your committee recognizes the need for freedom of action on the part of the individual Member of Congress and his right to vote at any time against the announced policy of his party. But we feel that if party accountability for policies and pledges is to be achieved, stronger and more formal mechanisms are necessary. The present steering committees, an informal and little-used device, seldom meet and never steer.

We recommend that these be replaced with the formal establishment in the House and the Senate of majority and minority policy committees. The majority policy committees of the two Houses would meet jointly at

frequent intervals, as would those of the minority, to formulate the over-all legislative policy of the two parties. The majority policy committee of each House would also hold frequent meetings to consider its role in expediting consideration and passage of matters pledged to the people by their party.

On issues where party policy is involved the decisions of these policy committees would be formally announced in the proceedings of Congress and formal records would be kept of such decisions. No member of either party would be required to follow such announced party policy except as he chose to do so. Each member would be free to vote as he saw fit, but the record of his action would be available to the public as a means of holding both the party and the individual accountable.

1. CREATION OF POLICY COMMITTEES

Recommendation: That both the House and the Senate establish formal committees for the determination and expression of majority policy and minority policy. Each of these four committees would be composed of seven members appointed in its entirety at the opening of each new Congress. The majority and minority policy committees in both Houses would be appointed by their respective majority and minority conferences.

We feel that in the establishment of such policy committee, the Congress chosen at the last general election should be controlling and that the policy-committee membership should therefore be chosen at the beginning of each new Congress. Membership on all policy committees would automatically expire at the close of each Congress.

Mr. President, the minority party at the time of that report was the Republican Party, but it became the majority party the following year. The majority leader was the late Senator Taft, of Ohio. As I understand, the Senate Policy Committee of the Republican Party follows those recommendations rather closely. I find it rather strange that the procedure for determining legislative policy within the Republican Party in the Senate is more democratic than the procedure for determining party policy—if we have such procedure—within the Democratic Party in the Senate.

Upon the recommendation of the Monroney-La Follette committee the Senate passed a bill which contained the following provision:

Sec. 244(a) It is the sense of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the majority party and the principal minority party in the respective Houses should each at the beginning of each Congress appoint a policy committee, consisting of seven members, for the formulation of overall legislative policy of the respective parties.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for each policy committee the sum of \$30,000 for the maintenance of a staff to assist in study, analysis, and research on problems involved in policy determinations. The members of each such staff shall be appointed, and their compensation fixed, by the policy committee concerned, but no such compensation shall be fixed at a rate in excess of \$8,000 per annum.

The above provision was not accepted by the House, but the Senate proceeded promptly upon its own to establish its own majority and minority policy committees. The Senate included in the legislative appropriation bill—passed within a few days after the reorganization bill became law—legislative provi-

sions which, in effect, authorized the establishment of policy committees and the employment of staffs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield; or does he prefer to proceed at this time?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee has been reading from the text of the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In that text it is provided that the majority party and the principal minority party shall appoint the policy committees. It does not say that the majority leader and the minority leader shall appoint the committees; the text states that the parties shall appoint the committees. Is that true?

Mr. GORE. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And therefore the Senator from Tennessee is laying the basis for indicating that it was the intent of the Senate that the policy committee should be the agent of the party.

Mr. GORE. That is clear, it seems to me, from the report of the Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress, from the bill S. 2177, 79th Congress, as introduced in the Senate, from the bill as passed by the Senate, and also from the measure which finally became law, the First Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1947 which was based upon the committee's recommendation, and which is the legislative basis for the Senate policy committees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Tennessee is correct. I merely wanted to raise this question, in order to point out, at the very least, the original intent of the bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator from Illinois. The provision was contained, as I have read it, in the bill which passed the Senate. The provision was not accepted by the House. When the House would not accept the provision, the bill was passed without it.

But to show the intent of the Senate, the Senate proceeded within a very few days to attach a legislative rider to an appropriation bill; and that rider did, in effect, authorize the establishment of policy committees in the Senate and the employment of staffs therefor. I should like to read that provision, which was contained in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1947, and which was passed in August 1946. I shall now read the provision, which today is the law:

For maintenance of a staff for a majority policy committee and a minority policy committee in the Senate, consisting of seven members each, for the formulation of overall legislative policy of the respective parties, the members of such staff to assist in study, analysis, and research on problems involved in policy determinations, and to be appointed, and their compensation fixed, by the policy committee concerned, at rates not to exceed \$8,000 per annum in any case, \$15,000 for each such committee, in all, fiscal year 1947, \$30,000, to be available at the beginning of the 80th Congress.

Note, Mr. President, how closely the language of the provision which became law followed the provisions of the bill recommended by the Monroney-La Fol-

lette committee, and adopted as a portion of the reorganization bill which was passed by the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to remain in the Chamber, to listen to all of the Senator's speech, for I am greatly interested in what he has to say. However, several persons are waiting for me, in my office.

So at this time I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. I know he will have a good answer to it, and therefore I wish to give him this opportunity to answer it: In light of the fact that the whole matter of how the policy committee should be selected is on the agenda for tomorrow, to be discussed behind closed doors, at a caucus called for that purpose where we of the Democratic Party can determine what action we should take with respect to this entire problem, I am curious to know why the able Senator from Tennessee wished to make this speech today, here on the floor of the Senate, in public, before all the press, as he is now doing. I am curious about that.

Mr. GORE. I was sure the junior Senator from Florida would be curious about it, and I shall be very pleased to satisfy his curiosity.

For one thing, this is a matter about which I am deeply concerned; and this is not the first time I have expressed such concern on the floor of the Senate. The people of Tennessee have honored me with an opportunity to be a United States Senator. In consequence of that honor and that office, I have the privilege of speaking in this forum; and that is one of the greatest privileges which can come to a man. Here one can be heard. Behind closed doors one can be steamrollered.

This is an issue which I think concerns all the people, because it goes to the heart of the responsibility of our parties; it goes to a method of determining party policy.

I should like to point out to the Senator that last year, without party policy, one committee dealt in one way with the interest rate problem; another committee dealt in another way with that problem. No one could tell us what the policy of the Democratic Party was, unless one wished to acknowledge that the advisory committee to the National Committee constituted such an authoritative organ for policy.

I take it that the Senator does not recognize that group as an authoritative spokesman for the party. Where, then, is there to be, and how is there to be, a formulation of legislative policies of the Democratic Party? As a result of the lack of party policy, as a result of the constant compromise of principle, we ended the last session in virtual rout on the economic issues.

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

Mr. GORE. I want to satisfy the Senator's curiosity. I think this is important to every American, not just to the Senators who are going to meet behind closed doors tomorrow. Yes, I will have

an opportunity to have my say there, and I will say some things there that I will not say here—perhaps—

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

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

Mr. GORE. Just a moment, and I will yield. But I have some things to say here as I have the opportunity which I feel it is my duty to say to all who will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is not a matter for the sole determination of Senators behind closed doors. Every Democrat in Florida should be interested in this, and I hope every Democrat in Tennessee is interested in it. I will certainly undertake to interest them in it.

Now I yield further.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure the Senator knows nobody questions his right to rise in the Senate and discuss anything about which he has convictions.

Mr. GORE. I understand the Senator has not questioned my right; he has expressed his curiosity.

Mr. SMATHERS. I was interested in your discussion in light of the fact that we know proposals were made for caucuses, having an opportunity to settle this type of question at them. I remember an argument made against the caucuses was that we could come to the floor of the U.S. Senate and debate the problems. I remember the argument was made in opposition to the proposal of the Senator from Pennsylvania that we really did not have to have a caucus, because a Senator could come to the floor and speak, as the Senator from Tennessee is doing, without inhibition, or limitation and to the whole world. But, the counterargument was made—and it prevailed—that we should argue things that have to do with party workings, washing our dirty linen, in our own party caucuses. I sort of subscribed to that practice, and I understood the Senator from Tennessee did. Therefore I have been at a loss to understand why he comes on the floor now. That is the reason why I was curious.

Mr. GORE. In the first place, I do not regard this question as being purely and strictly one of concern to Democratic Senators. As I have said, I think this is of interest to all our party members. Indeed, it is of interest to many independent citizens in the United States who do not have an affiliation with either party, because it goes to the heart of the operation of our two-party system. As our population continues to grow, multitudinous as it is, with 180 million people, it will be only through clear-cut choices, if there are any clear-cut choices any more between the two parties, that the American people will have a meaningful, constructive way of expressing a choice and giving direction and a mandate to their Government.

If we compromise with principle, if we wind up with the Democratic Party almost indistinguishable from the administration's party, then how, I ask, will the American people have a clear-cut choice?

I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Florida tell us what the

Democratic Party policy is with respect to any issue which he wishes to choose, how that legislative policy has been determined in the Senate, and what means we have now to determine such policy.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would say, irrespective of whether we do or do not have such means, that the whole debate involves a matter of mechanics and machinery. At least, that is what I thought. I thought that was the reason why we were to go into caucus tomorrow. That is the reason why I have felt, and many other Senators have felt, that from time to time we should have a caucus, as the Republicans do, which, as the Senator from Tennessee has explained, appear to be successful. However, I have not noticed that they stand on their side of the aisle and air their particular divisions for the whole world to see. Yes, I think they discuss them in caucus. I have not been invited to them. I have not been privileged to learn what they think their problems are. And I think they are wise in not advertising them.

I doubt the wisdom of once again pointing out, as I think everybody recognizes, some divisions in our own party, and the additional problem of how we should proceed to determine policy. I understand that the real purpose of the caucus was to state our positions, which naturally could be stated more freely in caucus, without the necessity of saying the same thing on the floor of the Senate, and without having it misunderstood as it goes out over the wires or radio and television.

If we are to argue the issues here on the floor today, there is no sense in arguing the same things in caucus tomorrow. May I mention this one complimentary thing?

Mr. GORE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SMATHERS. I know the Senator from Tennessee is absolutely sincere about what he is doing here. I know he has deep convictions about it. I know he is a loyal and dedicated Democrat and patriot. I understand all that. I think what he is talking about in the realm of determining policy has merit to it. I just wonder about the wisdom of rising on the floor of the Senate at this time and talking about it, and now broadcasting it to the public, in light of the caucus which has been called for tomorrow to determine these questions among ourselves. That is what aroused my curiosity.

Mr. GORE. I will have some further comments to make about that in a few moments. But the junior Senator from Tennessee asks the junior Senator from Florida to name one legislative policy of the Democratic Party, to outline, if he can, any formal procedure the 65 Senators belonging to the Democratic Party in the Senate have for determining a policy.

The Senator from Florida responded to my question by saying, "Irrespective of that situation," and then he proceeded to make a statement. I wonder if the able Senator from Florida would be able to tell me—and I am entitled to curiosity the same as the junior Senator from Florida is—

Mr. SMATHERS. Surely.

Mr. GORE. I am curious to know what he regards the policy of the Democratic Party with respect to housing to be.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to say, in answer to the able Senator from Tennessee, that one of the great virtues—or vices, I do not know which—

Mr. GORE. Well, now, there is a good deal of difference.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think there is a great deal of difference between them, but I am not sure whether in this instance what I am going to say is a virtue or a vice. I will leave that to the good judgment of the Senator from Tennessee. But one of the good things about the Democratic Party is that we cannot tell a Member what to do. The distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico said he did not care—and I applaud him for his position—how many Members got together and stated what they considered the Democratic Party's position and tried to tell him the way he should vote. He said the people of New Mexico sent him here and no Senator was going to bind him nor dictate to him as to how he was to vote.

I join with him in that noble sentiment. I was not sent to the U.S. Senate to go into any room with any group of people, even fellow Democrats, and have them tell me how I should vote on housing, agriculture, debt management, or on anything. The only people to whom I am responsible are the people of my State of Florida, who elected me to come here to represent them in the best possible way I could.

I ran on the Democratic ticket. The Democrats voted for me, I am delighted to say, and then sent me here to do that which I thought best for them and the Nation as a whole.

I do not know of a single Senator present who feels as though he is going to be bound by any statement of an advisory council, or of a caucus of any nature, or anything else. The whole purpose of the caucus, as I understood, is to converse about these matters, to see what is the middle ground and to see if there is anything upon which most of us can agree.

It would obviously always not be correct to assume that we could get the senior Senator from Illinois, who sits here, for example, to agree with the able senior Senator from Virginia. We could not get the Senator from Mississippi and the senior Senator from Minnesota to agree about civil rights. We could not get the Senator from Rhode Island to agree with the Senator from Oregon about farm problems. We have considerable division about these things.

We do not even have a policy with respect to reclamation which represents 100-percent unanimity.

However, we try to get together as best we can as they do in any legislative body, to give and take, to see what course we can follow with which most Senators will agree. That is what we have been doing.

I think we have been pretty successful, because even though a President of one party won by a tremendous margin

of votes in 1952 and again in 1956, we have nonetheless been able to increase our representation in the House and Senate, despite having to contend with this great personality. We have been able to do this, in my opinion, because the people believe the Congress has been reasonable, responsible, and sensible. The people have voted for our candidates, for our platforms, and for our course of action, as vague as they may sometimes appear to be. The people have voted for us, in the final analysis, and that is the test.

The Senator says, "Look at the Republicans; they have been perhaps a little more democratic than we." I can only say I doubt they have been, but certainly their course has not been as effective as ours, because we have been defeating them in every election.

I make these remarks with deep affection for my friend, who knows I mean sincerely what I am saying. I have the utmost admiration for the Senator from Tennessee. I am in sympathy with what he is saying. I think he is ringing a bell, but I do not think he is ringing it at the right address, on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, first I thank the able junior Senator from Florida for his generous remarks.

The Senator said he would leave it to me to judge whether in his remarks he was describing a situation which could be considered a vice or a virtue. I choose to apply the word "virtue" to the freedom of choice which my friend says every Senator must have.

I should like to read from the report of the Monroney-La Follette committee, which I read before the distinguished Senator entered the Chamber, on this particular point:

On issues where party policy is involved the decisions of these policy committees would be formally announced in the proceedings of Congress and formal records would be kept of such decisions. No member of either party would be required to follow such announced party policy except as he chose to do so. Each Member would be free to vote as he saw fit, but the record of his action would be available to the public as a means of holding both the party and the individual accountable.

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

Mr. GORE. I will yield in a minute.

Mr. President, I have asked the able junior Senator from Florida to name one instance in which he knows the legislative policy of the Democratic Party in the Senate—to show one way we have of developing in a formal way an effective and meaningful policy. The Senator has not answered.

We have a way of developing one. I shall answer my own question to some extent by saying that in the caucus, or in the conference, we can develop one. This is one effective and meaningful way to develop a policy and to announce formally the policy to the country.

Then the junior Senator from Tennessee would have to accept his responsibility, with the Democrats in Tennessee, as to whether he followed such a policy or whether he did not. As the

situation is now, there may be a coalition of a few Democrats and enough Republicans to bring a bill to the Senate even though the bill does not represent the view of the majority of the Democrats in the Senate. As a result of the coalition, a bill may be enacted into law without any yardstick ever having been established to show that it was contrary to the legislative policy of the Democrats in the U.S. Senate.

Before yielding further, I should like to amplify my answer to the Senator as to why I consider this to be a proper subject for debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Could the Senator help me by answering one question on that point?

Mr. GORE. I will answer further, and then I will yield.

For one thing, what we are discussing is a matter of legislation. The genesis of the policy committee, the authorization for its establishment and for the payment of its staff, is a matter of legislation. The membership is said to be seven. How did the number come to be more? I do not complain about there being more members. I think there should be more.

I think the rank and file of our party ought to know that on the Democratic policy committee of the Senate there is only one member from north of the Alabama line and east of the Mississippi River, the very distinguished and able Senator, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

I think we should have a policy committee which is something more than an arm of the leadership. We should have a policy committee which performs the functions and assumes the responsibilities envisioned in the Monroney-La Follette committee report.

Furthermore, I think the membership of the committee should be increased so that the committee will be more truly representative of all the Democrats in the Senate and of their constituents and so that it will be representative of all the great geographic sections of our country.

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

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Florida has one additional question.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have only one question.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Even if somebody wished to agree with everything the Senator from Tennessee has been saying, with respect to the verity of his argument about policy and how to get it, I think, however, that person could also logically say that this forum in which we speak today is not a caucus and is not a conference of Democrats, where these intraparty matters are supposed to be decided. On the contrary, this is the floor of the Senate of the United States, where we are bringing out into the open once again the washing, so to speak, our "dirty linen."

Mr. GORE. This is not "dirty" linen; it is simply faulty linen.

Mr. SMATHERS. Very well; faulty linen. If this were a Democratic caucus we would not see the able and distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] sitting here. We would not have a room full of people. We would not have a crowded press gallery looking down on us.

Perhaps we could decide this question in a party caucus. In a caucus each member would be free to vote as he saw fit. Perhaps we could decide some issues but I do not believe we Democrats are going to be able to decide anything on the basis of what we do this afternoon on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator wished to ask me one further question.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not have another question. I merely wished to make that observation, in all good conscience and good spirit.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me. As I say, I am not unsympathetic with the argument he is making. I am only a little doubtful whether the forum in which he is making it is the correct forum. I have been wrong before. I may be wrong in the future, and I may be wrong now. But I do not believe I am.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in the first place, the Democratic Party is the party of the people. I do not mind the people knowing my views on this subject. I do not mind the people knowing whether the party has or has not a means of formulating Democratic policy in the U.S. Senate. I want my constituents to know my views on this question, and this is the proper forum for a Member of the U.S. Senate.

I say again to the able junior Senator from Florida that this problem cannot be interpreted as purely a problem to be decided within the Democratic caucus, because the Congress enacted a law on the subject.

Furthermore, the Democratic Party in the Senate must go back to the basic legislation, containing the authorization for the payment of the staff of the committee. Therefore, the problem cannot be dealt with exclusively in the Democratic caucus.

There is one further point. I am not so naive as to think that this problem will be settled in the right way if no public notice is given as to the existence of the problem. I have been in public life for a few years. What little accomplishment it has been my opportunity to achieve has been in direct ratio to the extent of public information as to my efforts. Therefore, I am glad to accept the impeachment of the Senator's curiosity, and I am pleased to tell him that I am speaking as a Member of the U.S. Senate on a problem which goes to the very heart of the operation of the two-party system in the legislative branch of our Government. I do not think that is exclusively the privilege of either the Republican caucus or the Democratic caucus.

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

Mr. GORE. I promised to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I shall now prove a point in connection with what I said in the conference the other day, namely, that if three Democrats get together, it is impossible to get two of them to agree with the third.

With all due deference, and with no personalities whatsoever being involved, I shall remain on the side of my good friend from Tennessee this afternoon.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I feel that we can settle more party policy on this floor than in a million conferences.

Our friends on the other side—and I note the presence in the Chamber of my good friend from California [Mr. KUCHEL]—are supposed to be democratic in their way of thinking. They meet every day; but look at them.

Mr. KUCHEL. I hope my friend is not referring to my facial expression. [Laughter].

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; nothing like that at all.

We are not going to determine in a party caucus whether we are to have housing legislation. We are not going to determine in a party caucus whether we are to have civil rights legislation. We are not going to determine in a party conference whether we are to have progressive legislation and liberal legislation. The only time I ever had an opportunity to vote on liberal legislation was when I entered a big fight with my good friends from the South on the fair employment labor practices bill. At that time I occupied the seat in this Chamber now occupied by my friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I handled the legislation from my committee.

Party policy, so far as Democrats are concerned, will be determined here. Let us get to work and vote for the legislation by which we intend to make policy. To become irritated after listening to someone talk does not accomplish anything.

I repeat, that no party conference is going to bind me. I wish to find out what I am voting on, and not what the members of a party conference may think or say behind closed doors. I want the public to know the facts. I want the people of New Mexico to know how I stand and how I vote.

I, for one, am glad that the Senator from Tennessee is making the speech which he is delivering, even though I do not agree with him entirely.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his generous remarks.

I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that it is difficult for Democrats to get together. If I wished to live in perfect harmony with all members of my political party, I would join the Republican Party.

Mr. MORSE. That would be a mistake.

Mr. GORE. But I do not want to be a Republican. I want to be a Democrat.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think there is one important difference between the original voting position of the able senior Senator from New Mexico, and that of the very able Senator from Tennessee. When the question was first discussed the other day at our Democratic conference the able Senator from New Mexico said he did not believe any caucuses were necessary, because Senators could come to the floor and do exactly what the Senator from Tennessee is doing. But the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators said no, or implied that they did not agree, and that we should have a caucus, and there discuss such questions. That is the basic difference. I was one of those who agreed to a great extent with the able Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. GORE. But the Senator did not vote that way.

Mr. SMATHERS. On the contrary, the Senator from Florida did vote that way. As a matter of fact, there was no vote, but the Senator from Florida was prepared to so vote.

The point is that when the issues which are considered in the caucus are eventually brought to the floor of the Senate for debate, we can then get up and speak our piece, and let the people know where we stand. And we do not have to be bound by any discussion in the caucus, but we have had the benefit of it.

The type of meeting which I envisioned at the caucus was a meeting to decide when to bring issues to the floor of the Senate, and the most strategic way to bring them up. There was no effort to close the door on any Senator. All that was involved in the conferences which some Senators wanted was getting together on a policy which most of us could follow, and then bringing the issue to the floor of the Senate, so that every Senator could speak his piece.

That is why I applaud the able Senator from New Mexico, because he is consistent in his position.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wonder if my good friend will bear with me momentarily, in order to keep the record straight.

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Like Al Smith, I say, Let us look at the record.

This is not the first time that the question of a conference or policy committee has been discussed. Let me say to my friend from California [Mr. KUCHEL] that I remember when we were in the minority, not so long ago. On February 4, 1953, we met behind closed doors in a minority conference of Senate Democrats. At that time my good friend from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who is at present the majority leader, was then the minority leader.

He and I had a little colloquy, and I should like to quote from it:

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with all due deference to the minority leader, I, as one Senator, would like to find out from the President what his ideas are. I am willing

to use my own judgment in trying to cooperate with him in his desire to carry out his ideas. However, the point I should like to make is that the decision of the minority policy committee is not the decision of the minority. After all, I do not want the minority policy committee to make a decision for me. I should like to use my own judgment.

After all, the President of the United States is entitled at least to a fair chance to try to carry out what I consider to be the mandate of the American people. However, I should like to ask the minority leader at this time if it is expected by him that what the policy committee decides is to be the decision of the minority Members of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the minority leader merely read to the Senate the statement which was adopted by the minority policy committee. He did not attempt to speak for any Member of the Senate other than the members of that committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know, but what—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to finish my answer to the Senator from New Mexico. If the Senator will read the statement and then assume the same position which the nine members of the committee assumed, well and good. If he does not care to do so, of course, the Senator may—and I know he will—express his own personal viewpoint.

In other words, the way I understood the minority leader's answer at the time was that he was expressing only the opinion of those who had met with him as members of the policy committee, and did not intend in any way, shape, or form to bind individual Members of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the RECORD to be clear that the minority leader at that time, the Senator from Texas, did not at any time try to contend that they represented the majority of the Senate, or that they wanted the majority to be bound by their decision.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I should like to make one further suggestion to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. I was not one of those who originated the motion in the conference the other day for regular Democratic conferences. I was one of those who felt that we should not ignore the sentiment of so many of our colleagues who wished to have more Democratic get-togethers and discussions. I did not share the enthusiasm and hopes for party conferences which some of my colleagues expressed or felt. I thought, since they desired them, we should have some. However, I would not want in any respect to have the junior Senator from Florida take from me the privilege of discussing a public issue on the floor of the Senate, an issue which I have discussed many times heretofore on the floor of the Senate, just because I thought we should accede to the wishes of so many of our colleagues for some Democratic conferences.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join the Senator from New Mexico in commending the Senator from Tennessee for taking the floor this afternoon. I am delighted that all of this is coming

out in the open, not being leaked from behind closed doors supposedly clothing conferences or caucuses of Democratic Senators.

In that connection I should like to say that I was very much surprised to read in the paper this morning after last week's conference or caucus that there was literally a rebellion going on against the leadership on the Democratic side. It just was not so. I told the reporters who spoke to me about it that it was a harmonious meeting. One of the people who did the most to maintain a great degree of harmony was the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. That is how I got into it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right. I believe that caucuses are a waste of time. I believe we would lose more votes than we would probably gain, because stories will get out of the conferences which will overemphasize something of perhaps a somewhat spectacular nature, or contain only partial truth.

If we discuss issues in which we are interested, such as housing, aid to education, civil rights, and so forth, down here on the floor of the Senate, the newspaper people up there in the gallery will get an accurate report of what is said down here. I would hope that we would do our arguing and our quarreling and our debating out in the open.

As I understand, the Senator from Tennessee says—and I quote him—"This is the proper forum." I believe we will accomplish a great deal more here on the floor than in caucuses, from which stories are bound to be leaked. Those stories will contain half truths, and the result will be that the Democratic Party will be set against itself, and we will be furnishing fodder to the Republicans, who are sitting over there just laughing and enjoying themselves no end. I do not blame them.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I understand—

Mr. GORE. I understood the Senator from Montana to say that in his opinion caucuses would do that, and not what the junior Senator from Tennessee said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not a fact that the Republican Party has been holding caucus after caucus during the last 5 or 6 years?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that they have been having luncheon after luncheon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And they have lost man after man because of it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the Democrats have been gaining Members in the Senate because of the responsible and constructive way we have conducted ourselves.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Do I understand that the Senator from South Carolina is suggesting that here is some type of undercover urging by the Senator from Tennessee that the holding of caucuses could

defeat more Senators on his side in the next election?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. All I know is that as a result of caucuses held by the Senator's party, newspaper stories have been printed about Republican Senators fussing among themselves in the caucuses, and that some of the Senators who came up for election later were defeated for some cause or other.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for not more than thirty seconds for another statement.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. On that point I should like to say that I have been admonished by some of my fellow Republicans on this side of the aisle to be very careful about accepting any recommendation from the other side of the aisle as to how we can increase our membership on this side of the aisle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is good advice.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to say once again that I am not one of those who believes that frequent conferences of the Democratic Party will solve all our problems, or even, necessarily, develop a party policy. What I feel very strongly about is an effective, working Democratic policy committee performing the functions for which it was created. That is my concern. My concern is with an effective Democratic policy, perhaps above the necessity or the desire for having so many party conferences. That, I will say to the Senator from Montana, is my principal concern.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Before I go into my next topic, I should like to express the hope that, if we have a conference tomorrow, the members of the press will be in attendance, so that they can get a true and accurate story of what goes on, and not what is leaked out to them.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Tennessee in his discussion has been very accurate in his historical background of the legislation and the proposals emanating from the Monroney-La Follette idea for the reorganization of Congress—as far as he goes.

However, I believe there is another point I should bring out, and that is that on January 2, 1947, the next year, there was a meeting of the Democratic caucus under the leadership of the late Senator Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky. I now read from the minutes of the conference:

Senator Barkley then stated that the conference should discuss and determine the procedure to be followed in connection with committee assignments and questions relating to the steering committee and the minority policy committee, created by Public Law No. 663, 79th Congress (1st Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1937).

Senator Barkley stressed the importance of the newly created policy committee—

Incidentally, I think the committee is misnamed—

stating that while, of course, it was necessary to work as closely as possible in cooperation with the majority, it would neces-

sarily follow that the policy committee as a group would work in close association with the President.

A Democratic President.

Senator Barkley suggested that the conference first discuss the question of the minority committee assignments. Senator McKellar, of Tennessee—

The predecessor of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee—

stated that in his opinion the minority policy committee should be elected by the conference.

Mr. GORE. That shows that Tennesseans can be right twice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed, but wrong when it comes to the votes.

Senator Barkley stated that the question of how membership on the policy committee should be filled would be taken up later in the meeting.

The conference then discussed the minority policy committee heretofore referred to, and Senator Barkley repeated his previous statements regarding the committee. Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, recalled the suggestion previously made by Senator McKellar that membership on the minority policy committee should be filled by election by the conference. Senator O'MAHONEY addressed the conference and submitted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the chairman of the conference be authorized to appoint the membership of the minority policy committee, provided for by Public Law No. 663, 79th Congress, and that he is hereby named chairman of such committee."

The resolution offered by Senator O'MAHONEY was adopted by voice vote. (Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, voting in the negative.)

I thought the Democrats ought to know that, because that was done by the democratic action of the Democratic conference.

Mr. GORE. I do not think the record should be necessarily interpreted as indicating that there was only one vote in the negative. The usual custom is that, when there is a voice vote, no one's vote is recorded except when an individual says he wishes to be recorded either in the affirmative or the negative. I do not know whether on the voice vote in question there was only one negative vote, and the record does not say.

My esteemed predecessor, in my view, was right. He was a great Democrat, and he advocated democratic procedure within the Democratic Party. I am proud to be following in his footsteps in this particular regard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Tennessee is just as distinguished in his own right as was Senator McKellar.

Mr. GORE. I thank my able friend from Montana.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding. I would be happy if I could have the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Montana. The Senator from Montana, in his remarks a few minutes ago, indicated that there had been leaks from the conference last week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Leaks which had given an improper indication of what took place at the meeting.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I read the Washington newspapers, the New York newspapers, the Philadelphia newspapers, and other Pennsylvania newspapers quite carefully. In my judgment, there was nothing in any of those news accounts which incorrectly reported what took place at the conference.

The majority leader, in my presence, was interviewed by reporters immediately after the conference. With his permission, I sat with him. The account which he gave of the conference was completely accurate. With his permission, I made a slight addition, which he thought was equally accurate. So far as I am concerned, there was nothing in any of the newspapers which gave the slightest reason for believing that anything had been done or said which could be construed as an attack upon the majority leader, either before the conference or afterward.

Neither do I think there was any reason to infer from any of the press accounts that there was a wide split in the Democratic Party which was causing difficulty.

I myself think—the junior Senator from Montana was there, and he will have his own view—that the conference was conducted in a mature, orderly manner; that everyone was in good humor; that there were no voices raised; and that there was just the kind of democratic discussion of important issues which, in my judgment, should take place far more frequently in the future than has been the case in the past.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, it was a harmonious meeting.

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what I said. But did the Senator see what some of the newspapers said, did he read what the Washington Post said, that there was an indication that there was an uprising against the majority leader? But the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Baltimore Sun made no such statements.

Mr. CLARK. I read the Washington Post, and I saw nothing in the article which was inaccurate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did the Senator read the headlines? I read the article, too. But it is the headlines which attract attention to the news accounts.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I had intended to make one thing perfectly clear before I finished. I think now is the time to do it.

My motion in the Democratic conference does not arise out of any hostility to the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [LYNNDON JOHNSON]. I have stated these views previously. He and I had a debate on this subject last year. My esteem for him as a Senator, as a man, and as a leader has been expressed on the floor many times, and in many other ways and many other places. I think the senior Senator from Texas, the Honorable LYNNDON JOHNSON, is the ablest Democrat who has served as Democratic leader in

the Senate in my lifetime. Should there be any further question? This is a matter of principle; it is a matter of party responsibility, party policy, and party performance. It is not a matter of personality. I would certainly resist any such interpretation being placed upon my efforts.

I wish to make one other point clear. I have no objection to the present membership of the Democratic policy committee. Each member is my personal friend; each is the object of my esteem and affection. My concern arises out of my desire to see the Democratic Party have a fairly effective way of formulating policy and announcing that policy to the country, and then letting each Member consider his own responsibility in voting. But let the rank and file of our party and the people of the country have a yardstick by which to measure any Senator's party loyalty.

Unless there is some sense of party responsibility, the workings of the two-party system will break down in its end goal, which is to give to the people clear-cut choices.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I was not in Washington at the time the discussions took place, which have been mentioned. All I know is what I have read in the newspapers, except what I have heard today. I should like to put a question to the junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. GORE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CARROLL. I want to ask the Senator from Montana about the resolution passed in the 1947 Democratic conference. I think the Senator has read it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. How have the policy committees been appointed since 1947? Was it by virtue of some resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; by virtue of some resolution and by virtue of the fact that each majority leader appoints to any vacancy which may exist.

I point out that the present majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], has appointed two members, and only two, of the present policy committee. One is the senior Democrat in this body, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; the other is my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. In the latter respect, I believe I am correct—and I observe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on the floor; he can correct me if I am in error—in stating that the majority leader went to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to former Senator Lehman, and other Senators, and asked whom they wanted to have named to the policy committee. If I am correct, it was on their recommendation to the leadership that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was placed on that committee. Am I correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is substantially true. My memory is not perfect, but I think that is substantially true.

Mr. CARROLL. At the time the resolution was passed, was the Democratic

Party in the Senate the majority or the minority party?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was the minority party. I think we had 43 Members, if I remember correctly. But the President was of the Democratic Party.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to ask a further question in regard to the caucus, about which I received notification only this morning.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The notice was sent out only on Saturday morning, on the initiative of the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and before a letter—supposedly being sent—was received by the leader or anyone else; I refer to a letter asking that a conference or caucus be called.

Mr. CARROLL. That is the way the matter was reported by the press in Colorado.

I want to commend the leadership for calling the conference. After listening to the colloquy, I suppose we are discussing some of those questions at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to say I think the Senator from Tennessee has performed a real public service by bringing out this matter on the floor. I hope that we Democrats never arrive at the point where we have to reach our decisions behind closed doors. Let us use this public forum, and thus let all the people know of our differences and how we reconcile them.

Mr. GORE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me say that I agree with the Senator from Montana.

I have listened to the colloquy between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Montana. Certainly there is no dirty linen to be washed here. The Senator from Tennessee has said we are dealing with basic principle, and that is the question here. There is nothing to hide. But we should not be afraid to air or ventilate or fumigate if it becomes necessary. I ask the Senator from Tennessee whether it is his purpose today to discuss broadening the membership of the policy committee.

Mr. GORE. Yes; and if possible to spur its functioning in accordance with the responsibilities and the purposes for which it was created.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, as I read the law and as the Senator from Tennessee has indicated, it contains nothing which states that a Democratic caucus cannot elect the members of the policy committee. But because of a resolution which was adopted by a Democratic conference some years ago, and which seems to be continuing in nature, some of us who were not here at that time are bound by its provisions.

Today our party is in a different position. It is no longer a minority party; it is now the majority party, and has a majority of almost 2 to 1. As some Member has said, since the resolution was agreed to, the population of the country has increased by 20 million persons. So far as I know, never before has our party had so large a majority.

Our own majority leadership talks about responsibility. Certainly we have responsibility—not only to the Nation, but also to the people who form the Democratic Party.

Is there any reason why intelligent men cannot sit down and discuss who they wish to have serve on the policy committee?

Mr. GORE. I know of none.

Mr. CARROLL. Is there now any reason why intelligent men cannot enter the caucus room, and invite there the newspaper reporters, if necessary, to talk about something which I believe is more fundamental than the membership of the policy committee—namely, the membership of the steering committee? This is the crux of the matter. Such decisions should not be made by only one man or by a small group of men. All of us have had sufficient experience to know that it is our job never to permit too much power to be placed in the hands of one man or in the hands of a small group of men. The essence of democracy is the diffusion of such power; and the way to diffuse it properly is to have democratic representation, by means of voting. The Senator from Tennessee knows that to be true.

In the House of Representatives, where I formerly served, I was a member of the Ways and Means Committee. The Democratic members of that committee were selected by the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, not by only one person. I do not know how the Republican members of that committee were selected; but the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee had to run for that office. In those days, there were approximately 200 Democratic Members of the House of Representatives; and the procedure followed was to have them vote on candidates for the important Ways and Means Committee. They acted and proceeded through the Committee on Committees, which had the power to appoint the members of the other committees. The members of the Committee on Committees represented various zones. I remember that, because in those days I represented Colorado, Missouri, and, I believe, New Mexico.

I believe we can discuss this matter further in our meeting tomorrow. The discussion we have had here today is certainly in no way a reflection on the conduct of the majority leader.

Mr. GORE. Certainly I have not intended it to be.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Tennessee has said so clearly.

We have nothing to hide. Why cannot we open up this matter to the public? Certainly the Senator from Montana is 100 percent correct. We do not have to hide anything when we discuss party issues and party measures.

No skulduggery is involved in connection with these problems; but if there were some, it should be brought out into the open.

As the Senator from Tennessee has said, we are United States Senators, and we did not come here to bow before any-

one. If we have to fight over such matters, we will fight, if that is necessary.

Mr. GORE. And multiply.

Mr. CARROLL. I had not heard about this matter before today.

I commend the majority leader for calling the conference tomorrow; and at the conference tomorrow, if it is not feasible immediately to hold elections, it should be feasible immediately to broaden the base of the policy committee; and after we broaden its base and have more chance to express our views, then we ought to move into the next phase, which is to determine how elections ought to be made to the steering committee.

I have a basic interest in that matter; I refer, not to the membership of the policy committee, but to the membership of the steering committee and how its members are selected. This issue goes to the central power of the political body.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I had finished, and I am prepared to take my seat, unless the Senator from Wisconsin wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to commend the Senator from Tennessee for his masterful presentation, and I desire to ask him several questions about his position.

Mr. GORE. Very well.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wholeheartedly and enthusiastically agree with the position taken by the Senator from Tennessee. However, I wish to ask several questions in regard to the way he has presented his position.

I take it that his purpose is to arrive at an orderly, systematic method of formulating Democratic policy. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is very correct. Unless we have some guidelines by which the standing committees can operate, some guidelines for individual members, we have to "play by ear"; and in that event I fear that the rendition will not be a very harmonious one.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In the second place, the Senator from Tennessee is urging that the policy be formulated in such a way that, as he has stated the matter, there can be a greater sense of party responsibility on the part of all the Democratic Members of this body, and a better understanding of what our party stands for and what it seeks to do.

I believe the Senator from Tennessee has brought out most effectively, in the course of his colloquy with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the point that, first of all, we Democratic Senators do not know what the party policy is; and, in the second place, he has pointed out that the policy of the Democratic Party should be arrived at by some representative procedure, that is, by persons who represent us. He also emphasized that the policy should be formulated, not for our direction, but for our information and guidance.

Mr. GORE. And I want to be the first—well, not actually the first, because all Members who have spoken on this subject have proclaimed their independence and their reservation of the right to vote as they please. That I will do, but I want to have formulated a legislative policy of the Democratic Party. That legislative policy cannot be formulated by the advisory committee to Mr. Paul Butler. It cannot be formulated by Mr. Butler. He has not been chosen by the ballots of the people. Here in the Congress, where the Democratic Party has a two-thirds majority of the House and the Senate, chosen by the people as Members of the two bodies and as representatives of the Democratic Party, we have the most responsible spokesmen and officials of our party on the national level. Surely this group can devise some way of formulating a policy for the party, within the legislative branch. That is what I am pleading for. I think it is necessary. Without that, the vision of the Democratic Party is blurred; without that, and with one compromise after another, we would stand before the country as a party with an indistinct position.

For instance, I favor the passage of one housing bill. After careful consideration of the views of the President, the views of the Federal officials, the views of each member of the Democratic Party, the views of my constituents, and the views of the industry involved, and after having carefully determined the provisions of a housing bill supported by the Democratic Party, I favor sending it to President Eisenhower, and then letting him determine, for himself, whether he will veto it or whether he will sign it into law. I would not "weasel" one time after another until we stood for nothing except compromise.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Tennessee is reflecting, vigorously and properly, I think, on the recommendation which was contained in the Monroney-La Follette report, as follows:

These representations called for some mechanism which could bring about more party accountability for policies and pledges and announced and made in the national platforms of the major political parties.

I should like to say further that the distinguished assistant majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], as the spokesman for the leadership, has asked us—and I am sure he did not mean this to be a definitive answer—why we do not arrive at decisions like this on the floor of the Senate. I presume he believes the conference is no way to arrive at them. He was not asked his opinion, so it is not fair to imply he feels we could arrive at such decisions on the floor of the Senate, in contradistinction to the policy committee.

I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he thinks we can arrive at a party decision on the basis of this discussion on the floor today?

Mr. GORE. I hope the discussion will contribute to that end.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Perhaps I mistook the implication of the Senator from Wisconsin. I was not speaking for the leadership; I was speaking in my own capacity as a Senator from Montana, as I could speak only in that capacity, and as I always will. So far as getting anything accomplished in caucuses is concerned, it is my considered judgment that less will be accomplished in a caucus than will be accomplished in the open and through having a discussion in the forum where the ideas of Senators may be made known to the people of the country as a whole.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the junior Senator from Wisconsin made it emphatically clear last year on at least three occasions that he believed it was desirable to come to the floor of the Senate and speak one's convictions on these matters, but I did not say this was exclusive in any sense. I think the Senator from Tennessee is eminently correct in carrying the public's business to the people through their forum. I think it is also correct, however, as some of us contend, that these decisions—I repeat, decisions of Democratic Senators can only be made in conference of Democratic Senators.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, what the Senator is saying is that it is correct to bring these matters to the floor of the Senate, which is what we have been doing for many years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is right, but I do not see why that excludes our deciding that and other matters in conference.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does not do so at all, but to be perfectly frank, in my opinion, the name "policy" does not apply to that committee. It is a misnomer. The closest parallel one can give is the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives, which acts as a traffic cop on all kinds of vital and necessary legislation. But I challenge anyone to point to one piece of legislation which was held up by the policy committee, at least in the past 7 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is exactly correct. I think this is a point the Senator from Tennessee has made very well. The name "policy committee" is a misnomer. It is not a policy committee. It performs a very important function, but it is not the policy committee of the Senate. The Senator from Tennessee is calling this matter to our attention, and what we are trying to do is infuse responsibility and policymaking authority into the policy committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senate wants that, it can set up a policy committee and define its functions.

Mr. GORE. It has done so. I think the policy committee ought to be more than a traffic-control body. I want it to operate as it was intended. I want it to perform the functions for which, according to the record, it was created.

A part of its functions may well be to advise the majority leader in the scheduling of bills; but its functions are, or were intended to be, far broader than that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is a veteran of more than 20 years' service, and of really distinguished service, in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. He knows where policy is made. It is made in the legislative committees and is determined by a majority of the members of the committees. The policy committee, so-called, cannot go against the wishes of the legislative committees. All the policy committee can do is to expedite legislation, and we have done so very effectively. Again I say I do not know what further this committee can do. But if the Senator is interested in creating a bona fide policy committee, that can be done by majority vote of the Democrats in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. At the risk of repeating comments I have made earlier, I suggest that the able junior Senator from Montana read the recommendations of the Monroney-La Follette committee, because I think there it was envisioned that this policy committee would be selected by the Democratic Senators and that it would be a smaller group, a working group, to confer with all Senators, to meet with the caucus from time to time, but to formulate what in its opinion, after careful consideration, was the proper legislative position for the Democratic Party. Then each standing committee could be advised thereof. It was envisioned that this policy, once formulated, would be proclaimed to the world, to the Senate, in the Journal, and in the records of the Senate. Then each committee, each subcommittee, each individual Senator could perform its or his duties in the light of this promulgated policy.

As it is now, as it was last year, we dealt with the interest rate problem in one way in veterans' housing legislation and in another way in the other housing bill, and in a still different way in proposed legislation from the Senate Finance Committee, all without any determination of party policy on this very important question.

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

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Was there discrepancy insofar as interest rates were concerned in the passage of legislation affecting housing, veterans, and so forth, and so on?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So how could we formulate a policy—

Mr. GORE. We raised interest rates on veterans' housing, and refused to do so on long-term Government bonds. We gave way piecemeal, but not wholly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There were differences.

Mr. GORE. But we still have no policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To get back to the position which was adopted in the Monroney-La Follette report, it states:

For maintenance of a staff * * * consisting of seven members each, for the formulation of overall legislative policy of the respective parties, the members of such staff to assist in study, analysis, and research on problems involved in policy determinations, and to be appointed—

And so forth.

I can repeat that policy is made in the regular legislative committees. Then their recommendations are brought to the so-called policy committee, which is really a rules committee, and our job is to expedite the legislation proposed whether or not we are in accord with it.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is accurately describing the present procedure; I am undertaking to say we should proceed further.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then we ought to have a new committee which would really be a policy committee. It is really the rules committee of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. That is not the purpose for which it was created.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say it has been so interpreted by Senate leaders from Mr. Barkley down.

Mr. CLARK, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. PROXMIER addressed the Chair.

Mr. GORE. I should like very much to yield the floor. I have been speaking a long while. But I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Tennessee for his courtesy. I should like to ask him two questions.

Does the Senator from Tennessee agree that the jurisdiction of the policy committee should be that which was set forth in the Monroney-La Follette committee report and subsequently written into law in the appropriations bill about 10 years ago?

Mr. GORE. That is my view.

Mr. CLARK. Therefore, if the Senator's view should prevail in the conference, it would be the duty of the policy committee to formulate overall legislative policy, with a staff to assist in the study of, analysis of, and research on problems involved in policy determination, and not merely to be a rules committee?

Mr. GORE. That is my view.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point? I am trying to follow, but I did not quite understand the last part of the statement.

Mr. CLARK. I merely read from the provisions of the act and asked the Senator whether he agreed that is what the jurisdiction of the policy committee should be, and he said he did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

Mr. CLARK. My second point is this: I should like to associate myself with the view of the Senator from Colorado that the steering committee is almost as important as the policy committee, and that it, too, should be chosen by a majority of the members of the conference. This seems to me to be of substantial importance this year, but it will be of absolutely vital importance next year, when we hope to have a Democratic President, who will want to have his

policy, in accord with our party's platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention in July, carried into effect by the Congress. I see no way of doing that through the democratic process unless both the Democratic policy committee and the Democratic steering committee are selected by the members of the Democratic Party in the Senate of the United States.

I should like to commend my friend from Tennessee for a very able and reasoned presentation.

Mr. GORE. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I commend the Senator from Tennessee for raising this very important issue not merely on the floor of the Senate, but before the Nation. There are, probably, certain aspects of this question which can be best discussed inside a Democratic conference, but the general proposition which the Senator from Tennessee has developed, namely, that the policy committee should be the arm of the Senators of a given party and not the instrument of the leadership of that party, seems to me to be indisputably sound. I commend the Senator for presenting that point of view with great ability.

Mr. GORE. I am very grateful for the remarks of my friend from Illinois.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may say a very few words?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I commend the Senator from Tennessee. This has been a helpful discussion.

Especially I should like to have the attention of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], because he has contributed much wisdom to the discussion today.

Mr. GORE. I should like to thank the junior Senator from Montana, the whip, for his presence and for his participation. I am grateful for the presence of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and for the presence of other Senators.

I hope this has been a helpful discussion. The Democratic Party is our party. The operation of the two-party system is a necessary part of our democratic procedure. Perhaps from this discussion will come an improvement of it. I hope that will be true.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, there is one point I should like to make. I have learned one or two simple facts, which I had not known before. Our present majority leader did not establish this policy; it was established before he became the majority leader.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was established by Mr. Barkley and the Democrats.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes; but that was some years ago. At that time we had control of the executive branch of the Government, but were in the minority in the Congress.

There has now been a change in the situation. The distinguished junior Sen-

ator from Montana said that we all know from experience we cannot have a policy committee which can set definite standards. Why is that so? It is because we operate under the committee system. This is why I emphasize that the steering committee represents the crux of the problem.

Suppose I were to be chosen as a member of the policy committee. I could name many Senators who would be excellent candidates. But who is so wise that he could formulate a policy which could bind the Democratic Party? This is why the committee has limited powers.

As the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has stated, matters would come to the committee, as is done in the House, and it would act more or less as a traffic cop. The majority leader has to have some leeway, so that he can sense when the body can move and when it should move. The policy committee must be a group which will cooperate.

The point the Senator from Tennessee makes is a good one. This being true, let us broaden the base. Why should we do that? There are 10 more Democratic Senators who have come from the West. They were not Senators when the Barkley resolution was adopted. The junior Senator from Montana in the interim period has been made the whip of the Democratic Party in this body.

We have heard many arguments which, in commonsense, should be agreed with. We ought to broaden the base of the policy committee. That ought to be done tomorrow, without any argument.

Secondly, but of more importance, we ought to establish a little larger group. We can call it, not a policy committee, but a steering committee. The committee would be a Democratic representation of 65 Senators, to help in committee appointments and to help in policy matters. There would be no criticism against the majority leader or against anybody else if we broadened the base of our operation.

I understand that is what the Senator from Tennessee has been talking about today. I commend the Senator from Tennessee for a very brilliant presentation.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GRUENING and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, has the Senator from Tennessee yielded the floor?

Mr. GORE. I have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield to me for a minute and a half?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement at this point, where it will follow the very fine speech of the junior Senator from Tennessee, as it relates to it.

There seemed to develop in the course of the colloquy this afternoon a feeling that conferences might be unwise for a number of reasons. I subscribe to the view that there are very great difficulties in having successful conferences in the Democratic Party in the Senate.

As one who championed conferences last year I want to go on record as stating that I would be satisfied if we could develop a policy committee which was representative of all Democrats, a policy committee which would meet and determine policy and which would permit all Democrats to be present when it met and when it discussed the important legislative policies at which the committee decided it would like to arrive. I think that would provide the principal objective I was trying to obtain when I championed conferences last year.

Therefore, I think there is no real or substantial difference between the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee this afternoon and the position I have consistently taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Alaska yield to the Chair for a moment?

Mr. GRUENING. I am glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it should be brought to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin that when proposed legislation is considered by the policy committee the Senators who are interested in the proposed legislation can appear before the policy committee.

Furthermore, during the past year and extending into this year there have been three additional members of the policy committee; namely, the members of the calendar committee, which is composed of the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

The Chair simply wanted to mention that fact.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Wisconsin is aware of that fact, and is aware of the fact that Senators are urged to appear before the committee if there is proposed legislation in which they are interested which is important in regard to policy. I am simply saying that if the policy committee became the kind of policy formulating body which it is not now but which the Senator from Tennessee suggested, and if all Senators could attend the meetings, it would serve the purpose of the caucus, in my judgment.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I should be glad to yield to either Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely desire to have two resolutions from the House of Representatives laid

before the Senate, with respect to deceased Members.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am interested in one of those resolutions, Mr. President, but I should be happy to have my colleague offer a resolution first.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, OF IOWA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 402), as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.
January 6, 1960.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Steven V. Carter, a Representative from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 222) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Steven V. Carter, a Representative from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BUSH, OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 403) from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Alvin R. Bush, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 223) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Alvin R. Bush, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BOYLE, OF ILLINOIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 401) from the House of Representatives, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Charles A. Boyle, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 224) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Charles A. Boyle, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

SEAWAY ROBBERY—A PLEA TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO SUP- PORT HIS OWN STAND AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the State of Alaska is now engaged in a fateful contest, which represents yet one more battle in a perennial war which it has long fought for the life of its economy. Our opponent in this struggle is a familiar one, one with which we have contended for many years. It is the conference of steamship lines on which Alaska depends for its existence, the most powerful member of which is the Alaska Steamship Co.

Since the passage of the Jones Act in 1920 the State of Alaska has been the victim of ever increasing costs of water transportation which, while stifling the economy of the former territory, have, at the same time, resulted in benefits to the dominant carrier which, I venture to say, are unparalleled in the experience of common carriers. Under the benign management of the Federal Maritime Board and its predecessors, which passes for regulation of water carriers, the Alaska Steamship Co. has obtained one increase in its rates after another. The last, an increase of 15 percent was granted in 1958. Now, less than 2 years after

receiving this tribute from the consumers of Alaska, the same carrier, from the same agency, has obtained another increase of 10 percent, which became effective yesterday. So, in this short period of time the Alaska Steamship Co. has added 26.5 percent to the burden of unduly inflated transportation costs with which Alaska has long been afflicted.

For a long time, and increasingly in recent years, the people of Alaska have been victims of what I think can only be described as seaway robbery. It is a crime in which the policeman, the Federal Maritime Board, has more often than not helped point the gun and pick the pocket.

This is not the first time the scandal of seaway robbery of Alaskans in the form of exorbitant shipping rates has been brought to the attention of the Congress. Time and time again, committees of Congress and this entire body have been told, with documentation, that shipping rates to Alaska are the highest in the world, with the least justification. Time and time again the Congress has had explanations of the manner in which this situation has continued under the supervision, and indeed, with the aid of the Federal Maritime Board and its predecessor agencies.

Once again, I call the attention of the Congress to the way in which the interest of the public has been flouted and completely disregarded by the arbitrary and capricious action of the only agency upon which Alaskans may rely for protection against unjust, unreasonable, and illegal freight rates of water carriers operating from the other States.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Alaska to say that freight rates to Alaska have increased by 36½ percent?

Mr. GRUENING. By 26½ percent within less than 2 years.

Mr. CHURCH. And that a further 10-percent increase has been granted without benefit of a hearing?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes, without benefit of a hearing. It was granted yesterday, as I shall develop in a moment, despite the urgent plea of the Alaska delegation to withhold action until hearings could be held and the case of the people of Alaska demonstrated.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the distinguished Senator from Alaska not regard this action as highly inconsistent with the oft-stated position of the administration against inflation?

Mr. GRUENING. It is not merely inconsistent; it is absolutely contradictory; and, as I shall develop, it goes directly counter to the words which the President uttered in his state of the Union message. Almost simultaneously with the fine references to his policy to fight inflation as one would fight a fire in one's home, that policy was being violated by one of the executive agencies, all of whose members were appointed by the President.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the Senator not agree that that is another flagrant example of the way this administration

has been combating inflation with pious platitudes?

Mr. GRUENING. It is a perfect illustration of that contradiction.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator. I think he is rendering a great service to the people of Alaska by bringing this question to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GRUENING. I hope it is a service not only to the people of Alaska, but to the people of our entire Nation. I think it is highly important that we see the great disparity between the fine words which are uttered on high and the actions which are so completely contrary to the noble sentiments expressed.

In accordance with the law and procedures of the Federal Maritime Board the State of Alaska petitioned the Board that a hearing be held upon the issue of the proposed rate increase and that the 10-percent increase be suspended and not allowed to go into effect pending such a hearing and a final order of the Board. The petition cited, at length, the old familiar facts of monopolistic shipping practices of the carrier, the outrageously high price of shipping to Alaska, the need of Alaska for relief from such an intolerable burden, and the fact that the carrier would suffer no damage and would, in fact, retain its presently high earnings if the rates were not increased at all. It pointed out that the basis upon which the carrier has asked for this increase is unrealistic, cannot be substantiated, and is not an accurate reflection of the economics of the case. It pointed out that, contrary to the representations of the carrier, it can expect, as its current rates, not a decline in earnings in the coming year in Alaska, but, instead, a substantial increase in profits after taxes. In brief, the State made such a case it could under the circumstances, to show that the rate increase must be suspended at least until such time as the carrier would be required to come before the Board in public hearing and justify its position.

I remind the Senate that, at this stage of the proceeding, the State is limited to the most meager information concerning the financial status of the carrier. It does not have available the invaluable weapons of interrogation, of discovery, and of cross-examination which can be obtained only with the machinery of a public hearing under established rules of procedure.

As for the Federal Maritime Board, it has before it the bare statement of the carrier that it must add another 10 percent to its already astronomical rates. There has been no hearing, no examination of evidence, no interrogation and cross-examination of witnesses. In short, no process of factfinding at all.

And yet, without having had a hearing, without having given the State of Alaska, which is the most important party in interest in this matter, an opportunity to present its case, the Federal Maritime Board has issued an order by which it refuses to suspend the rate increase.

It has granted a hearing, yes. But to the people of Alaska this is small comfort. In fact, it is a farce. Even should the 10-percent increase be found exces-

sive as a result of the hearing, the people of Alaska are faced with an immediate and unjustified addition to the already scandalously high cost of living in the 49th State. Had the increase in rates been suspended for the 120-day period for which provision is made in the law, the people of the State of Alaska would have, at least, been saved from its inflationary effects for that length of time. They would have had an opportunity to put the Alaska Steamship Co. to its proof of the need for an increase. They would have had an opportunity to present their case and to challenge that of the carrier.

But this was not allowed Alaska.

Rather, the Board has already allowed the increased rate to go into effect.

In effect, the State of Alaska has lost this case.

Immediately, prices for commodities sold in Alaska will increase and the increase will come from the pockets of every member of the community. There is no way this can be recovered. The prices will not go down if the rate increase is disapproved, after hearing, in whole or in part. There may be a windfall to the shippers if the rate increase is not approved. But there is no possible way in which the citizens of Alaska, the consumers of Alaska, can recover.

They are in the position of one who has been made to serve a sentence in jail; and, even if later found innocent, have already served their time. Except, for Alaska, there is really no end to the effects of this failure to suspend the rates. The increased costs to the shippers occasioned by the higher rates will simply be passed on to the merchants who will pass them on to the consumer, with inevitable snowballing all along the way. The tragedy of this is that the individual Alaska consumer, on whom the full burden falls, has had no opportunity whatever to protest or to avoid effectively the consequences of the action of the Federal Maritime Board.

There is another aspect of this freight rate increase which is particularly unfortunate, distressing, and ironic. All of us listened attentively last Thursday in the Chamber of the other body when the President of the United States in his address on the state of the Union solicited our cooperation in the struggle to prevent inflation. To quote the President, "We must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home."

At that very moment, before the echoes of the President's words were stilled, one of the agencies of his administration was busy pouring fuel on the fire of inflation. The Federal Maritime Board, every member of which was appointed by this administration, was taking the most inflationary of actions and doing so without even looking at the evidence.

The President of the United States on Thursday described the inflation as "an opponent of so many guises that it is sometimes difficult to recognize." There is no difficulty involved in recognizing the direct inflationary effects of a general 10-percent increase on top of a 15-percent increase less than 2 years ago, in shipping costs to an area like Alaska which depends for its existence on ocean transportation.

Mr. President, if the State where this large increase fell were California, or Texas, or Massachusetts, there would be alternatives by which the citizens could in some measure adjust their operations so as to lessen its consequences. They could turn to other means of transportation. They could ship by railroad, or by motortruck. But in Alaska, except to a degree and to a limited area which make their effect immaterial, these means of transportation are nonexistent. Every man, woman, and child in Alaska depends on water transportation to a degree which is unknown in any other State except Hawaii. When water transportation rates go up, the cost of living goes up, immediately and for everyone.

The action of the Federal Maritime Board in permitting this 10-percent increase in Alaska freight rates to go into effect without a hearing is the most inflationary action which has been perpetrated in my part of the United States in the past year. In the preceding 12 months, the most inflationary action affecting Alaskans was the 15-percent freight rate increase of 1958. Both of these calamities were permitted, presided over, and even endorsed by a board appointed by the same President Eisenhower who has so often urged the rest of us to fight inflation. The President's fine sounding words will have a hollow ring throughout the 49th State whose entry into the Union in the very same message the President both hailed and saluted as one of our two new western stars. We wish his administration's actions would correspond with his fine words. Certainly the way in which the 10-percent increase which became effective yesterday was permitted without the necessity of any proof of need amounted to an open invitation to the carriers to do it again—and do it any time you like.

To demonstrate the effects of this action somewhat more graphically, let me tell you what this will mean in dollars and cents to Alaska, and to the steamship company.

Based on the company's own estimated projection of its 1960 revenues, the allowance of this 10-percent increase will result in an increase in its revenues of more than \$1,600,000 this year. The State of Alaska, finding that the basis upon which the company's estimate is unrealistic, estimates that this increase to the company will amount to nearly \$1,900,000. This increase, in conjunction with the 15-percent increase previously allowed, places a burden of some \$4 million annually on the people of Alaska.

It fairly staggers the imagination, to say nothing of one's sense of justice and democratic government to think that this intolerable tax for the benefit of the Alaska Steamship Co. was imposed upon the people of Alaska by a Federal agency without their having had the slightest opportunity to protest effectively. I say here that the Federal Maritime Board has acted in this instance without any regard whatever for the public interest. It has acted arbitrarily, capriciously, and with a cavalier disregard of the dismaying results of its action which is shocking.

I wish to emphasize that the law provides for suspension of such a rate in-

crease for a maximum period of 120 days. The Federal Maritime Board could, in its discretion, have taken the action which I believe to be wise and proper, and could have suspended this increase long enough for the people of Alaska to make their case. It refused to do this when specifically requested to do so in the public interest.

It occurs to me that the reasons for such procedures and such decisions by this agency constitute a fitting subject for congressional investigation. The action of the Board was, to be sure, in accord with the procedures permitted by law. The aspect of the matter that is most troublesome is that, having the discretion to act in the public interest by suspending the rates, the Board instead acted only for the benefit of the Alaska Steamship Co. There is, at this time, no way of determining the mechanics by which such action was taken. But I think we can all agree that the Congress cannot look with equanimity upon the spectacle of a public body, which ought to act in the interest of the public, taking action which favors only the interests of a steamship company, an action which it has taken again and again.

Now, had there been some overriding reason for the failure to suspend the rate increase, this action could be explained. But in this case there is none.

This is not the case of a poor, struggling company which, in the interests of the public, should be saved from starvation or bankruptcy. The Alaska Steamship Co. is not losing money. Quite the contrary.

According to the statement of the company itself it was not losing money in 1959. In fact, its own statement of profits after taxes, partially on a projected basis, shows that in 1959 it earned profits of some \$99,617.

The company bases its need for an increase in rates on increases in costs which would cause losses if—and this is the most serious fallacy in its calculations—tonnage carried by the company in 1960 is at the same level as tonnage carried in 1959. Such a projection is without meaning.

As it happens, the year of 1959 was marred, in Alaska, by the occurrence of a prolonged carpenters' strike, which continued from June until September—the prime construction and business season in Alaska. Its effects there were more pervasive, and devastating, than were those of the recent steel strike on the Nation. Construction in Alaska, a major factor in the economy, was almost completely halted, thus depressing severely the economy of the State, and, consequently, diminishing the amount of tonnage carried to Alaska by the Alaska Steamship Co.

But, even in 1959, taking into account the depressed conditions flowing from the carpenters' strike, the Alaska Steamship Co. made money.

And in 1960 there is no likelihood whatever of the conditions which prevailed in 1959. In fact, all estimates for economic growth and development in 1960 indicate a more prosperous year by far than 1959. This will, inevitably, result in an increase in tonnage carried by the Alaska Steamship Co., consequently

an increase in its revenues despite rising costs.

However, we Alaskans do not want to prejudice the case. It may be that the increases will be found on examination to be justified. Certainly, if a way to justify them can be found, we may count on the Federal Maritime Board to do so. My remarks today go to another issue. It is the issue of rendering of a verdict before the evidence has been heard. Of this the regulatory agency in this instance is guilty.

The Federal Maritime Board has said, in answer to protests over its failure to suspend this rate increase, that its primary consideration in this action was the welfare of the carrier.

Mr. President, I submit that the welfare of the carrier has had quite enough attention. It is now time to give attention to the welfare of the public, something which this administration seldom does.

So that the President may not be wholly unaware of what is going on in his administration, the Alaska delegation to Congress, Senator BARTLETT, Congressman RIVERS, and myself have sent him the following telegram:

January 9, 1960.

HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

We are profoundly shocked that even as you delivered your state of the Union message, which included an urgent plea that "We must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home," the Federal Maritime Board, constituted wholly of appointees of your administration, has just poured gasoline on the fires of inflation, not merely imperiling but beginning to consume the homes of all Alaskans. The Board has granted a 10 percent increase in water freight rates immediately effective without a prior hearing requested by the State government of Alaska, its congressional delegation, and virtually every public body in the State, although the Board is permitted by law to suspend such increases for 120 days.

The burden which runs into several millions of dollars falls not only on the homes of Alaskans but also on the Federal Government which is likewise an important shipper. The implications of the Board's action are known to it because they were explicitly explained to it as late as Friday afternoon by the entire Alaska congressional delegation. It is wholly pertinent that in this very same message, where you so dramatically urged the fight on inflation, you also said: "Neither we nor any other free-world nation can permit ourselves to be misled by pleasant promises until they are tested by performance." We call upon you, therefore, respectfully to back up your words on inflation by performance and to request the Federal Maritime Board to rescind its order and suspend the rate increases ordered as of tomorrow, January 10—

This telegram having been sent on Saturday—

for the 120-day period permitted it by law and give Alaska an opportunity to present its case before being convicted and our whole economy drastically penalized by the fires of inflation.

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senator.

RALPH J. RIVERS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I think it will be interesting for the American public to see

whether the President is willing, in view of his repeated and vigorous declarations against inflation, to join us in fighting the contemporaneous conflagration which imperils our homes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I congratulate the Senator from Alaska for an argument and presentation to which I believe there can be no successful rebuttal. I believe his logic is unassailable. As one who supported statehood for Alaska for a number of years, the junior Senator from Louisiana became convinced that the problems were so great and so varied, and the injustices to Alaskans so many in number, that it would be absolutely impossible ever to have these matters straightened out, with justice and fairness to all, unless Alaska was represented in the United States Congress by members who would fight for Alaska and point out the injustices which were being done.

I congratulate the Senator from Alaska, not only for the work he is doing here today, but also for the work he has done in the past in writing books and articles and making speeches, explaining the great number of instances in which there has been unfair discrimination against Alaskans, contrary to the will of the great majority of the American people.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the distinguished and able Senator from Louisiana, who has been helpful to us for many years in our fight to achieve equality. I appreciate his support this afternoon.

I point out to him what will be increasingly evident as the story of Alaska unfolds: That although Congress has granted Alaska statehood, and we have equality on paper, the economic consequences of 90 years of colonialism are still with us. This is a striking example. The same carrier which was given special privileges and a monopoly by congressional action 40 years ago still persists, to the detriment of Alaska, in seeking to extend its monopoly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I might offer a prediction, I believe that if Alaska continues to get the kind of able representation it has been receiving in Congress since it became a State, it will not take a great number of years to correct most of those practices.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I commend the Senator from Alaska for his remarks on the floor today. I, too, have felt the effects of discriminatory freight rates. I well remember that in 1934, when I was elected Governor of South Carolina, I found to my utter disgust that the freight rates imposed against what was known as the South—anywhere below the Mason-Dixon line—were from 35 to 40 percent higher than the freight rates paid in the other areas of the United States. I found that to ship a box of shoes from Boston,

Mass., to South Carolina cost from 35 to 40 percent more than to ship the same box of shoes from Boston to any other part of the country.

The Governors of the Southern States, at my suggestion, held a conference and began to work on the matter of freight rates. The result was a saving to the South of hundreds of millions of dollars in freight rates. That conference caused a saving of that much in freight rates.

The Senator from Alaska is to be commended for what he is doing, at the first sign of a move to increase freight rates on shipments to Alaska without a proper hearing being afforded before the courts.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I congratulate him on his leadership in freeing the South from the burdensome and unjust freight rates which had been imposed on that region of the country.

But I call his attention to the fact that, in addition to the extortionate maritime rates, a precisely similar situation exists with respect to rail rates. It may be of interest to the Senator from South Carolina to know, and for the Senate as a whole to know, that we in Alaska are charged more for the shipment of an article destined for Alaska over the same railroad than if the identical article is sent to any other place bordering on the Pacific. For instance, if a refrigerator is bought in Detroit and is destined for Fairbanks or any other city in Alaska, the freight rates on that article from Detroit are much higher than if the identical article were tagged for some place in Japan, Australia, the west coast of South America, or almost any other place in the Pacific. That is due to the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission, against which we have to date protested in vain. But we will continue our fight, stimulated by the experience of which the Senator from South Carolina has spoken concerning the fight by the South against similar unjust practices.

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

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the distinguished Senator from Alaska upon his splendid speech. I have had the opportunity to study and read it as well as to hear a large part of it.

I think the Senator is eminently correct. There may be some kind of case for a 15-percent sales tax—that is what this really is—although I doubt it. It is a tax on virtually everything which Alaskans have to buy. All of us are proud of Alaska. We are proud that it is now a State. There is no question in the mind of anyone that as a State Alaska offers richer potential resources for development than any other part of the United States of America. Whether those resources will be developed or not depends to a very great extent on whether they can be made commercially attractive today. The great penalty and the great problem which the two Senators from Alaska understand so well is the very serious substantial transportation cost.

When the Federal Government raises freight rates, as the Senator from Alaska

says, within a very few hours of the time when the President made his strong speech against inflation, and imposes a 15-percent addition on the cost of the transportation of freight shipped to Alaska, there is no question that such action should be protested vigorously.

I think the Senator from Alaska deserves great credit for what he is doing.

Mr. GRUENING. We greatly appreciate the support of the Senator from Wisconsin. I should like to ask him whether, in view of the fact that within 2 years the freight rates have been increased by 26½ percent, he knows of any other situation, anywhere under the flag, which justifies an increase of that proportion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I certainly do not.

I think the last point which the Senator from Alaska made, namely, that it costs more to ship freight to Alaska than to any other point on the Pacific, points which are farther away, points which are not under the American flag, is a most telling point, one which is most shocking.

Above all, to put this increase into effect without a hearing is something which I simply cannot understand.

Mr. GRUENING. I call attention to the fact that the higher rates, the exorbitant rates, charged by the maritime cargo carrier, are particularly flagrant in that, as I pointed out in the colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], they are higher—sometimes as much as 140 percent higher—than the rates charged for precisely the same services involving the same type of articles shipped elsewhere in the United States.

It is hard to believe that if an Alaskan wishes to buy a certain article and if the shipping tag on the article shows that it is destined for Alaska, he has to pay up to 140 percent more, in certain cases, for shipping the article to Alaska, whereas if the article is marked for shipment to Australia or any other area in the Pacific, including even Communist China, if the article could go there, a lower rate is available.

That situation is protested by the General Services Administration, which is interested in saving the Government money.

Thus it is that the people of Alaska are confronted with a terrible dilemma.

Let me say that I greatly appreciate the support of the Senator from Wisconsin and the support of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to say, in conclusion, that in effect, the Maritime Board is imposing a tax on the people of Alaska. Actually, it is a rate increase; but in effect it is a discriminatory tax increase. It is most unfair; and I think the Senator from Alaska is eminently correct in protesting it as vigorously as he has.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the subject which has so properly engaged the attention of my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. I join the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] in commend-

ing my colleague [Mr. GRUENING] for his speech, which very much needed to be made.

Mr. President, this is a story which I very much regret to have to tell in sequel to the remarks already made by my colleague from Alaska. It is a story about inflation. It is a story about administrative procedure in which the voice of the public has been stilled.

On December 10, 1959, the members of the Pacific Coast-Alaska Freight Conference, which operate as carriers by water between Pacific coast ports and Alaska, filed tariff supplements with the Federal Maritime Board. The tariff supplements called for a general freight rate increase of 10 percent in the Alaska trade. The carriers published the new schedules to become effective on January 10, 1960, 30 days after filing.

Responsible Alaskans expressed concern. Dedicated to the development of an area whose economic progress is vital to the well-being of our Nation, Alaskans saw in the proposed freight-rate increase a new threat to our efforts to check inflation and to promote the growth of the 49th State.

But the concern in Alaska, Mr. President, was not tantamount to panic. We Alaskans anticipated an adversary proceeding under the practices and procedures of the Federal Maritime Board. Governor Eagan, of Alaska, directed Alaska's attorney general, John Rader, to fly here to the Nation's Capital, and to act appropriately to protect the public interest. The resources of the people of Alaska were ready to be marshaled in the anti-inflation cause. Responsible Alaskans did not prejudice the demands of the carriers; but responsible Alaskans did look forward to a quasi-judicial proceeding in which these demands could be assessed after a hearing of all interested parties and after the presentation of evidence. To be sure, we were puzzled to note that the carriers predicted a 1960 freight volume no greater than the volume in the year just ended. As residents of a growing area of America, we realized that 1959 was an abnormally poor year in the history of the Alaska economy. Our construction was brought virtually to a standstill by a labor-management dispute. Our salmon pack reached a low point in its cycle. In fact, the salmon pack was the smallest on record. There was general agreement that the economic prospects for 1960 were bright. Some Alaskans, too, challenge the method by which the carriers calculated their rate base. But Alaskans anticipated that the reasonableness of the carriers' computations of their volume and of their rate base would be the subject of an impartial hearing before the Federal Maritime Board.

The expectations of the Alaska people followed reasonably from the previous practices of the Board on matters affecting the Alaska trade. We recalled, for example, that as recently as 1958, these carriers sought and obtained a 15-percent freight-rate increase. We remembered that the 1958 increase was granted after a hearing, and that no increase was imposed until the hearing was completed. With confidence in our State administration and the abilities of

State experts, we looked ahead to the 1960 hearings in the belief that the interests of the Alaska consumers would be represented adequately and that the hearings would be fair to the people and fair to the carriers. Fairness to all concerned was our desire.

Moreover, Mr. President, the people of Alaska were heartened by the decision of the General Services Administration to participate as an ally of the State of Alaska in challenging the proposed new rate schedule. The General Services Administration agreed with us—who called upon the agency to participate—that the Government of the United States, as the principal shipper of goods to Alaska, has an important stake in the prevention of increased freight costs. All Americans are alerted to the dangers of inflation. We may as practical men disagree about some of the causes of inflation; but no one can dispute the fact that a 10-percent freight-rate increase will raise the cost of living and doing business in Alaska, not only for Alaskans, but for American taxpayers everywhere.

Mr. President, on January 5, the Alaska Senators and Representative sent a telegram to the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board. Our telegram called for suspension of the proposed rate increase until full hearings could determine the reasonableness of the proposed new tariff. We warned that "The interests of the people of Alaska cannot be adequately protected in any other manner." Our request was consistent with the Board's previous procedure in its regulation of the Alaskan trade. Our request was consistent with the law and the regulations. Our request was consistent with commonsense concepts of fairplay.

I wish that I could advise the Senate, the President, and the people that our expectations were fulfilled and that our warning was heeded. Instead, I must report that the Board, on January 7, ordered the new rates to become effective on January 10, and directing an investigation of them sometime in the future.

So the new year begins with still more inflationary pressure upon the Federal budget, and, in particular, upon the Alaska householder, housewife, and businessman who suffered, only 2 years ago, at the instance of these carriers, a 15-percent rate increase.

The cost of moving goods by water to or from Alaska, then, has risen over 25 percent in 2 years. The people of Alaska are asked to absorb these increases without even having an opportunity to challenge their essentiality.

Mr. President, the imposition of the latest increase made a sad anniversary for my State, which on other counts might review its first year of statehood with satisfaction. Alaska has been handed an anniversary present it does not want, and cannot protest—an anniversary present whose effects cannot be undone.

Mr. President, I can hear already the contention that should the Board's future investigations prove the new tariff to be unwarranted, the Board will require the carriers to make refunds to the shippers of the money paid to meet the

higher rates. But, who, Mr. President, makes refunds to the housewife? Who keeps records to make whole the consumer in Alaska?

For such a procedure and such a ruling as the Board has issued, there ought to be some justification. Here is a procedure that allows a challenge of the higher rates only after they are imposed. Here is a procedure that promotes the inflation which all Americans are committed to resist. Here is a procedure that discourages the development of an area strategic in location, vital in its natural and human resources.

Mr. President, the Alaska delegation to Congress met with the three members of the Federal Maritime Board on Friday afternoon last. We expressed our shock and dismay. We called for justification.

Justification No. 1 was that the practice of allowing rate increases prior to hearings, even in situations in which challengers assert a public interest against the increase, is followed in other administrative agencies. Such an argument deserves little comment except to say that it indicates with what frequency the regulators—or some of them—are seeing the interests of the public and the interests of the regulated through the wrong end of the telescope.

Justification No. 2 was that the carriers in the Alaska trade are in such dire condition that to continue to perform until May 10, 1960, under the old schedule would be disastrous for the trade. May 10, of course, is the latest date, under the regulations, to which the Board could have suspended the imposition of the new tariff.

This conclusion, Mr. President, is unsupportable, unless the carriers have been so irresponsible, so imprudent, and so heedless of the public interest and the interest of their stockholders, that they have waited until the eleventh hour to file new tariffs to save themselves from economic disaster.

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

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will not impose at any length on the time of the Senate, but I have been listening to the able addresses by both the senior Senator from Alaska and the junior Senator from Alaska.

It was my privilege and opportunity to serve in Alaska during much of World War II and to have visited Alaska on many occasions thereafter. If my recollection serves me correctly, very often when one asked why the price of so many necessities of life, such as food, lodging, medical services, and other essentials, was so grievously high in Alaska, almost invariably he would be told, "It's the freight rates." The distinguished Senators from Alaska have heard that comment on many more occasions than I have.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is a common phrase used in Alaska.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Now there is to be a further justification for this phrase, to the extent of 25 percent.

It seems to me if this great frontier, which has just been granted statehood,

is to prosper, something is going to have to be done about increased freight rates. Evidently this administration has decided that that something is for freight rates to go still higher.

I join my colleagues from Alaska in protesting against these ever-increasing freight rates and I shall be happy to join with them in any action which they think might possibly bring about a diminution of spiraling freight rates which can only make it more difficult for industry and business to succeed in Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank my friend, the Senator from Oregon. I would say that there is something the Federal Maritime Board might do, instead of acceding, almost automatically, to every request for freight increase made by the carriers serving, if you please, not only Alaska, but Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico is the most comparable situation to that which we have in Alaska.

I would say it is the duty of the Federal Maritime Board to evolve a plan for presentation to the Congress to take care of a shipping situation which differs so radically from that which we find in the foreign trade and that which we find in the intracoastal and intercoastal trade. But, to the best of my belief and knowledge, the Federal Maritime Board has given no consideration at all to solving this vexing and very real problem. Instead, it appears that the Federal Maritime Board is content to sit in its offices downtown and merely approve whatever rate increases are asked for by the carriers, whenever they are requested. The time has come, in my considered opinion, when this procedure will no longer do.

The people of Alaska cannot survive economically forever in a situation of this kind, which, in 2 years, has seen a freight rate increase of 25 percent. How is it expected that an economy can maintain its own, much less develop, under that sort of accelerated increase?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have some constituents in Oregon who are investing some of their capital, if I am not mistaken, in developing a sawmill and related forest industry in Wrangell.

Mr. BARTLETT. They are. We welcome them. They are doing a good job.

Mr. NEUBERGER. They are doing an excellent job. Increases in freight rates make it more difficult for those who invest their capital there to compete with the forest products industry elsewhere. Is that not correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. That statement follows as a matter of course. Alaska is a State of great and many natural resources. From Alaska we obtain some raw materials fractional in amount compared with those available for use for the benefit of the Nation. But if production costs—and freight rates constitute a very considerable segment—continue to mount faster than they do else where, it is obvious we cannot expect to have new mines, new sawmills, new pulp mills. We will have to forget that to which we looked forward so confidently—an era immediately ahead of us of expanding economic growth. That era can still come if the Federal Government

will see to it that freight rates are not exorbitant, and the Federal Maritime Board, as apparently is the case now, does not make every possible contribution toward an increase in those rates.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I conclude by emphasizing again that I wish to join with the Senators from Alaska in such action as they recommend in trying to remove from around the neck of Alaska this albatross of ever-increasing maritime freight rates.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I had noted a belief that it is scarcely likely the steamship companies did not know, before the date they filed tariffs for higher rates, that they might require increases. My view, rather, is that the carriers were prepared for a suspension of rates, in accordance with the Board's own precedents, and that they had planned far ahead of the present time. My view is based on what we are entitled to expect from management in a great industry. I note, too, that the leading carrier predicted a loss of \$228,000 in 1960 if the new rates were not imposed. Even assuming that the loss for the first 120 days of 1960 would be one-third of this 1960 loss figure, and even assuming the accuracy of the loss figure itself, it is clear—by the computations of this carrier—that suspension of the rates for not longer than 4 months would have worked no irreparable hardship upon the industry. The procedure adopted, however, does cause irreparable harm to every Alaskan.

At the conference held on Friday between my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], Representative RIVERS, and myself on the one side and the members of the Federal Maritime Board on the other side, we invited the members of the Board to reconsider their decision and to suspend the imposition of the new tariffs until all of the facts could be heard. We were promised careful consideration and review of the matter. The Board members parted from us upon that assurance. Within minutes, Mr. President, a telephone message was left for us advising that the Board would adhere to the order of January 7.

Our request was rejected. As a matter of fact, I should note that this is only a rumor so far as I am concerned, to date, but it is a rumor which comes from a good source. The telephone call was made to the office of my colleague from Alaska. The members of the board did not have the courtesy to call me.

The promise of careful consideration and review was nothing more, clearly, than a retreat from an indignant Alaska public. The careful consideration and review—at most—became a quick nose count in a taxicab between the Senate Office Building and Maritime Board headquarters.

So, Mr. President, the first phase of the story has ended. The losers are the Alaska consumers, the American taxpayers, the soundness of administrative process, and, I might add, the justice of administrative process.

Let us resolve that in the second phase of this story we shall scrutinize the per-

sonnel, the practices, the procedures, and the policies of these agencies so that the public interest will be paramount, as it ought to be.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina.

THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at a later date I intend to present for the RECORD the speech President Eisenhower made in Columbia, S.C., when he was running for the office of President of the United States. The speech he made there will show why I am making these few remarks at the present time.

Mr. President, the state of the Union message delivered by the President of the United States last week was a masterful political speech which leaves no doubt that although Mr. Eisenhower is President, he is also still general.

He was generally misleading. He generously dealt in generalities and he generally left out half the facts about nearly every general subject he spoke upon. I must say, however, his address was much clearer than some of his press conferences.

When the President spoke about the \$290 billion debt, I could not help but think of the \$30 billion that have been added to the national debt since Eisenhower became President. He did not say anything about that.

And I could not help but remember his campaign speeches of 1952 when he attacked the Democratic administration of that day for not having reduced the national debt, ignoring the fact that we had just finished a world war and were in the midst of fighting another war in Korea.

In 1952 the President promised to halt inflation, to reduce the national debt, to eliminate farm surpluses, and to maintain 90 to 100 percent of parity. He also promised to keep our defenses strong, and he promised practically everything else necessary to capture votes.

What is his record? In two terms he has failed completely not only to halt inflation, but even to do anything to try to stop it. He increased the national debt in each of the 7 years he has held office, and during this period has promoted other inflationary policies such as huge nonmilitary oversea spending and high interest rates. Mr. Eisenhower's administration has raised the national debt approximately \$30 billion since it has been in office.

His tight money policies accompanied by high interest rates on all Government loans, both as lender and borrower, have resulted in runaway inflation. In his speech of general terms the President said he wanted a "freer hand" in debt management.

He spoke, as usual, in general terms. But what the President wants to do specifically, as we all know, is to increase interest rates even higher, thereby spiraling the cost of debt management higher,

thus hiking the national debt. All this would be at the cost of the taxpayer, with the benefit reaped by the money-lenders.

Interest rates under Eisenhower's administration in many areas have more than doubled since he took office. If he succeeds in getting his "freer hand" in debt management, I predict interest rates will go higher and inflation will run away with some more of the public's pocketbook before he leaves office.

I am afraid the big economic boom for 1960 that economists are talking about will be confined to inflation and interest rates, and will not include take-home pay for working people if Eisenhower has his way this year on fiscal matters as he has had for the past 7 years.

The administration's handling of farm problems has not varied during its 7 years in office. The President has been a rubberstamp for Mr. Benson, who has promoted programs which have done nothing for the farmers except to lower their net income and to raise their debts. Instead of keeping his promise to maintain high parity, the President bowed on every occasion to Mr. Benson's various jack-leg farm proposals. In doing so, the President knocked the props out from under nearly every program in the books. This shotgun approach to farm problems succeeded in skyrocketing the amounts of surpluses in Government warehouses and the costs of maintaining them.

While he has reduced parity to the lowest possible point on every basic farm program in existence except tobacco, which he could not touch because of the way the law was written, he has allowed the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain the parity for wool at roughly 110 percent throughout his tenure of office. Of course, the people grow wool out where Mr. Benson comes from.

Moreover, the administration closed warehouses in many parts of the country that were storing food surpluses at reasonable prices and shifted the storage to more costly warehouses. Storage costs have skyrocketed under Mr. Benson. Under Eisenhower's farm programs the cost of all farm programs to the Government, including salaries, storage of surpluses, giveaway programs, and everything else amounted to more than \$7 billion in 1959 alone.

Under President Truman, in 1951, the last year before he left office, all these farm programs cost less than \$700 million, or only one-tenth of what they cost under Benson and Eisenhower last year.

In all of Mr. Truman's administration, all farm programs cost approximately \$14 billion, while under Alibi Ike's administration the farm programs have cost roughly \$40 billion. At least under Mr. Truman's administration the farmer was getting 90 percent of parity for his products and could pay his taxes and bills and feed his family. Under Ike the farmers cannot even hold onto their land, much less make a living. Farm incomes have, and still are, steadily dropping, while costs of operation continue to rise, along with what the housewife has to pay for what the farmer grows. I, for one, want no more of the

so-called realistic approaches to the farm problems that Eisenhower spoke of in his address on the state of the Union.

His economies are a big farce. His military glitter is not much better than sequins sprinkled on gummy paper, and his budgeting program is about as sound as a hollow log.

The President's boastings concerning our military missile accomplishments are about as astonishing to responsible thinking people who know the facts as will be the firing of an atomic bomb by France or the invention of a submachine gun by lower Slobovia. It is good that we have developed what we have, but it is a tragedy in our history the way we lag.

I have nothing personal against the President of the United States. I recognize the fact that his job is a most difficult one to perform. But I cannot sit complacently by and let Mr. Eisenhower's high-fidelity speeches send us all into a dream world while the realities of life go by.

It is impossible for me to be as optimistic about the future on every score as the President, and I refuse to accept his state of the Union message as any realistic picture of our situation in the world today. For the welfare of our Nation I hope the President himself knows all the facts that he left out of his half-factual state of the Union message.

Mr. President, there is one final thought that I would like to get over. The President predicts that in 1961 the Nation will have a surplus of more than \$4 billion in the Treasury.

In making up this surplus, he will reduce no wartime taxes. He will also ask for additional taxes, in order to produce a surplus. I doubt whether the Congress will grant them. Very likely a request for supplemental appropriations will be made in a very few months, amounting to probably \$1 or \$2 billion.

The same thing will be true in 1961. I ask Senators to watch that prediction, and see if it is not borne out.

There will be an election between now and 1961, and I presume that there will be a partisan Republican like Mr. Eisenhower running for presidential office this fall. To predict this surplus on paper is good politics, but before we count our chickens, let us wait for the old eggs to hatch.

If President Eisenhower succeeds in raising the interest rates on money borrowed by this country and fails to do anything to halt inflation, I fear that the surplus of eggs he has glowingly predicted will hatch to be nothing but higher debt ceilings, bigger national debts and similar creatures he has been laying and hatching for us for the past 7 years.

The total interest paid today on money borrowed by this country is approximately \$9½ billion. The amount of interest paid has been approximately doubled since Mr. Eisenhower has been in office.

Again I say that I do not share the President's delight over his record of the past 7 years nor his optimistic glowing over the future of his last year in office.

SPECIAL SENATE SHOWING OF THE MOTION PICTURE "ON THE BEACH"

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I know it is impertinent for a Republican to comment on the matter which has occupied the attention of many of my colleagues this afternoon, the question of Democratic policy meetings. However, I should like to suggest, after sitting here for most of the afternoon, that I am in favor of more of them, because if they are held during the session of the Senate, there will be time for a Republican to be recognized before a quarter to 6 in the evening.

The failure to get timely recognition bothers me a little tonight, because the subject on which I wish to speak had a kind of deadline at 5 o'clock.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, because his remarks may be very important.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the Senator from Alaska will not go through with that suggestion, because the effect of it would be to delay me another 20 minutes before I would have an opportunity to make the remarks I should like to make.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] had thoughtfully arranged for a special showing today at 5 p.m. of the motion picture "On the Beach," for Senators and members of their staffs. I hope that many Members of the Senate were able to take advantage of this opportunity to view a motion picture which is both interesting and thought provoking.

However, I should like to sound a note of warning. I think this film could do a great deal of harm. In my opinion it paints a distorted picture of what a nuclear war would probably be like, and I believe it is important that those who see it should accept it for what it is—an imaginative piece of science fiction, a fantasy, and not a dramatization of what would probably happen in the event of nuclear war.

Let me make two things crystal clear at this point.

First, I do not minimize the wholesale destruction which is implicit in an all-out nuclear attack. The loss of life and property would far surpass anything the world has ever seen, and the prevention of such a holocaust is the biggest job facing the diplomats of the world today.

Second, I do not criticize the motion picture on dramatic or esthetic grounds, and I do not challenge the right of the author to create any fictional situation, however unrealistic it might be, for dramatic purposes. But I think it should be made clear that the situation, as well as the plot, is fictional.

As most Senators know, the situation involves the contamination of the atmosphere by radioactivity, which engulfs the earth over a period of months, wiping out all human life.

In fairness to the author of "On the Beach," Mr. Neville Shute, let me say at this point that I believe the novel made it clear that this situation did not result from the kind of nuclear war which

might be fought with existing nuclear weapons, but that it could result from what we might call a technological breakthrough, which made it possible for cheap atomic bombs to be made by the thousands, so that even the tiniest countries had large supplies, including bombs of far greater radioactivity than those we now have.

The picture does not make this point clear. It creates the impression that a major nuclear war, if there should be one in the near future, would be the sort depicted. It does not go into the "ifs, ands, and buts" which are prerequisite to that situation.

To take this kind of motion picture literally is to invite catastrophe. If we assume, as the picture does, that civil defense measures are completely worthless, as they would be in the fictional situation of "On the Beach," we will make no effort to take cover, to protect ourselves from fallout, to resist the attack as best we can. And if an enemy knows we have that attitude, he will be that much more likely to attack.

In some respects, this situation is reminiscent of the "Invasion From Mars" staged by Orson Welles two decades ago. In that case, as in this, a conceivable but highly unlikely situation was accepted as fact by many Americans. In that case, however, the error was easily corrected; in this case, it is very difficult to set the record straight.

Let me reiterate that I am not saying that nuclear war is as remote a possibility as an invasion from Mars. I am saying only that the kind of nuclear war contemplated in the movie, with a 5- to 20-year blanket of lethal fallout all over the globe, is at present in the realm of fantasy.

This is not merely a personal opinion. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have sat through many hearings on radioactive fallout, and just this morning I consulted with several radiation experts from the Atomic Energy Commission on this subject. I think there is no question about the premise of the movie being unrealistic.

God forbid that we shall ever witness the use of nuclear weapons in international conflict. But if, despite our best efforts, we should become involved in that kind of catastrophe, I hope—and I believe—that the human race will retain the will to live, the innate courage which keeps us going against seemingly insurmountable odds.

The black death, which took the lives of one-fourth of the people of Europe in the 14th Century, must have been just as frightening at that time as nuclear war is today—and it was just as deadly. The 25 percent of the population it killed compares roughly with the 30 percent we would probably lose in a heavy nuclear attack, if no one took cover. But unlike the medieval Europeans, we have the knowledge to reduce that 30 percent figure to 3 percent by taking proper precautions. And this, of course, is assuming the worst. Our real hope lies in finding some way to assure that there will never be a nuclear war.

So I hope that some of those who see this movie today will keep in mind that it is science fiction, and that the situation it assumes is not to be taken as one based on scientific fact.

The science in it is just as fictitious as its characters. Unless the picture is viewed against this background, it can only result in confusion, misunderstanding, and perhaps unjustified resignation to a seemingly inevitable doom.

Mr. President, I have just been handed a note which indicates that the picture which was shown at 5 o'clock, in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building, will be shown again at 7:30 tonight. I think it is worthwhile for Members of Congress and their staffs to see the picture, if they approach it with the proper background. However, if they view it with the idea that it is a scientific presentation of the actual effects to be expected from an atomic attack, and if their reaction is the same as that of many of the characters in the picture, namely, complete resignation and acceptance of inevitable death, then the picture can have very serious effects.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, pursuant to the resolutions previously agreed to, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Richard M. Simpson, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, the memory of the late Honorable Steven V. Carter, a Representative from the State of Iowa, the memory of the late Honorable Alvin R. Bush, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and the memory of the late Honorable Charles A. Boyle, a Representative from the State of Illinois, I move that Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative Richard M. Simpson, the late Representative Steven V. Carter, the late Representative Alvin R. Bush, and the late Representative Charles A. Boyle, adjourned until Wednesday, January 13, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

Robert Bernard Anderson, of New York, to be governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be an alternate governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

Robert Cutler, of Massachusetts, to be an executive director of the Inter-American De-

vement Bank for a term of 3 years and until his successor has been appointed.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the positions indicated:

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, vice Robert D. Murphy, resigned.

Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Livingston T. Merchant, elevated.

Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany, vice David K. E. Bruce, resigned.

John D. Hickerson, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines, vice Charles E. Bohlen, reassigned.

Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea, vice Walter C. Dowling, reassigned. Edson O. Sessions, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland, vice John D. Hickerson, reassigned.

William P. Snow, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Burma, vice Walter P. McConaughy, reassigned.

John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala, vice Lester D. Mallory, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Edward Page, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bulgaria.

Dennis A. FitzGerald, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director for Operations of the International Cooperation Administration in the Department of State.

John Ewart Wallace Sterling, of California, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1962, and until his successor is appointed and qualified, vice Rufus H. Fitzgerald, term expired.

Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Defense, vice Neil Hosler McElroy, resigned.

James H. Douglas, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, vice Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., elevated.

Franklin B. Lincoln, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice W. J. McNeil, resigned.

Dudley C. Sharp, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Air Force, vice James H. Douglas, elevated.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Robert Kramer, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

U.S. ATTORNEY

William H. Webster, of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Harry Richards, resigned.

U.S. MARSHAL

William K. Holt, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal, for the middle district of Georgia, vice Billy E. Carlisle, resigned.

FOREIGN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Thomas W. S. Davis, of Virginia, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, vice Whitney Gilliland, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Robert A. Forsythe, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, vice Elliot Lee Richardson, resigned.

Dr. Winchell McKendree Craig, of Minnesota, to be Special Assistant on Health and Medical Affairs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, vice Aims C. McGuinness, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

John C. Meisner, of Illinois, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill., vice Frank Peska, resigned.

Harold W. Reeves, of Florida, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 18, with headquarters at Tampa, Fla., vice Merrill D. White, term expired.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

John M. McKibbin, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Postmaster General, vice Edson O. Sessions, resigned.

Bert B. Barnes, of Iowa, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice John M. McKibbin, elevated.

George M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice E. George Siedle, resigned.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Sigfrid B. Unander, of Oregon, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1961, vice Ben H. Guill, resigned.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Alan S. Boyd, of Florida, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1962, vice Louis J. Hector, resigned.

Whitney Gilliland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1965.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for terms expiring August 3, 1963:

Dr. Theodore Robert Van Dellen, of Illinois.
Dr. Warner Lee Wells, of North Carolina.
Dr. Maynard Kiplinger Hine, of Indiana.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR

Philip McCallum, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration, vice Wendell B. Barnes, resigned.

U.S. CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

J. Joseph Smith, of Connecticut, to be U.S. circuit judge for the second circuit, vice Carroll C. Hincks, retired.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

William H. Timbers, of Connecticut, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Connecticut, vice J. Joseph Smith, elevated.

Charles F. Paul, of West Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of West Virginia, vice Herbert S. Boreman, elevated.

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

James R. Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims, vice Benjamin H. Littleton, retired.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

James Major Baley, Jr., of North Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of North Carolina for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

N. Welch Morrisette, Jr., of South Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Joseph S. Bambacus, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia for a term of 4 years, vice Lester S. Parsons, resigned.

U.S. MARSHALS

James H. Somers, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of North Carolina for a term of 4 years, vice William B. Somers, deceased.

Robert E. Stockdale, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Ohio for a term of 4 years, vice Xavier North, deceased.

Hobart K. McDowell, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Texas for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo to be director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Frederick Uhrhane, **XXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Horace Freeman Bigelow, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Norfleet Griffin, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Theodore Francis Bogart, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. William Darwin Hamlin, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Albert Watson, 2d, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Andrew Ralph Lolli, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Wallace Hawn Brucker, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. William Maxwell Rodgers, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Herbert George Sparrow, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Stephen Ogden Fuqua, Jr., **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. John Frederick Thorlin, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Benjamin Henry Pochyla, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Carl Darnell, Jr., **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Moore Blanchard, Jr., **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Oren Eugene Hurlbut, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Edwin Rust, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. William Hutcheson Craig, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. James Richard Winn, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Henry White, Jr., **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Carson Kyser, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Howard Kilbourne Eggleston, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Butler Warren, **XXXXXX**, U.S. Army.

Col. Frank Joseph Sackton, **XXXXXX**, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Elmer John Gibson, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Clark Louis Ruffner, [XXXXXX] Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army) in the rank of general.

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Harry Purnell Storke, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army, for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, in rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. John Cogswell Oakes, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Clement Franklin St. John, [XXXXXX], Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Ernest Fred Easterbrook, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Frederick Cassidy, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Breckinridge Duff, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Earle Fremont Cook, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert Barrett Skinner, [XXXXXX], Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier general, Veterinary Corps

Col. Russell McNeillis, [XXXXXX], Veterinary Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3037:

To be brigadier general, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Col. Clio Edwin Straight, [XXXXXX], Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be majors

Tansey, Robert F., [XXXXXX]
Uhland, Herbert W., [XXXXXX]
Vann, John P., [XXXXXX]

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Barrett, William T., [XXXXXX]
Beaulieu, Gary P., [XXXXXX]
Bickley, James E., [XXXXXX]
Bolt, Richard R., [XXXXXX]
Bready, Robert J., [XXXXXX]
Bryant, Thomas E., Jr., [XXXXXX]
Drummond, Louis A., [XXXXXX]
Fairchild, Robert L., Jr., [XXXXXX]
Finch, Arthur L., Jr., [XXXXXX]
Fisher, Paul D., [XXXXXX]
Gaines, Merrel E., [XXXXXX]
Gallagher, Joseph P., [XXXXXX]
Geczy, George, Jr., [XXXXXX]
Guba, Howard J., [XXXXXX]
Hampton, Emery W., [XXXXXX]
Harris, Robert W., [XXXXXX]
Higgins, George R., [XXXXXX]
Johnson, Donald K., [XXXXXX]
Klingbell, Richard C., [XXXXXX]
Lemes, Ralph V., [XXXXXX]
Mason, Arthur W., [XXXXXX]
McMillan, Druey C., [XXXXXX]
Meyer, Clyde E., [XXXXXX]
Mills, Robert E., Jr., [XXXXXX]
Musial, Walter F., [XXXXXX]
Nash, Harold F., Jr., [XXXXXX]
Nelson, William J., [XXXXXX]
O'Connor, John H., [XXXXXX]
Pugh, John W., [XXXXXX]
Schiefer, Henry J., [XXXXXX]
Schmidt, Guy L., [XXXXXX]
Simons, Robert J., [XXXXXX]
Tamminen, David L., [XXXXXX]
Tuszynski, Andrew J., [XXXXXX]
Wallace, George C., [XXXXXX]
Walters, Charles O., [XXXXXX]
Yoos, Robert E., [XXXXXX]

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bayne, Calvin, [XXXXXX]
Bryant, Robert J., [XXXXXX]
Casasanta, John J., [XXXXXX]
Clegg, George J., [XXXXXX]
Cornwall, Ralph W., [XXXXXX]
Heriot, Richard M., [XXXXXX]
Hull, Donald R., [XXXXXX]
La Luzerne, Ronald J., [XXXXXX]
Otterstedt, Charles C., Jr., [XXXXXX]
Pantalone, Julius D., [XXXXXX]
Pitts, William P., [XXXXXX]
Romero, Daniel J., [XXXXXX]
Shaw, Dale L., [XXXXXX]
Van Nus, Frederick, [XXXXXX]

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Hanson, Carol L., [XXXXX]

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades, and where applicable, the corps specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Daughtry, Barney A., [XXXXXX]

To be lieutenant colonel

Tapper, Gordon U., [XXXXXX]

To be captain

Carrig, Stephen J., [XXXXXX]

To be lieutenant colonel, Army Nurse Corps

Galloway, Marie S., [XXXX]

To be major, Army Nurse Corps

Leonard, Margaret W., [XXXX]

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades, and where applicable, the corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

To be second lieutenant

Krimmer, John A., [XXXXXX]

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Gray, Stephen E., [XXXXXX] Infantry.

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Roysden, Brunn W., [XXXXXX] Artillery.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade, and where applicable the corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be second lieutenants

Allen, Charlie J.
Alley, Glen D.
Barton, David C.
Brennan, Robert G., Jr., [XXXXXXXX]
Brooks, Lawrence E.
Chen, Robert.
Connor, George H., Jr., [XXXXXXXX]
Dayhuff, Charles H., III.
Degner, Herbert L.
Durbin, Jerome A.
Evans, Kenneth A.
Gonzalez, Manuel.
Graham, Michael L.
Halbert, Edward, [XXXXXXXX]
Hawkins, Cyril A., Jr.
Huntington, William L.
Langdale, Daniel T., [XXXXXXXX]
LaSala, Robert J.
Lydum, Robert D.
Lee, George B.
Martin, Robert G.
McNell, Charles B.
Miner, James F.
Miner, William H., [XXXXXXXX]
Oulmet, William C., Jr.
Overby, Gordon J.
Pruitt, Fleming S., Jr.
Rabon, Jim D.
Riley, Donald A.
Robe, Edward S.
Robinson, Charles D.
Rydberg, Carl R., [XXXXXXXX]
Shine, Joseph P., [XXXXXXXX]
Smith, Wayne A.
Symons, John W., [XXXXXXXX]
Tanner, Junius I.
Van Zee, James L., [XXXXXXXX]
Weatherly, Emory D., Jr.
Weber, Bowman H.
Wesneski, Carl A.
Williams, Cary E.
Zutler, Gerald M.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Grider, Donald A., [XXXXXXXX]
Howard, Vance F.
Opitz, Arthur C., Jr., [XXXXXXXX]
Schlaak, James R.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Beganle, Henry R., [XXXXXXXX]
Bowden, James A., [XXXXXXXX]
Brice, Emmett T., [XXXXXXXX]
Brigden, Douglas A., [XXXXXXXX]
Cahill, James P., [XXXXXXXX]
Enteles, Theodore L., [XXXXXXXX]
Fields, Hampson H., [XXXXXXXX]
Fluckiger, Fred, Jr., [XXXXXXXX]
Gildersleeve, Robert E., [XXXXXXXX]

Graham, Albert W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Harding, Claude D., XXXXXXXX
 Henry, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Hill, James A., XXXXXXXX
 Hostetler, Jerome K., XXXXXXXX
 Kearns, Thomas C., XXXXXXXX
 Knuepfer, Dieter C., XXXXXXXX
 Konvicka, Henry H., XXXXXXXX
 McClain, John W., XXXXXXXX
 Minton, William, XXXXXXXX
 Moeller, William H., XXXXXXXX
 Puleo, Albert, XXXXXXXX
 Purkhiser, Harry R., XXXXXXXX
 Ramsburg, John H., XXXXXXXX
 Sadler, John F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Sanders, Leo F., XXXXXXXX
 Sinko, William A., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, James R., XXXXXXXX

To be captains

Aboud, Edmond P., XXXXXXXX
 Allred, James H., XXXXXXXX
 Atwood, James P., XXXXXXXX
 Bludworth, Donald G., XXXXXXXX
 Boardman, Donald R., XXXXXXXX
 Booth, James W., XXXXXXXX
 Bowman, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Bradley, Joseph S., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Brambilla, Robert M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Clark, Donald T., XXXXXXXX
 Cleveland, Edwin I., XXXXXXXX
 Cranford, Charles R., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Dawson, George R., XXXXXXXX
 Desaulniers, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Doster, Robert W., XXXXXXXX
 Duncan, Conrad L., XXXXXXXX
 Engle, John F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Ericsson, Eric A., XXXXXXXX
 Finch, Edward B., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Florelli, Michael C., XXXXXXXX
 Gallagher, Charles P., XXXXXXXX
 Galloway, Jesse M., XXXXXXXX
 Geiges, Elmer B., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Gendron, Alvin J., XXXXXXXX
 Goozman, John F., XXXXXXXX
 Green, James E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Gutzmann, Leslie E., XXXXXXXX
 Hall, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Haney, Leslie D., XXXXXXXX
 Haygood, Jack L., XXXXXXXX
 Henry, Henry N., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hill, James F., XXXXXXXX
 Hoagland, Dale N., XXXXXXXX
 Hojnacki, William J., XXXXXXXX
 Hunt, Jim I., XXXXXXXX
 Hyne, Merrel E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Jackson, Hal G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Jackson, Luther H., XXXXXXXX
 Jacobs, Norman P., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Albert A., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, Leon C., XXXXXXXX
 Kean, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Lamastus, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Langford, Richard J. E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Levy Walter, XXXXXXXX
 Little, Andrew E., XXXXXXXX
 Love, John A., XXXXXXXX
 Maddox, Chesley B., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Mancinelli, Thomas B., XXXXXXXX
 Manross, Theodore D., XXXXXXXX
 Mattingly, Joseph G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McKee, Dewey E., XXXXXXXX
 Melcher, Ralph W., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Lewis, XXXXXXXX
 Mojecki, John A., XXXXXXXX
 Monahan, William J., XXXXXXXX
 Moore, Wallace D., XXXXXXXX
 Morton, Karl R., XXXXXXXX
 Myron, Harold L., XXXXXXXX
 Nickolls, Charles E., XXXXXXXX
 Nunnelee, Billy R., XXXXXXXX
 O'Brien, George F., XXXXXXXX
 O'Brien, James J., XXXXXXXX
 Okarski, Gerald M., XXXXXXXX
 Owens, Welvin B., XXXXXXXX
 Pannier, Leon G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Perkins, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Powell, Alfred J., XXXXXXXX
 Rust, Henry W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Schumacher, David J., XXXXXXXX

Shimon, Walter W., XXXXXXXX
 Slegler, Norman J., XXXXXXXX
 Skipper, Powell H., XXXXXXXX
 Slocum, Robert D., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Dane M., XXXXXXXX
 Snyder, Charles L., XXXXXXXX
 Sorg, Creighton D., XXXXXXXX
 Stahling, Joseph M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Sullivan, John L., XXXXXXXX
 Sweet, Thomas G., XXXXXXXX
 Tate, Wallace L., XXXXXXXX
 Thompson, Robert J. E., XXXXXXXX
 Threadgill, Frank G., XXXXXXXX
 Tilton, William S., XXXXXXXX
 Tubbleville, Billy C., XXXXXXXX
 Van Horn, Vannah E., XXXXXXXX
 Vorisek, Robert B., XXXXXXXX
 Watson, Robert G., XXXXXXXX
 Whately, Wayne B., XXXXXXXX
 Wheeler, Douglas E., XXXXXXXX
 Wild, Donald J., XXXXXXXX
 Woods, Jack C., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants

Abrahams, Edwin G., XXXXXXXX
 Abt, Irwin E., XXXXXXXX
 Adams, John E., XXXXXXXX
 Allen, Charles B., XXXXXXXX
 Allen, James H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Antkowiak, Robert S., XXXXXXXX
 Ault, William E., XXXXXXXX
 Barrere, Richard P., XXXXXXXX
 Barron, William T., XXXXXXXX
 Bell, Alexander D., XXXXXXXX
 Benoit, William R., XXXXXXXX
 Bernhardt, William R., XXXXXXXX
 Blascak, Donald W., XXXXXXXX
 Bowman, Joseph R., XXXXXXXX
 Brickwell, Wilbur D., XXXXXXXX
 Bryan, Richard L., XXXXXXXX
 Burton, Glenn E., XXXXXXXX
 Caprio, Daniel W., XXXXXXXX
 Cashman, James D., XXXXXXXX
 Cawley, John H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Chandler, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Chapman, Joseph M., XXXXXXXX
 Cheesborough, Richard S., XXXXXXXX
 Child, Paul W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Christensen, George F., XXXXXXXX
 Clark, Denzel L., XXXXXXXX
 Clark, Jon M., XXXXXXXX
 Clayberg, Richard P., XXXXXXXX
 Collins, Harry D., XXXXXXXX
 Collins, Howard L., XXXXXXXX
 Curran, Kenton W., XXXXXXXX
 DeRouen, Milton, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Diener, Everett P., XXXXXXXX
 Dilday, Colbert L., XXXXXXXX
 Draper, Leo, XXXXXXXX
 Duffy, Henry A., XXXXXXXX
 Eberhard, Floyd, XXXXXXXX
 Erickson, Charles A., XXXXXXXX
 Eubanks, James M., XXXXXXXX
 Ewing, Leroy B., XXXXXXXX
 Fambrough, John A., XXXXXXXX
 Flynn, James J., XXXXXXXX
 Foradori, Harry L., XXXXXXXX
 Fritchman, Lynn V., XXXXXXXX
 Fronczak, Theodore J., XXXXXXXX
 Furney, Robert M., XXXXXXXX
 Gallagher, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Gallagher, Thomas M., XXXXXXXX
 Green, Robert E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Gregg, Dale P., XXXXXXXX
 Hallmark, Robert C., XXXXXXXX
 Handback, Henry C., XXXXXXXX
 Haney, Charles H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hartman, Donald F., XXXXXXXX
 Helkinnen, Kenneth L., XXXXXXXX
 Hendricks, Thomas E., XXXXXXXX
 Herring, Shelby D., XXXXXXXX
 Hertz, Sanford G., XXXXXXXX
 Hoffmann, Theodore H., XXXXXXXX
 Holt, Bill V., XXXXXXXX
 Hubb, Frank, XXXXXXXX
 Jackson, James C., XXXXXXXX
 Jhung, Bryson, XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, William M., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, David W., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, Ronald A., XXXXXXXX
 Kay, Joseph V., XXXXXXXX
 King, Gregory N., XXXXXXXX
 Lacy, James F., XXXXXXXX
 Lauthers, David E., XXXXXXXX
 Leonard, Dan S., XXXXXXXX
 Lilley, Walter G., XXXXXXXX
 Liscinsky, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 Long, Arthur W., XXXXXXXX
 Long, Kenneth D., XXXXXXXX
 Looney, Robert C., XXXXXXXX
 Mackey, William C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Magness, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Marini, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Martin, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Martin, Quinton T., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McGraw, John F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McGregor, Harold W., XXXXXXXX
 McKee, Kenneth J., XXXXXXXX
 Metzger, Ronald W., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Leonard L., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 Moore, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Moran, Hugh F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Morse, Guy P., XXXXXXXX
 Moulton, Rodney F., XXXXXXXX
 Nadworny, M. Joseph, XXXXXXXX
 Neal, Charles A., XXXXXXXX
 Neil, Arthur G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Nix, Eddie M., XXXXXXXX
 Noble, George E., XXXXXXXX
 Nork, William G., XXXXXXXX
 Norton, Albert L., XXXXXXXX
 O'Connor, James J., XXXXXXXX
 Okita, Harold K., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Pack, Kenneth L., XXXXXXXX
 Paradiso, Richard A., XXXXXXXX
 Parks, Hugh W., XXXXXXXX
 Peden, Ronald L., XXXXXXXX
 Rexroad, William P., XXXXXXXX
 Plencner, Francis B., XXXXXXXX
 Price, Oscar G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Principe, Martin A., XXXXXXXX
 Pritchard, Donald H., XXXXXXXX
 Puig, Joseph P., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Ragovis, George, XXXXXXXX
 Raymond, Henry J., XXXXXXXX
 Riviere, George L., XXXXXXXX
 Rodenhiser, Carl L., XXXXXXXX
 Sands, Clifton A., XXXXXXXX
 Saunders, LemRoy L., XXXXXXXX
 Schaefer, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Selig, Clyde P., XXXXXXXX
 Silvanic, George, XXXXXXXX
 Sisk, Isaac R., XXXXXXXX
 Snyder, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Sontag, Paul D., XXXXXXXX
 Stamper, James M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Starkey, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Stevenson, Joseph M., XXXXXXXX
 Sullivan, Andrew J., XXXXXXXX
 Swoboda, Edward A., XXXXXXXX
 Tanner, Lester W., XXXXXXXX
 Tenny, Roy L., XXXXXXXX
 Thaxton, Billy J., XXXXXXXX
 Thomas, Max E., XXXXXXXX
 Thomas, Richard W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Tobiasen, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 Tomlin, James B., XXXXXXXX
 Top, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Treece, Ausby J., XXXXXXXX
 Vavra, George R., XXXXXXXX
 Waibbe, Leo C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Walter, Paul B., XXXXXXXX
 Watkins, Edward A., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Wedemeier, Terry T., XXXXXXXX
 White, Harry S., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Wilson, Charles E., XXXXXXXX
 Woodward, James O., XXXXXXXX
 Young, Lawrence B. H., Sr., XXXXXXXX

To be second lieutenants

Abuhl, Willmott, XXXXXXXX
 Adams, James G., XXXXXXXX
 Addy, Buford W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Adriaansen, Leslie I., XXXXXXXX
 Allen, William L., XXXXXXXX
 Ammons, David C., XXXXXXXX
 Anderson, Joseph M., XXXXXXXX
 Arcari, Joseph J., XXXXXXXX
 Arndt, Terrance L., XXXXXXXX

Aylward, James J., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Baker, John P., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Barkett, John S., XXXXXXXX.
 Beavers, Guy M., XXXXXXXX.
 Beck, John A., XXXXXXXX.
 Behnke, James E., XXXXXXXX.
 Bennett, James C., XXXXXXXX.
 Berry, William W., XXXXXXXX.
 Bingham, Ellis D., XXXXXXXX.
 Blankenship, Donald K., XXXXXXXX.
 Boccard, Richard A., XXXXXXXX.
 Bosway, Stephen G., XXXXXXXX.
 Bowen, Guy P.
 Bower, Duane M., XXXXXXXX.
 Bowman, Roy R., XXXXXXXX.
 Braa, Emery W., XXXXXXXX.
 Brantley, John T., XXXXXXXX.
 Braspeninckx, Harold J., XXXXXXXX.
 Brassfield, Bobbie A., XXXXXXXX.
 Brett, William J., XXXXXXXX.
 Brock, Robert J., XXXXXXXX.
 Brown, Elbert L., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Bruck, Harold A., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Brumbaugh, Larry W., XXXXXXXX.
 Burke, Sib H., XXXXXXXX.
 Burton, Dawson L., XXXXXXXX.
 Campbell, Jerry K., XXXXXXXX.
 Cancienne, Louis G., XXXXXXXX.
 Carnahan, Ronald J., XXXXXXXX.
 Catlett, Charles, XXXXXXXX.
 Cauthen, Tommy E., XXXXXXXX.
 Chapman, Ruthven H., XXXXXXXX.
 Chaudrue, Robert G., XXXXXXXX.
 Chesak, Charles D., XXXXXXXX.
 Clark, Dennis J., XXXXXXXX.
 Clark, Donald P., XXXXXXXX.
 Clark, Richard A., XXXXXXXX.
 Clark, Richard M., XXXXXXXX.
 Clary, William T., XXXXXXXX.
 Cole, Leslie W., XXXXXXXX.
 Cooney, Terrence P., XXXXXXXX.
 Cox, Wallace R., XXXXXXXX.
 Craig, Sammy W. II, XXXXXXXX.
 Craighead, Clyde V., XXXXXXXX.
 Cullins, Thomas E., XXXXXXXX.
 Cunningham, James G., XXXXXXXX.
 Daly, George M., XXXXXXXX.
 Dalzell, Gary W., XXXXXXXX.
 Davis, George C., XXXXXXXX.
 Davis, Phillip A., XXXXXXXX.
 Dedman, Richard O., XXXXXXXX.
 Dendtler, Robert B., XXXXXXXX.
 Dennen, David W., XXXXXXXX.
 Digh, Ned P., XXXXXXXX.
 Dolby, John F., XXXXXXXX.
 Drewett, George S., XXXXXXXX.
 Duncan, Robert D., XXXXXXXX.
 Dyer, Donald E., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Erickson, Curtis C., XXXXXXXX.
 Farley, Dennis S., XXXXXXXX.
 Fassel, Laverene F., XXXXXXXX.
 Faulkner, Gordon K., XXXXXXXX.
 Flesher, Dale D., XXXXXXXX.
 Florey, Richard R., XXXXXXXX.
 Flynn, Thomas F. X., XXXXXXXX.
 Fowler, Darrell V., XXXXXXXX.
 Friend, Stephen G., XXXXXXXX.
 Frink, Robert K., XXXXXXXX.
 Gardella, John L., XXXXXXXX.
 Geddings, Cecil C., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Geiger, Arthur H., XXXXXXXX.
 Gilbert, John C., XXXXXXXX.
 Gilliam, Glen L., XXXXXXXX.
 Goodchild, Gerald B., XXXXXXXX.
 Gordon, Dudley J., XXXXXXXX.
 Gosnell, Carlos D., XXXXXXXX.
 Gray, David W., XXXXXXXX.
 Gray, Harlen E., XXXXXXXX.
 Gruber, Lee C., XXXXXXXX.
 Guillory, Kenneth R., XXXXXXXX.
 Haas, Gaylord P., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Hackney, Edward C., XXXXXXXX.
 Hall, John M., XXXXXXXX.
 Hallmark, Billy J., XXXXXXXX.
 Halverson, Jay G., XXXXXXXX.
 Harwood, Michael S., XXXXXXXX.
 Hittner, Leon B., XXXXXXXX.
 Hodge, Charles D., XXXXXXXX.
 Holland, Gerald R., XXXXXXXX.
 Hollingsworth, Jerome L., XXXXXXXX.

Hovanec, Vincent J., XXXXXXXX.
 Howard, Lee N., XXXXXXXX.
 Hull, Arthur V., XXXXXXXX.
 Hummel, Theodore W., XXXXXXXX.
 Hunt, James W., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Hurley, William P., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Iaconis, Emil P., XXXXXXXX.
 Iori, Richard A., XXXXXXXX.
 Jackson, Raymond F., XXXXXXXX.
 Jacobson, Walter R., XXXXXXXX.
 Jankiewicz, Edward J., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Jansen, Edward F., XXXXXXXX.
 Jennings, Richard P., XXXXXXXX.
 Keville, Clarence H., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Killian, Howard J., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Kinnison, Harlen W., XXXXXXXX.
 Kondi, Albert J., XXXXXXXX.
 Kuehn, Walter, Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Kuntz, George R., XXXXXXXX.
 Kurtz, Robert W., XXXXXXXX.
 Kwak, John J., Sr., XXXXXXXX.
 Lacy, Paul J., XXXXXXXX.
 Ladden, Richard M.
 Lagutchik, Peter, Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 LaMarche, Bertrand D., XXXXXXXX.
 Lane, George H., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Lanzillo, Eugene R., XXXXXXXX.
 Lauby, Robert F., XXXXXXXX.
 Lawn, William J., XXXXXXXX.
 Lee, William E., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Lide, Theodore A., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Loker, Jon O., XXXXXXXX.
 Long, Glenn W., XXXXXXXX.
 Long, Melvin D., XXXXXXXX.
 Longoria, Ezekiel, XXXXXXXX.
 Louney, Patrick D., XXXXXXXX.
 Lovell, Austin L., XXXXXXXX.
 Lowe, James I., XXXXXXXX.
 Lowry, Louis L., XXXXXXXX.
 Lufburrow, Robert P., XXXXXXXX.
 Luisi, Gerard H., XXXXXXXX.
 MacLellan, John A., XXXXXXXX.
 Maffett, Fletcher H., XXXXXXXX.
 Maloney, Mark L., XXXXXXXX.
 Marsella, Louis J., XXXXXXXX.
 Marshall, Wesley B.
 Martin, Alfred L., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Martin, Bruce A., XXXXXXXX.
 Martin, Willard L., XXXXXXXX.
 Mason, William B., XXXXXXXX.
 McCloskey, William B., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 McGinnis, Michael J., XXXXXXXX.
 McGivern, Parlan L., XXXXXXXX.
 McHugh, Charles W., XXXXXXXX.
 McInerney, Bernard M., XXXXXXXX.
 McKenzie, Peter P., XXXXXXXX.
 McKibben, Clifford F., XXXXXXXX.
 McKenzie, George J., XXXXXXXX.
 McMullan, Frank W., XXXXXXXX.
 McWaters, John R., XXXXXXXX.
 Meininger, Herbert N., XXXXXXXX.
 Meister, Jerome F., XXXXXXXX.
 Messineo, Joseph F., XXXXXXXX.
 Mickelson, Roger W., XXXXXXXX.
 Mitchell, Richard G., XXXXXXXX.
 Mixer, Wilbur R., XXXXXXXX.
 Moates, James T., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Morgan, Jack E., XXXXXXXX.
 Moriarty, Donald P., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Morris, Dannie B., XXXXXXXX.
 Morris, Ellis R., XXXXXXXX.
 Murray, Lark R., XXXXXXXX.
 Neely, Cecil N., XXXXXXXX.
 Nichols, James M., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Nilsson, John A., XXXXXXXX.
 Olsen, Norman W., XXXXXXXX.
 O'Neill, Charles F., XXXXXXXX.
 Otto, James W., XXXXXXXX.
 Parker, David M., XXXXXXXX.
 Patterson, James L., XXXXXXXX.
 Pearce, William E., XXXXXXXX.
 Phelan, Arthur J., XXXXXXXX.
 Poach, James R., III, XXXXXXXX.
 Porter, Ronald E., XXXXXXXX.
 Price, Robert D., XXXXXXXX.
 Proeschel, Donald L., XXXXXXXX.
 Radcliff, William A., XXXXXXXX.
 Rambo, James E., XXXXXXXX.
 Reagan, Jerry E., XXXXXXXX.
 Reese, Thomas D., XXXXXXXX.
 Resa, Philip E., XXXXXXXX.

Reynolds, James A., XXXXXXXX.
 Richardson, Joseph B., XXXXXXXX.
 Rider, Charles R., XXXXXXXX.
 Roach, Armand D., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Robinson, James B., XXXXXXXX.
 Rooney, Lawrence A., XXXXXXXX.
 Rorie, Forest G., XXXXXXXX.
 Rosamond, John B., XXXXXXXX.
 Rose, Rocco V., XXXXXXXX.
 Sarbanes, Anthony S., XXXXXXXX.
 Saunders, Richard G., XXXXXXXX.
 Schroder, Romayne E., XXXXXXXX.
 Schroeder, William M., XXXXXXXX.
 Schuetze, Raymond A., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Schultz, Gary E., XXXXXXXX.
 Schultz, Norman O., XXXXXXXX.
 Scott, Richard L., XXXXXXXX.
 Searl, Peter H., XXXXXXXX.
 Serna, Albert I., III, XXXXXXXX.
 Shanahan, Edward J., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Shearer, David L., XXXXXXXX.
 Sheldon, William W., XXXXXXXX.
 Shelton, James E., XXXXXXXX.
 Sherwood, Donald L., XXXXXXXX.
 Siderius, Robert R., XXXXXXXX.
 Siegel, Eugene E., XXXXXXXX.
 Siler, Samuel M., XXXXXXXX.
 Sims, Charles O., III, XXXXXXXX.
 Slsak, James C., XXXXXXXX.
 Slocum, Neil R., XXXXXXXX.
 Smith, Robert T., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Smith, Robert W., XXXXXXXX.
 Smith, William J., XXXXXXXX.
 Smitherman, Joe V., XXXXXXXX.
 Speicher, William F., XXXXXXXX.
 Stamps, Doyle W., XXXXXXXX.
 Stedman, Robert W., XXXXXXXX.
 Surprise, Lyle G., XXXXXXXX.
 Symons, Frederick E., XXXXXXXX.
 Taylor, Alfred E., XXXXXXXX.
 Taylor, Paul W., XXXXXXXX.
 Taylor, Thomas W., XXXXXXXX.
 Teasley, Harry N., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Tebo, Robert J., XXXXXXXX.
 Thomas, Charles R., XXXXXXXX.
 Thomas, Robert H. B., XXXXXXXX.
 Tomel, Giancarlo A., XXXXXXXX.
 Totin, John R., XXXXXXXX.
 Tudhope, Lawrence K., XXXXXXXX.
 Turner, Peter J., XXXXXXXX.
 Walker, Clifford M., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Walsh, Richard J., XXXXXXXX.
 Walton, Warren J., XXXXXXXX.
 Ward, James J., XXXXXXXX.
 Ward, Leonard M., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Waring, Mowton L., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Watkins, Thomas D., II, XXXXXXXX.
 Wenthe, David H., XXXXXXXX.
 Wesley, Clemon H., XXXXXXXX.
 Westbrook, Tommy R., XXXXXXXX.
 White, Jewel G., XXXXXXXX.
 Widell, Carl A., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Widmer, Edwin R., XXXXXXXX.
 Wilson, John P., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Wise, Paul E., XXXXXXXX.
 Wizbowski, Walter L. P., XXXXXXXX.

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3291, 3292, 3294, and 3311:

To be major, Dental Corps

DiJoseph, Benjamin J., XXXXXXXX.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Pratt, Daniel W., XXXXXXXX.
 Runcik, Karel, XXXXXXXX.
 Van Hoorn, Jacob Z., XXXXXXXX.
 Wilson, William E., XXXXXXXX.

To be major, Medical Service Corps

Bryan, George R., XXXXXXXX.

To be major, Chaplain

Fiser, James H., XXXXXXXX.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Cunningham, Dillard, XXXXXXXX.
 Grech, Anna A., XXXXXXXX.

Rogers, Janet A., [REDACTED]
 Rothrock, Lois R., [REDACTED]
 Utt, Yvonne M., [REDACTED]

To be captains, Dental Corps

Bellerose, Gilbert A., [REDACTED]
 Civjan, Simon, [REDACTED]
 Cote, Robert R., [REDACTED]
 Cutright, Duane E., [REDACTED]
 Deane, Clarence E., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Guilford, Harold J., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hatchett, Robert K., [REDACTED]
 Jensen, John G., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Paul, William H., [REDACTED]
 Peppe, Isadore O., [REDACTED]

To be captains, Medical Corps

Baughman, Charles H., [REDACTED]
 Blakely, Lee A., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Busch, Edwin S., [REDACTED]
 Cadigan, Francis C., [REDACTED]
 Campbell, John J., [REDACTED]
 Erickson, Darroll J., [REDACTED]
 Finnerty, Paul E., [REDACTED]
 Garrison, James M., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Goodner, John W., [REDACTED]
 Luttrull, John W., [REDACTED]
 Munson, Wayne M., [REDACTED]
 Newman, William E., [REDACTED]
 Rank, William B., [REDACTED]
 Roberts, Howard H., [REDACTED]
 Schaefer, Glennon S., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Snyder, Donald L., [REDACTED]
 Swedenborg, Samuel W., [REDACTED]
 Uhrig, Henry T., [REDACTED]
 Wheby, Munsey S., [REDACTED]

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Kershner, Edward C., [REDACTED]
 Oestereich, Orlyn C., [REDACTED]
 Wells, Robert J., [REDACTED]

To be captains, Chaplain Corps

Christoph, Edward J., [REDACTED]
 Miller, Alfred A., [REDACTED]
 Remark, Phillip B., [REDACTED]
 Siege, John C., [REDACTED]

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Lara, William K., [REDACTED]
 Movsesian, Anthony A., [REDACTED]

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Bray, Lydia M., [REDACTED]
 Niblack, Sarah F., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Dobbs, Eunice R., M3081.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Fess, Dorothy E., [REDACTED]
 Hanover, Gloria A., [REDACTED]
 Johnson, Ellen, [REDACTED]
 Joyner, Mary E., [REDACTED]
 Learned, Grace, [REDACTED]
 Littlefield, Jaclyn, [REDACTED]
 Nellis, Virginia M., [REDACTED]
 Reed, Della K., [REDACTED]
 Shoemaker, Vera E., [REDACTED]
 Supplee, Jeanne L., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, Dental Corps

Brunton, Donald A., Jr., [REDACTED]
 L'Homme, Paul R., [REDACTED]
 Swain, Marshall M., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Agnew, Hall W., [REDACTED]
 Ballard, Michael D., [REDACTED]
 Beck, William L., [REDACTED]
 Bowman, John A., [REDACTED]
 Bybee, Paul R., [REDACTED]
 Collins, Delano M., [REDACTED]
 Genest, Aloria S., [REDACTED]
 Gilroy, Francis J., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hazlett, David R., [REDACTED]
 Kahane, Stanley B., [REDACTED]
 Kolbert, Gerald S., [REDACTED]
 Kriz, Frank K., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Levy, Joel V., [REDACTED]
 Massad, Louis B., [REDACTED]
 Park, Robert C., [REDACTED]

Pating, Roger, [REDACTED]
 Peterson, Richard B., [REDACTED]
 Reiss, Walter E., [REDACTED]
 Sokoloff, Burton Z., [REDACTED]
 Spaulding, Abbot G., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bourland, Gene M., [REDACTED]
 Clark, Scott W., [REDACTED]
 Hoen, Warren K., [REDACTED]
 Lawrence, Frank P., [REDACTED]
 Levy, Louis B., [REDACTED]
 Liedtka, Frederick A., [REDACTED]
 Stevens, Clarence O., [REDACTED]
 Van Straten, James G., [REDACTED]
 Van Wyck, William E., [REDACTED]
 Villanueva, Teodoro, Jr., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Chandler, Harold K., [REDACTED]
 Eckermann, Edgar H., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain Corps

Ambrose, George Jr., [REDACTED]
 Brooks, Tommy C., [REDACTED]
 Cook, Richard G., [REDACTED]
 Degl, Joseph, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Forrest, Alfred T., [REDACTED]
 Garner, Calvin H., [REDACTED]
 Graber, Howard M., [REDACTED]
 Green, John E., [REDACTED]
 Hartman, Richard W., [REDACTED]
 Johnson, Charles M., [REDACTED]
 Knowlton, Robert L., [REDACTED]
 Kovacic, Francis, [REDACTED]
 Lapp, Ernest D., [REDACTED]
 Logan, John D., [REDACTED]
 Lyon, Wilson L., [REDACTED]
 Magalee, John E., [REDACTED]
 Martin, William A., [REDACTED]
 McCloy, Charles H., Sr., [REDACTED]
 Moss, Ira G., [REDACTED]
 Nagata, William M., [REDACTED]
 Ninedorf, Robert W., [REDACTED]
 Nybro, Richard, [REDACTED]
 O'Shea, Edward L., [REDACTED]
 Polhemus, David W., [REDACTED]
 Stanford, James A., [REDACTED]
 Stover, Earl F., [REDACTED]
 Swager, Robert G., [REDACTED]
 Tate, David F., [REDACTED]
 Tibbetts, Alan C., [REDACTED]
 Trobaugh, William P., [REDACTED]
 Wright, Wendell T., [REDACTED]
 Yarbrough, Jimmie W., [REDACTED]
 Young, Willis F., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Alford, John R., [REDACTED]
 Alley, Wayne E., [REDACTED]
 Davis, Bruce E., [REDACTED]
 Drake, Walter H., [REDACTED]
 Harvey, Alton H., [REDACTED]
 Henson, Hugh E., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Knakal, Joseph C., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lassiter, Edward A., [REDACTED]
 Miller, Harold L., [REDACTED]
 Miller, William T., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wells, Jerry E., [REDACTED]
 Wold, Pedar C., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Alford, John R., [REDACTED]
 Alley, Wayne E., [REDACTED]
 Davis, Bruce E., [REDACTED]
 Drake, Walter H., [REDACTED]
 Harvey, Alton H., [REDACTED]
 Henson, Hugh E., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Knakal, Joseph C., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lassiter, Edward A., [REDACTED]
 Miller, Harold L., [REDACTED]
 Miller, William T., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wells, Jerry E., [REDACTED]
 Wold, Pedar C., [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Maybin, Patricia J., [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Hall, Mary S., M2291388.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Diener, Dolores E., [REDACTED]
 Jones, Addie B. L., [REDACTED]
 Michael, Marbeth G., [REDACTED]
 Paulsen, Margaret J., [REDACTED]
 Teele, Kathryn M., [REDACTED]
 Tinklenberg, Esther J., [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Ashwood, Carl R., [REDACTED]
 Barber, Leroy M., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Belcher, Lillard F., [REDACTED]
 Boston, Lester E., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Braddock, Thomas E., [REDACTED]

Burkett, Samuel L., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Carroll, William F., [REDACTED]
 Clark, Robert C., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Curtis, Michael R., [REDACTED]
 Davis, John P., [REDACTED]
 Eberwine, James A., [REDACTED]
 Fields, Robert E., [REDACTED]
 Fletcher, Oliver K., Jr., [REDACTED]
 French, George R., [REDACTED]
 Gilliland, Bobby E., [REDACTED]
 Goodman, Dorris C., [REDACTED]
 Hayes, James H., [REDACTED]
 Heller, Kyle M., [REDACTED]
 Hopkins, Richard L., [REDACTED]
 Hucks, John A., [REDACTED]
 Hudson, James F., [REDACTED]
 Jessen, Gary C., [REDACTED]
 Jones, Donn C., [REDACTED]
 Keim, Walter H., [REDACTED]
 Kelly, Peter C., [REDACTED]
 Lander, Robert J., [REDACTED]
 Lawson, James L., [REDACTED]
 Litman, Leon H., [REDACTED]
 Locklear, James P., [REDACTED]
 Loring, Douglas M., [REDACTED]
 McDermott, Frank E., [REDACTED]
 McLeod, William R., [REDACTED]
 McMahan, Robert P., [REDACTED]
 McNulty, William J., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Merritt, Thomas E., [REDACTED]
 Murphy, Joseph H., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Murphy, Robert J., [REDACTED]
 Pacheco, Miguel, [REDACTED]
 Picha, Norbert O., [REDACTED]
 Powell, Harold W., [REDACTED]
 Rockwell, John H., [REDACTED]
 Rumley, Richard E., [REDACTED]
 Scanlan, William H., [REDACTED]
 Silvas, Manuel M., [REDACTED]
 Sorem, David N., [REDACTED]
 Stavish, Peter J., [REDACTED]
 Tilmon, George W., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Vann, Lawrence K., [REDACTED]
 Walls, Neal H., [REDACTED]
 Webb, Charles L., [REDACTED]
 Wilburn, James H., [REDACTED]
 Wood, Malcolm H., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wunder, William H., [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

Caldwell, Doris L., [REDACTED]
 Hallman, Jane L., [REDACTED]
 Lipner, Lois, [REDACTED]
 Nelson, Nancy L., [REDACTED]
 Phillips, Charlotte E., [REDACTED]
 Thornton, Dorothy J., [REDACTED]
 von Metnitz, Carol, [REDACTED]

(NOTE.—These officers were appointed, transferred, or promoted during the recess of the Senate.)

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following persons who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the 86th Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major, USAF (medical)

John S. Flint, [REDACTED]

To be captain, USAF (medical)

Don T. Mosher.

To be captain, USAF (dental)

Patrick J. Mulligan.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captain, USAF (medical)

John W. Barrett, [REDACTED]

To be captains, USAF (dental)

William J. Clark, [REDACTED]
Robert G. Hutfless, [REDACTED]
Robert C. Johns, [REDACTED]
Edward W. Rogers, [REDACTED]

To be captains, USAF (chaplain)

Milton H. Allen, [REDACTED]
Ramon W. Blach, [REDACTED]
Jefferson E. Davis, Jr., [REDACTED]
Homer E. Gardiner, [REDACTED]
Willis H. Newton, Jr., [REDACTED]
Erwin R. Ray, [REDACTED]
Neil F. Wolfe, [REDACTED]

To be captains, USAF (judge advocate)

Harold Howell, [REDACTED]
Robert E. Johnson II, [REDACTED]
Hilleary D. Moore, [REDACTED]

To be captains, USAF (veterinary)

Jerry Fineg, [REDACTED]
Norman D. Heidelbaugh, [REDACTED]
William L. Jones, Jr., [REDACTED]
Robert M. McCully, [REDACTED]
Albert D. Wright, [REDACTED]

To be captains, USAF (nurse)

Elvira C. Bakken, [REDACTED]
Mary C. Warner, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical)

Henry J. Schmitt, Jr., [REDACTED]
R. J. Black Schultz, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (dental)

Rufus C. Hargrove, Jr., [REDACTED]
Wayne T. Harris, Jr., [REDACTED]
Arthur F. Mello, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (chaplain)

Alfred J. Abernethy, [REDACTED]
John J. Benda, [REDACTED]
William G. Boggs, [REDACTED]
Newton V. Cole, [REDACTED]
Arthur L. Eves, [REDACTED]
James E. Flinn, [REDACTED]
William D. Franks, [REDACTED]
Vancil V. Gibson, [REDACTED]
Leo J. Lyons, [REDACTED]
Vincent A. Meskenas, [REDACTED]
Edward E. Shoupe, [REDACTED]
Rufus G. Smith, [REDACTED]
James R. Taylor, [REDACTED]
William J. Vaughn, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (judge advocate)

Fred L. Bowden, [REDACTED]
Maurice F. Ellison, Jr., [REDACTED]
Jerome R. Isenberg, [REDACTED]
Frank T. Moniz, [REDACTED]
Roy A. Olson, [REDACTED]
Julius C. Ullrich, Jr., [REDACTED]
Joseph N. Wiltgen, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (veterinary)

Harold W. Casey, [REDACTED]
Dean E. Ewing, [REDACTED]
Charles E. Fuller, [REDACTED]
Lea R. Hutchinson, [REDACTED]
Charles C. King, Jr., [REDACTED]
Joe E. West, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

James H. Auburn, Jr., [REDACTED]
Robert A. Bauer, [REDACTED]
John L. Bluhm, [REDACTED]
Donald C. Choisser, [REDACTED]
Horace A. Corley, [REDACTED]
Phillip H. Darling, Jr., [REDACTED]
William J. DeMuth, Jr., [REDACTED]
Charles E. Deramus, Jr., [REDACTED]
John L. Gildner, [REDACTED]
Thomas J. Harn, [REDACTED]
Richard L. Inley, [REDACTED]
William G. Jacobsen, [REDACTED]
Marvin E. Kennebeck, Jr., [REDACTED]
Paul F. Kratzsch, [REDACTED]
Adolph A. Lindsley, [REDACTED]

Charles W. Martino, [REDACTED]
Robert T. McIntyre, [REDACTED]
John P. Meade, [REDACTED]
Joseph C. Monk, [REDACTED]
Curtis G. Park, [REDACTED]
Albert Podkin, [REDACTED]
Marvin Podkin, [REDACTED]
Jerry H. Schussele, [REDACTED]
Daniel H. Seal, [REDACTED]
Gordon R. Shaw, [REDACTED]
Jack L. Shelton, [REDACTED]
John A. Skinner, [REDACTED]
Marion J. Stansell, [REDACTED]
Herbert E. Straughn, [REDACTED]
Bertram D. Targove, [REDACTED]
Harold O. Walker, Jr., [REDACTED]
James R. Wedding, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (nurse)

Josephine M. Candella, [REDACTED]
Susie A. Florence, [REDACTED]
Beatrice J. Hale, [REDACTED]
Frances A. Hamilton, [REDACTED]
Anna M. Kreasky, [REDACTED]
Barbara L. Legalle, [REDACTED]
Ruth A. McMurdo, [REDACTED]
Elizabeth L. Park, [REDACTED]
Loretta V. Petersen, [REDACTED]
Dolores J. Scribner, [REDACTED]
Carolyn M. Wagner, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical specialist)

Mary F. Golson, [REDACTED]
Carolyn T. Page, [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Gary L. Adams, [REDACTED]
Rex D. Gaede, [REDACTED]
John R. Gillis, [REDACTED]
Wayne P. Kirchoffer, [REDACTED]
John C. Kuchta, Jr., [REDACTED]
Donald G. Silva, [REDACTED]
Robert W. Suiter, [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenant, USAF (nurse)

Della F. Greer, [REDACTED]

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284, of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Distinguished aviation cadet graduates

William D. Bryden, Jr., [REDACTED]
James A. Dewey, [REDACTED]
Fredric S. Fitzsimmons, [REDACTED]
Phillip W. Handley, [REDACTED]
Reginald A. Hearn, [REDACTED]
Robert A. Martin, [REDACTED]
Richard E. Read, [REDACTED]
Dwight E. Roach, [REDACTED]
Ronald L. Selberg, [REDACTED]
Belford M. Spurlock, [REDACTED]
Alden R. Starkey, [REDACTED]
Carl E. Steingrebe, Jr., [REDACTED]
Joe T. Stockett, [REDACTED]
Rodney A. Upton, [REDACTED]
Bruce E. Wilcox, [REDACTED]
Norman D. Wilson, [REDACTED]

Distinguished officer candidate graduates

Donald P. Bahr, [REDACTED]
Charlotte M. DeFuy, [REDACTED]
Harold E. Eaton, [REDACTED]
Lawrence M. G. Enomoto, [REDACTED]
Oscar W. Hall, [REDACTED]
Robert W. Hultslander, [REDACTED]
Allen J. Montecino, Jr., [REDACTED]
Thomas E. Straight, [REDACTED]
John B. Stueve, [REDACTED]
Harry A. Thomas, Jr., [REDACTED]

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10,

United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Harold C. Alger.
Thomas N. Arnold.
Albert H. Collins.
Troy G. Dobbins.
Gerald L. Fuller.
Wingate A. Jackson III, [REDACTED]
William D. Jones, Jr., [REDACTED]
Leon B. Newman.
Charles L. Rackley, [REDACTED]

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Manuel J. Asensio, [REDACTED] (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

The following officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

Maj. Gen. Jacob E. Smart, [REDACTED], Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, [REDACTED] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, second 5231, the following named officer for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving:

Vice Adm. Harold P. Smith, U.S. Navy.

The following named officers for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Adm. Jerauld Wright, U.S. Navy.

Adm. Walter F. Boone, U.S. Navy.

The following named officers for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. William V. Davis, Jr., U.S. Navy.

Vice Adm. William G. Cooper, U.S. Navy.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

Rear Adm. Charles D. Griffin, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. John S. Thach, U.S. Navy.

*Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg III, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

*Rear Adm. Edmund B. Taylor, U.S. Navy.

*Rear Adm. Harold T. Deutermann, U.S. Navy.

The following named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Line

Ephraim P. Holmes James M. Farrin, Jr.
John T. Hayward George H. Wales
Vernon L. Lowrance Edward J. O'Donnell
Charles C. Kirkpatrick Andrew M. Jackson,
Alfred G. Ward Jr.

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

Kleber S. Masterson
 Marshall E. Dornin
 Robert L. Moore, Jr.
 Frank L. Johnson
 Lot Ensey
 Denys W. Knoll
 John W. Alles, III
 Robert J. Stroh
 James W. Davis
 Paul P. Blackburn, Jr.
 Joseph C. Clifton
 Allan L. Reed
 Ernest C. Holtzworth
 Ray C. Needham
 Robert M. Reynolds

Medical Corps

James L. Holland
 Cecil L. Andrews

Supply Corps

Howard F. Kuehl
 Joseph M. Lyle
 James S. Dietz

Civil Engineer Corps

Eugene J. Peltier
 Henry G. Clark

Norman J. Drustrup
 James R. Davis

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Line

William T. Alexander
 Leroy J. Alexanderson
 *Grant G. Calhoun

*Louis A. Gillies
 Wharton E. Larned

Supply Corps

*Levi J. Roberts

Civil Engineer Corps

Edward Denbo

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Line

Alvan Fisher
 Herman Reich
 John E. Harlin
 Arthur A. de la Hous-
 saye

John W. McElroy
 Richard O. Patterson
 Victor Hicks

Medical Corps

Joseph S. Barr
 William L. Rogers
 Francis J. Braceland

Robert A. Ross
 Wendell G. Scott

Chaplain Corps

William E. Collins

Civil Engineer Corps

Edwin N. Blackwood

Dental Corps

William M. Burns

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Alan Shapley
 Robert B. Luckey
 Arthur F. Binney
 Thomas G. Ennis
 Carson A. Roberts

James P. Berkeley
 Donald M. Weller
 Wallace M. Greene, Jr.
 Charles H. Hayes

*Maj. Gen. Chester R. Allen, U.S. Marine Corps, to be quartermaster general of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of January 1960.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Alpha L. Bowser
 Harvey C. Tschirgi
 Avery R. Kier
 Sidney S. Wade
 James M. Masters, Sr.
 Ralph K. Rottet
 Samuel R. Shaw
 John P. Condon

Frank C. Tharin
 Robert E. Cushman,
 Jr.
 Richard G. Weede
 Lewis J. Fields
 Leonard F. Chapman,
 Jr.
 Paul R. Tyler

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

James E. Howarth, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

*William W. Stickney

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

*Charles H. Cox
 *George E. Tomlinson
 *Harry R. Van Liew
 *John L. Winston

*Charles O. Clark
 *William H. Klenke,
 Jr.
 *Harry N. Lyon

POSTMASTERS

The following named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Virgil B. Huff, Brundidge, Ala., in place of V. B. Huff, transferred.
 C. Buryell Finch, Detroit, Ala., in place of Flora Ballard, retired.
 Jimmy R. McWhirter, Dolomite, Ala., in place of Gladys Reaves, retired.
 Mabron L. Compton, Elkmont, Ala., in place of W. S. Morris, removed.
 J. Fred Wilcutt, Falkville, Ala., in place of A. K. B. Patterson, retired.
 John D. Lassiter, Hartford, Ala., in place of M. F. Ward, retired.
 Hugh F. Penn, Hartselle, Ala., in place of J. T. Cooper, retired.
 Mary D. Putnam, Lexington, Ala., in place of A. M. Campbell, removed.
 Joe A. Hamilton, McCalla, Ala., in place of N. T. Waldrup, retired.
 Ramon N. Days, Sr., Magazine, Ala., in place of Zada Davis, resigned.
 Eugene Williamson, Orrville, Ala., in place of H. E. Marshall, retired.
 Thomas O. Rudder, Stevenson, Ala., in place of E. O. Mann, retired.
 Albert T. Tucker, Sweet Water, Ala., in place of W. F. Beverly, retired.
 J. Carson Whitson, Talladega, Ala., in place of B. B. Hardegree, resigned.
 Jessie W. Hagood, Town Creek, Ala., in place of J. W. Davis, transferred.
 Charles F. Brantley, Troy, Ala., in place of L. J. Ledbetter, transferred.
 Doctor F. Gibson, Wadley, Ala., in place of M. M. Pearson, retired.
 Samuel W. Carpenter, Jr., Wedowee, Ala., in place of J. F. Wilson, retired.

ALASKA

Virginia L. Simonds, Annette, Alaska, in place of G. A. Cobb, resigned.
 Alice P. Harris, McGrath, Alaska, in place of O. S. Feltnley, resigned.
 Norma I. King, McKinley Park, Alaska, in place of Elvira Hehr, resigned.
 Hardy A. Peters, Tanana, Alaska, in place of W. H. Thompson, resigned.

ARIZONA

Jack Meeker, Coolidge, Ariz., in place of F. E. Morris, deceased.
 Agnes M. Young, Dateland, Ariz., in place of J. M. Collins, resigned.
 Paul E. Violette, Miami, Ariz., in place of H. P. Williams, retired.

ARKANSAS

William McKinley Huddleston, Batesville, Ark., in place of E. F. Crutchfield, transferred.
 Ernest E. Castleberry, Bono, Ark., in place of O. E. Wyatt, retired.
 Cline C. Pile, Charleston, Ark., in place of C. W. Spiller, retired.
 Devoe Bollinger, Jr., Horatio, Ark., in place of A. T. Cowden, retired.
 Oscar H. McKamey, Jr., Imboden, Ark., in place of J. D. Fortenberry, retired.
 Wilburn Gale Hanna, Luxora, Ark., in place of F. R. Rogers, transferred.

Ruby R. Ryan, Magazine, Ark., in place of G. O. Thomasson, deceased
 Hubert C. Robbins, Jr., Piggott, Ark., in place of H. M. Jinks, resigned.
 Jake M. Dunn, Pocahtontas, Ark., in place of Myrt Walrond, retired.

CALIFORNIA

William G. Moore, Atascadero, Calif., in place of G. N. Southwick, retired.
 Florabelle Rominger, Bangor, Calif., in place of V. H. Conger, deceased.
 Richard J. Williamson, Camino, Calif., in place of A. B. Peirsol, resigned.
 Ruth H. Burkett, Cedar Glen, Calif., in place of B. B. Malcom, retired.
 Gay Nell V. Mentzer, Coulterville, Calif., in place of V. E. Sackett, retired.
 Paul A. Helms, Culver City, Calif., in place of P. H. Jarrett, retired.
 Laurence D. King, Del Mar, Calif., in place of M. A. Kibler, retired.
 Helen M. Lowey, Downville, Calif., in place of J. M. Costa, retired.
 William F. Evans, Ducor, Calif., in place of M. L. Stewart, retired.
 Leslie V. Sims, Fallbrook, Calif., in place of J. L. Sims, retired.
 Donald F. Cox, Hollister, Calif., in place of R. A. Hubbell, retired.
 Lulu Ellen Spradlin, Homeland, Calif., office established December 16, 1949.
 Shirley J. McLean, Keene, Calif., in place of C. E. Wilson, transferred.
 Eva C. Edwards, Littlerock, Calif., in place of M. A. Wallace, resigned.
 Walter T. Robinson, Mariposa, Calif., in place of W. C. Quigley, retired.
 Harold E. Purpus, Millbrae, Calif., in place of J. H. Meyer, retired.
 John A. Black, McClellan Air Force Base, Calif., in place of L. F. Barksdale, retired.
 James W. Thoms, Mojave, Calif., in place of B. T. Finnin, retired.
 Merritt L. Carroll, Montgomery Creek, Calif., in place of Phoebe Vickroy, retired.
 Minnie P. Lynn, Rio Oso, Calif., in place of J. E. Butler, resigned.
 Ray E. Taylor, Roseville, Calif., in place of R. A. Bates, retired.
 Jewel D. McQuaid, San Ardo, Calif., in place of M. F. Flucker, deceased.
 Nancy M. Baranger, Santa Fe Springs, Calif., office established September 1, 1958.
 Vera V. Wood, Smartville, Calif., in place of L. W. Colling, deceased.
 Carol B. Gamble, Suisun City, Calif., in place of M. R. Wolfskill, retired.
 Ralph B. Gump, Tarzana, Calif., in place of D. M. Benedict, retired.
 Robert W. Dixon, Thornton, Calif., in place of J. E. Hambleton, retired.

COLORADO

Howard W. Cross, Grand Junction, Colo., in place of R. T. Ellington, retired.
 Harold W. Best, Larkspur, Colo., in place of J. U. Mixer, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Philo J. Perham, Amston, Conn., in place of S. G. Turshen, deceased.
 William B. Blackman, Brookroy, Conn., in place of V. C. Geddes, resigned.
 Sarah B. Friedman, Colchester, Conn., in place of J. J. Shea, retired.
 Jared A. Pratt, Jr., Essex, Conn., in place of P. D. Guptill, deceased.
 Peter Perun, Middlefield, Conn., in place of R. A. Chadsey, resigned.
 Salvatore J. Puglisi, Middletown, Conn., in place of R. J. Wamester, deceased.
 Herbert R. Trolle, Springdale, Conn., in place of J. H. Fahey, retired.
 Peter A. Koops, Thomaston, Conn., in place of M. T. Doyle, retired.
 Doris M. Madden, Vernon, Conn., in place of F. L. Foley, resigned.
 Donald C. MacDonell, Washington Depot, Conn., in place of J. F. Connerty, retired.
 Arthur Manzi, Woodbury, Conn., in place of P. F. Cassidy, removed.

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

DELAWARE

Martha E. Armstrong, Cheswold, Del., in place of M. W. Vaughn, Sr., transferred.
 Martin M. Williams, Kenton, Del., in place of H. W. Pratt, deceased.

FLORIDA

Stewart H. Hawkins, Anna Maria, Fla., in place of F. I. Warttig, retired.
 George C. Coker, Bartow, Fla., in place of L. C. Olive, retired.
 Harlow J. Schutt, Boynton Beach, Fla., in place of E. S. Pierce, retired.
 Robert T. Arnold, Brandon, Fla., in place of R. A. McIntosh, retired.
 Robert K. Tillman, Bushnell, Fla., in place of W. T. Eddins, retired.
 Jay R. Shattuck, Deerfield Beach, Fla., in place of E. V. Morrow, resigned.
 Johnny V. Boling, Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., office established January 1, 1958.
 James F. Rylant, Fernandina Beach, Fla., in place of Louis Goldstein, retired.
 Marion M. Woolley, Fort Walton Beach, Fla., in place of H. T. Stewart, resigned.
 Huber C. Hurst, Jacksonville, Fla., in place of G. C. Blume, deceased.
 Charles T. Perry, Maitland, Fla., in place of J. T. Stover, retired.
 Arthur R. Van Valkenburg, Pinellas Park, Fla., in place of M. M. Stevenson, retired.
 Lorence E. Brandon, Saint Petersburg, Fla., in place of W. H. Bowes, resigned.
 Gordon J. Burris, Sebring, Fla., in place of R. N. Durrance, retired.
 Joseph William Penrod, Stuart, Fla., in place of R. W. Hartman, retired.
 Edward S. Raymond, Venice, Fla., in place of R. E. Shallberg, retired.

GEORGIA

Manor B. Folsom, Jr., Barney, Ga., in place of C. R. Lanneau, transferred.
 Larree Johnston, Cartersville, Ga., in place of J. C. Nelson, retired.
 Henry R. Taylor, Cumming, Ga., in place of W. P. Hughes, retired.
 Henry R. Bennett, Darien, Ga., in place of R. H. Manson, retired.
 John F. Craft, Doerun, Ga., in place of L. J. McPhaul, deceased.
 Horace J. Healan, Hoschton, Ga., in place of J. P. Pirkle, retired.
 Wilfred W. Rivers, Jr., Leesburg, Ga., in place of R. C. Harris, deceased.
 Pauline T. King, Sea Island, Ga., in place of M. D. Cate, retired.
 Robert L. White, Trenton, Ga., in place of E. L. Raulston, retired.

IDAHO

Albert W. Miller, Gooding, Idaho, in place of M. H. Shotwell, retired.
 Wayne S. Shaeffer, Nezperce, Idaho, in place of R. L. Anstine, retired.

ILLINOIS

Arlynn M. Price, Abingdon, Ill., in place of J. W. Lucas, resigned.
 Clarence P. Siebert, Aledo, Ill., in place of C. D. Lawson, retired.
 John W. Dehmlow, Algonquin, Ill., in place of M. W. Struwing, removed.
 Rex H. Carter, Berwyn, Ill., in place of J. J. A. Borkovec, retired.
 Ethel F. Hierman, Bluffs, Ill., in place of T. B. Meehan, removed.
 Glenn E. Jones, Bulpitt, Ill., in place of M. N. Ceyte, deceased.
 Robert V. Loft, Capron, Ill., in place of M. M. Boyd, removed.
 Delbert H. Pittman, Cisne, Ill., in place of Gordon Perry, retired.
 Christian M. Willman, Jr., Deerfield, Ill., in place of J. J. Welch, retired.
 Carl S. Yates, Divernon, Ill., in place of J. W. Rettberg, retired.
 Irma L. Dodds, Eola, Ill., in place of G. L. Dodds, transferred.
 Clarence B. O'Marah, Eureka, Ill., in place of R. E. Duncan, resigned.

Ernie R. Rightmyer, Fairfield, Ill., in place of J. C. Stanley, removed.
 Milton L. Farney, Forrest, Ill., in place of H. O. Franklin, retired.
 Robert M. Maller, Geneva, Ill., in place of A. N. Modaff, resigned.
 Kenneth L. Pfium, Genoa, Ill., in place of J. R. Sester, removed.
 Loren C. Bowman, Greenup, Ill., in place of R. A. Carrell, retired.
 Viola Kinman, Hamburg, Ill., in place of E. F. Day, retired.
 Albert C. Marchi, Hines, Ill., in place of H. M. Gerhard, retired.
 Richard R. Michelsen, Huntley, Ill., in place of W. L. Donahue, transferred.
 John L. Knight, McLeansboro, Ill., in place of M. L. Hunt, retired.
 Harry R. Johnson, Madison, Ill., in place of R. O. Johns, retired.
 Ellen M. Manuel, Mansfield, Ill., in place of W. H. House, declined.
 Albert L. Edwards, Marshall, Ill., in place of Leroy McNary, retired.
 Charles H. White, Media, Ill., in place of R. E. Sullivan, deceased.
 Frank D. Talley, Mount Carmel, Ill., in place of Fay Moyer, removed.
 Clyde H. Steffee, Mundelein, Ill., in place of C. E. Teson, retired.
 Cecil Moore, New Canton, Ill., in place of C. T. Gilbert, retired.
 Joseph A. Gossett, Norris City, Ill., in place of W. S. Smith, retired.
 Robert F. Baker, Oakwood, Ill., in place of E. E. Chestnut, resigned.
 Raymond C. Foley, Paris, Ill., in place of Grady O'Hair, deceased.
 John Craig Templeton, Pinckneyville, Ill., in place of T. A. Denton, transferred.
 Raymond R. Yahnke, Plainfield, Ill., in place of L. V. Keeley, deceased.
 Gerald W. Sears, Plano, Ill., in place of I. W. Nelson, retired.
 Benton Pullen, Princeville, Ill., in place of R. P. Callery, deceased.
 Joe M. Stoddard, Ramsey, Ill., in place of O. W. Hinton, removed.
 Robert L. Kupferschmid, Rankin, Ill., in place of G. H. Sloan, transferred.
 James A. Blender, Raritan, Ill., in place of F. E. Overstreet, declined.
 Leonard E. Kaffenberger, Red Bud, Ill., in place of A. H. Brandt, retired.
 Frank G. Brown, Salem, Ill., in place of C. H. Roberts, transferred.
 Arthur M. Mulford, San Jose, Ill., in place of F. E. Smith, retired.
 Leonard A. Graham, Shobonier, Ill., in place of O. W. Morell, transferred.
 Chester C. Heindel, Stockton, Ill., in place of F. C. Niemeyer, deceased.
 Lester Lippincott, Sullivan, Ill., in place of G. C. Miller, retired.
 Howard M. Welsh, Taylorville, Ill., in place of S. W. Hershey, deceased.
 Charles W. Weaver, Tennessee, Ill., in place of B. P. Hodges, retired.
 Wendell C. Kepner, Warren, Ill., in place of V. C. McGinnis, retired.
 Walter E. Rose, Windsor, Ill., in place of D. M. Wallace, resigned.
 Paul H. Eberle, Wonder Lake, Ill., in place of Arthur Hay, removed.

INDIANA

Hayward A. Claybaugh, Argos, Ind., in place of N. D. Thompson, retired.
 Wilfred M. Bedel, Batesville, Ind., in place of C. H. Andres, deceased.
 Harry R. Shidaker, Bremen, Ind., in place of H. G. Carblener, retired.
 Robert E. McKain, Carthage, Ind., in place of J. E. Porter, removed.
 Arthur R. Wilkerson, Commiskey, Ind., in place of Fred Corbin, Jr., resigned.
 Harold E. Newberg, Donaldson, Ind., in place of C. C. Garrison, retired.
 Lloyd Goodwin, Edwardsport, Ind., in place of M. F. Shepard, retired.

Jack S. Brown, Hillsdale, Ind., in place of L. J. Britton, deceased.
 Philip Earl Buecher, Jasper, Ind., in place of Albert Rumbach, deceased.
 Vernie J. Wright, La Crosse, Ind., in place of C. D. Watson, retired.
 J. George Bascom, Lynn, Ind., in place of D. B. Mann, deceased.
 Norval W. Chamness, Marshall, Ind., in place of H. E. Delp, retired.
 Harold H. Scott, Monterey, Ind., in place of C. A. Good, retired.
 Harry E. Fields, Norman, Ind., in place of C. M. Bowman, retired.
 H. Earl Himes, North Webster, Ind., in place of R. A. Richwine, retired.
 Charles E. Inks, Plymouth, Ind., in place of Jesse Yoder, retired.
 Paul Burns, Oakland City, Ind., in place of T. J. Lemasters, retired.
 Vita J. Hutchison, Oakville, Ind., in place of B. E. Garrett, removed.
 Mary L. Butler, Pershing, Ind., in place of C. E. Rodenberg, deceased.
 Jack V. Porter, Roachdale, Ind., in place of W. E. Etcheson, retired.
 Geraldine Z. Marsteller, Russellville, Ind., in place of I. C. Bain, deceased.
 Lynn A. West, Scottsburg, Ind., in place of Avis Carille, retired.
 Ernest D. Chambers, Springport, Ind., in place of W. C. Bunner, deceased.
 Warren W. Robinson, Tippecanoe, Ind., in place of A. B. Rhodes, retired.
 J. Howard Hetzler, Wabash, Ind., in place of A. E. Reynolds, deceased.
 Charles E. Carey, Whitestown, Ind., in place of E. M. Miller, retired.
 Lowell W. Rush, Windfall, Ind., in place of M. E. Martin, transferred.

IOWA

Donald E. Trees, Armstrong, Iowa, in place of M. E. Darles, removed.
 Norman P. Nelson, Britt, Iowa, in place of J. M. Townsend, retired.
 Dick W. McCauley, Carlisle, Iowa, in place of O. K. Owens, transferred.
 David H. Crenshaw, Des Moines, Iowa, in place of E. M. Johnson, removed.
 Kenneth F. Halverson, Fenton, Iowa, in place of J. A. Schwartz, retired.
 Russell E. McLarty, Kingsley, Iowa, in place of F. J. Spain, deceased.
 Gloria L. Pool, McCausland, Iowa, in place of Arline Darland, resigned.
 Kenneth A. Jensen, Massena, Iowa, in place of T. D. Casey, transferred.
 Lewis F. Palsley, Sherrill, Iowa, in place of A. G. Haberkorn, deceased.
 Oliver H. Wisgerhof, Sully, Iowa, in place of Harry De Jong, retired.
 Willard E. Leiran, Waterville, Iowa, in place of M. A. Slattery, retired.
 Elijah L. Simpson, Wesley, Iowa, in place of H. H. Gerdes, retired.

KANSAS

Boyd W. Ensley, Cambridge, Kans., in place of H. K. Lundy, retired.
 William S. Stevenson, Clay Center, Kans., in place of S. V. Hemphill, deceased.
 Clarence H. Lang, Cuba, Kans., in place of M. F. Jehlik, retired.
 William D. French, Eureka, Kans., in place of R. L. Marlin, resigned.
 Delmar F. Loe, Glasco, Kans., in place of C. E. Brown, transferred.
 Roland I. Kraft, Lecompton, Kans., in place of L. W. Crady, deceased.
 Lorn R. Lahey, Sr., McCune, Kans., in place of C. E. Mansfield, retired.
 Howard J. Chambers, Minneapolis, Kans., in place of L. E. Harvey, retired.
 Lois A. Mitchell, Rose Hill, Kans., in place of R. B. Dunlap, retired.
 Gottfried W. Staub, Jr., Saint John, Kans., in place of M. M. John, Jr., transferred.
 Donald L. Long, Sylvia, Kans., in place of Victor Gibson, retired.

Lloyd W. Barker, Valley Falls, Kans., in place of Clayton Wyatt, retired.
Thomas B. Standard, Winona, Kans., in place of A. F. Goebel, retired.

KENTUCKY

Freeman Fitch, Ashland, Ky., in place of H. D. Shanklin, retired.
Sally M. Conniff, Clermont, Ky., in place of C. B. Riley, retired.
William E. Wilson, Columbia, Ky., in place of Ray Flowers, retired.
Irene M. Mullins, Cromona, Ky., in place of Esther Branham, deceased.
James S. Hinton, Jr., Flemingsburg, Ky., in place of Gilbert Adams, retired.
Edwin P. M. Hamby, Fort Campbell, Ky. Office established June 1, 1959.
James H. Easterling, Grayson, Ky., in place of W. L. Horton, removed.
Ada Lee Davis, Hardyville, Ky., in place of Donald McDonald, transferred.
William D. Gorman, Hazard, Ky., in place of A. M. Moore, retired.
M. Elvadine Riggs, Loretto, Ky., in place of M. H. Buckler, retired.
William B. Mathews, Maysville, Ky., in place of N. M. Hargett, removed.
William H. Smith, Owenton, Ky., in place of H. C. Thomas, transferred.
Smith C. Ledford, Paint Lick, Ky., in place of K. L. Walker, retired.
Jean C. Hall, Viper, Ky., in place of M. H. Brashear, retired.
Amanda N. Blackford, Wilmore, Ky., in place of C. W. Mitchell, retired.
Paul R. Simmons, Worthville, Ky., in place of Nellie Clubb, retired.

LOUISIANA

John T. Baldwin, Jr., Bernice, La., in place of M. M. Baldwin, retired.
Bobby Ray Holley, Dubberly, La., in place of Joe Butler, transferred.
Everett Hill, Pitkin, La., in place of C. W. Carson, retired.
Herman P. Louque, Paulina, La., in place of P. B. Cambre, deceased.

MAINE

Karl T. Spruce, Bradley, Maine, in place of A. F. Barton, retired.
Pauline L. Sawyer, Cambridge, Maine, in place of R. C. Whitney, retired.
Katherine I. Bowden, Castine, Maine, in place of C. W. Richardson, Jr., retired.
Eugene P. Duran, East Corinth, Maine, in place of G. L. Hawes, retired.
Hartley O. Nelson, New Sweden, Maine, in place of W. W. Anderson, retired.
Robert C. Fisher, Oakfield, Maine, in place of G. M. Sullivan, deceased.
Louis W. Bowden, Orrington, Maine, in place of E. A. Spencer, deceased.
Philip G. Lewis, Rumford, Maine, in place of M. B. Manson, deceased.
Edward T. White, Vinalhaven, Maine, in place of O. V. Drew, retired.

MARYLAND

G. Carlton Powell, Berlin, Md., in place of G. E. Boston, retired.
Raymond C. Strine, New Windsor, Md., in place of W. D. Lovell, Jr., retired.
Ethel M. Grover, Solomons, Md., in place of G. W. Condiff, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

A. Eugene Feio, Central Village, Mass., in place of C. M. Brackett, retired.
Hugo A. Taglieri, Haverhill, Mass., in place of R. V. McNamara, retired.
Edward B. Walker, Millbrook, Mass., in place of L. A. Freeman, retired.
Alice F. Donovan, Pinehurst, Mass., in place of W. F. Eggo, retired.
Joseph H. Boucher, South Carver, Mass., in place of L. W. Jenney, retired.
William H. Evans, Webster, Mass., in place of Alexander Wylie, retired.

MICHIGAN

Milton R. Hein, Ada, Mich., in place of T. M. Lampert, retired.
Budd A. Goodwin, Adrian, Mich., in place of P. F. Frownfelder, retired.
Aubirt D. Cox, Battle Creek, Mich., in place of J. O. Curry, retired.
Kenneth S. King, Cassopolis, Mich., in place of O. J. Breese, retired.
Harriet E. Burditt, Cement City, Mich., in place of L. M. Taggart, removed.
Byron B. Borgman, Conklin, Mich., in place of H. D. Harrison, retired.
Morris E. Parish, Coopersville, Mich., in place of R. A. McLellan, resigned.
Otis E. Howe, Decatur, Mich., in place of H. H. Creagan, removed.
A. Ray Krider, East Lansing, Mich., office reestablished February 1, 1955.
William R. Brazell, Fair Haven, Mich., in place of V. M. Meyer, retired.
Louis Gee, Farwell, Mich., in place of J. R. Littlefield, retired.
Charles H. Pratt, Flint, Mich., in place of W. O. Kelly, resigned.
Paul Richard Conklin, Fremont, Mich., in place of J. E. Davis, retired.
Winifred M. Buss, Galesburg, Mich., in place of J. C. Lane, resigned.
Oscar A. Ohman, Gladstone, Mich., in place of B. M. Micks, retired.
Sayre H. Ostrander, Grand Marais, Mich., in place of E. L. Mulligan, retired.
James Patejdi, Harbert, Mich., in place of O. W. Tornquist, retired.
Otto Klein, Jr., Harrisville, Mich., in place of C. F. Riebow, deceased.
Kenneth E. Scripsma, Holland, Mich., in place of Harry Kramon, retired.
Shirley E. Thorne, Horton, Mich., in place of Velma Strat, retired.
Urho J. Koski, Houghton, Mich., in place of J. C. Healy, removed.
Frederick J. Goossen, Houghton Lake, Mich., in place of W. K. Peters, resigned.
Selden W. von der Hoff, Interlochen, Mich., in place of R. J. Buller, retired.
Edwin L. Gillespie, Jr., Jonesville, Mich., in place of B. A. Dobson, retired.
John W. Van Eck, Kalamazoo, Mich., in place of Walter Schanz, removed.
Frederick E. Reyer, Marshall, Mich., in place of M. C. Kibler, deceased.
Robert H. Gorsline, Milford, Mich., in place of V. E. Boyle, removed.
Georgia E. Larsen, Nawaygo, Mich., in place of C. C. Larsen, Jr., deceased.
Leo G. Smith, Newberry, Mich., in place of Joseph Villemure, retired.
Carl T. Redding, North Adams, Mich., in place of B. F. Taylor, retired.
Richard E. Jackson, Palmyra, Mich., in place of A. C. Johnston, transferred.
Robert C. Miller, Pontiac, Mich., in place of G. L. Stockwell, retired.
Frank E. Rodman, Quinnesec, Mich., in place of Emery Massie, retired.
Cecil L. Erfourth, Rudyard, Mich., in place of P. C. Carr, retired.
Erwin H. Kubath, St. Joseph, Mich., in place of E. M. Evans, retired.
Charlena Shaver, Silverwood, Mich., in place of L. P. Temple, deceased.
Addison L. Pauley, Tuscola, Mich., in place of H. M. Aldrich, resigned.
Harold J. Hawkins, Wayland, Mich., in place of M. R. Ehle, removed.
Robert W. Curtice, Wells, Mich., in place of V. C. White, removed.

MINNESOTA

W. Stanley Sevaldson, Albert Lea, Minn., in place of H. C. Day, retired.
Raymond R. McAloney, Breckenridge, Minn., in place of L. D. Drey, retired.
Marvin E. Michelson, Buffalo Lake, Minn., in place of J. G. Williams, transferred.
Donna J. Gross, Calumet, Minn., in place of P. F. Preice, retired.

Marion G. Berge, Castle Rock, Minn., in place of D. W. Burton, deceased.
John P. De Greeff, Chandler, Minn., in place of C. C. Moret, retired.
Clarence M. Whiting, Clitherall, Minn., in place of H. V. Nelson, transferred.
Mildred E. Mester, Coleraine, Minn., in place of W. L. Franti, deceased.
Donald C. Carrigan, Cosmos, Minn., in place of D. W. Anderson, transferred.
William E. Kieren, Gilbert, Minn., in place of Herman Frajola, retired.
Leslie M. Olson, Hartland, Minn., in place of I. C. Stensrud, retired.
Herbert P. Venske, Howard Lake, Minn., in place of F. C. Larson, retired.
Leo J. Redig, Ivanhoe, Minn., in place of J. L. Gilson, retired.
Charles H. Bordwell, Keewatin, Minn., in place of O. A. Olson, retired.
Richard C. Zimmerman, Kent, Minn., in place of L. C. Clark, transferred.
Herbert F. Zelmer, Kilkenny, Minn., in place of Alice Gillespie, retired.
Hardin H. Kinder, Lynd, Minn., in place of A. H. Roloff, retired.
Frank M. Thompson, Maynard, Minn., in place of W. L. Huber, retired.
Harry E. Maki, Menahga, Minn., in place of A. P. Nunn, retired.
Harry A. Smith, Mound, Minn., in place of R. E. O'Donnell, deceased.
Everett M. Vitala, Mountain Iron, Minn., in place of H. H. Schur, resigned.
Carmen J. Curtis, Noyes, Minn., in place of A. A. Rustad, retired.
William Vedders, Jr., Pease, Minn., in place of F. R. Greenfield, deceased.
Charles T. Trane, Pelican Rapids, Minn., in place of H. N. Halvorson, retired.
Conrad J. Christie, Royalton, Minn., in place of H. L. Fisher, transferred.
Robert L. Penne, Saint James, Minn., in place of C. J. Strom, resigned.
Lawrence E. Hanson, Santiago, Minn., in place of G. M. Wold, resigned.
Sherman A. Granberg, Scandia, Minn., in place of E. M. Hawkinson, resigned.
Eino R. Latvala, Tamarack, Minn., in place of D. W. Brekke, transferred.
Howard K. Uhren, Vining, Minn., in place of P. A. Nyberg, transferred.
Henry J. Maertens, Wabasso, Minn., in place of T. C. Franta, resigned.
Earle Henry Welty, Winona, Minn., in place of C. B. Erwin, retired.
Dennis H. Kilmartin, Zimmerman, Minn., in place of S. E. Jones, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Sam L. Mansell, Camden, Miss., in place of R. W. Castens, deceased.
Thomas H. Buford, Holly Springs, Miss., in place of H. H. Orr, retired.
Norman J. Stockstill, Picayune, Miss., in place of T. R. Pearson, retired.
Edgar I. Adcock, Ridgeland, Miss., in place of B. D. Battley, resigned.
Levi C. Jenkins, Jr., Sallis, Miss., in place of H. A. Robertson, deceased.
Fabian S. Clark, Ripley, Miss., in place of H. A. Smith, transferred.
James C. Wiggins, Sidon, Miss., in place of O. L. McMath, retired.
Frank L. Middleton, Woodland, Miss., in place of Bessie Abernethy, retired.

MISSOURI

Forrest H. Forderhase, Berger, Mo., in place of H. C. W. Strothmann, deceased.
Robert C. Greenwood, Brunswick, Mo., in place of A. J. Clayton, retired.
Gordon A. Rollins, Carthage, Mo., in place of C. O. Smith, removed.
Wanda P. Wilson, Malta Bend, Mo., in place of E. S. Spencer, deceased.
Norman E. Paul, Chilhowee, Mo., in place of L. H. English, retired.
David C. Baumann, Huntsville, Mo., in place of C. E. Burkhardt, transferred.

Jeffrey P. Hillelson, Kansas City, Mo., in place of A. F. Sachs, retired.
 Willard E. Mohns, Lee's Summit, Mo., in place of J. F. Stevenson, retired.
 Harold F. Courtois, Mineral Point, Mo., in place of P. C. Walton, retired.
 John W. Aufder Heide, Owensville, Mo., in place of E. E. Smith, retired.
 William H. Lea, Steelville, Mo., in place of J. D. Marsh, deceased.
 Wilbert Haux, Sturgeon, Mo., in place of F. F. Hullett, retired.
 Harold E. Williams, Waynesville, Mo., in place of V. V. Long, retired.
 Leroy A. Vanzandt, Washburn, Mo., in place of G. B. Windes, retired.
 Loyd V. Howell, Wyaconda, Mo., in place of E. W. Kurtz, retired.

MONTANA

Kenneth M. Hall, Bainville, Mont., in place of A. C. Coulston, deceased.
 Leonard E. Eriksen, Hungry Horse, Mont., in place of H. D. Howell, resigned.
 Phyllis A. Lea, Inverness, Mont., in place of E. M. Shults, deceased.
 Sherman S. Cook, Jr., Lincoln, Mont., in place of Elsie Didriksen, retired.
 Lee M. Enochson, Medicine Lake, Mont., in place of N. P. Miller, retired.

NEBRASKA

Warren W. McBride, Archer, Nebr., in place of W. P. Hansen, retired.
 Raymond W. Pettinger, Burchard, Nebr., in place of E. J. Pepperl, transferred.
 Dale W. Farmer, Callaway, Nebr., in place of C. B. Bengler, retired.
 Marvin J. Capoun, Dwight, Nebr., in place of J. H. Novacek, resigned.
 Carl J. Mann, Hoskins, Nebr., in place of G. E. Fletcher, deceased.
 Lora B. McQuay, Keystone, Nebr., in place of L. L. McQuay, resigned.
 Marie A. Bodzek, Linwood, Nebr., in place of P. F. Thomas, retired.
 Harry A. Simmon, Miller, Nebr., in place of W. B. Brown, transferred.
 Kenneth L. Mussman, Ohio, Nebr., in place of F. C. Sleckman, retired.
 M. Ruth Shaver, Primrose, Nebr., in place of V. J. King, retired.
 Helen M. Ilg, Raymond, Nebr., in place of J. E. Schulling, retired.
 C. Clifford Dame, Tekamah, Nebr., E. G. Brune, retired.
 John R. Baumert, Walthill, Nebr., in place of C. J. Mullaney, deceased.
 Carroll L. Falk, Wilcox, Nebr., J. W. Brawner, retired.

NEVADA

William A. Leno, Owyhee, Nev., in place of R. R. Archuleta, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Phyllis M. Coniaris, Hollis, N.H., in place of D. H. Goodwin, retired.
 Marjorie A. Kimball, South Danville, N.H., in place of M. M. Heath, retired.
 Earle W. Ladd, West Stewartstown, N.H., in place of L. Y. Ladd, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

William F. Anderson, Allendale, N.J., in place of F. A. Farrell, removed.
 Klaus E. Schmidt, Allentown, N.J., in place of W. F. Rue, retired.
 William T. Minkoff, Blackwood, N.J., in place of J. A. Beetle, resigned.
 Samuel H. Rifkin, Dutch Neck, N.J., in place of H. R. Tindall, resigned.
 Herbert J. Engelhardt, Egg Harbor City, N.J., in place of M. R. Stone, deceased.
 Walter Hamilton, Jr., Fieldsboro, N.J., in place of Elizabeth Hamilton, deceased.
 John R. Wert, III, Hopewell, N.J., in place of M. J. McAlinden, retired.
 Marie J. Holloway, Magnolia, N.J., in place of J. M. Schmidt, retired.
 Michael Czahlo, Montville, N.J., in place of Floyd Smith, retired.

Paul W. Haller, Moorestown, N.J., in place of R. G. Shreve, deceased.
 Stanford B. Tidaback, Newton, N.J., in place of M. N. Strader, retired.
 Joseph L. Yearly, Riverton, N.J., in place of M. E. Haas, retired.
 Albert G. Gleckler, Rockaway, N.J., in place of M. S. Malone, retired.
 Charles T. Camp, South Seaville, N.J., in place of M. M. Ratcliffe, resigned.
 Merrill M. Tucker, Teaneck, N.J., in place of J. F. Carroll, removed.
 Marjorie E. Houghtaling, Vernon, N.J., in place of A. E. Baldwin, deceased.
 Shirlee W. Thompson, Vincentown, N.J., in place of H. S. Eibert, removed.
 Jesse W. Landon, White House Station, N.J., in place of W. W. Lance, retired.
 A. Robert Deter, Woodbridge, N.J., in place of L. E. McElroy, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Romeo A. Ortiz, Bernalillo, N. Mex., in place of C. C. Montes, retired.
 Charles S. Stanfield, Clovis, N. Mex., in place of E. L. Manson, retired.
 Robert W. Prunty, Red River, N. Mex., in place of E. C. Simlon, resigned.
 Leon F. Dryden, Ruidoso, N. Mex., in place of O. J. Hull, retired.
 Laudente T. Quintana, Jr., Wagon Mound, N. Mex., in place of H. M. Vigil, transferred.

NEW YORK

George M. Wood, Allentown, N.Y., in place of W. A. Withey, deceased.
 Ethel Gowdey, Bloomingburg, N.Y., in place of F. E. Hagan, retired.
 Lyle S. Vannatta, Cohecton, N.Y., in place of W. J. Porr, retired.
 Robert S. Freeman, Constableville, N.Y., in place of H. M. Bintz, retired.
 Jean N. Van Kleuck, Cragmoor, N.Y., in place of N. C. S. Garritt, resigned.
 Kenneth R. Smith, Delmar, N.Y., in place of A. I. Ryan, retired.
 Mae M. Gibbs, East Nassau, N.Y., in place of P. J. Marsh, resigned.
 John J. Hogan, Flushing, N.Y., in place of F. J. Cassidy, retired.
 Nellie M. Rice, Freeville, N.Y., in place of W. F. Moore, retired.
 John L. Kress, Jr., Galway, N.Y., in place of J. T. Hunter, retired.
 Theodore J. Palcic, Gowanda, N.Y., in place of P. W. Christenson, retired.
 Hamilton C. Fish, Great Neck, N.Y., in place of E. F. Higgins, retired.
 Ellen M. Newman, Greenhurst, N.Y., in place of J. A. Johnson, retired.
 Edward A. Byrnes, Haverstraw, N.Y., in place of E. A. Ganson, resigned.
 Roy E. Jenne, Hermon, N.Y., in place of A. E. Cook, deceased.
 Gerald W. Reamer, Kendall, N.Y., in place of M. F. Drennan, deceased.
 Raymond D. Ingram, Knowlesville, N.Y., in place of G. B. Clapp, deceased.
 Hazel M. Carr, Lisbon, N.Y., in place of E. E. Jones, deceased.
 Elaine L. Bruce, Molra, N.Y., in place of C. C. Young, deceased.
 Mildred T. Wadsworth, Niverville, N.Y., in place of G. L. Crausway, retired.
 Norman T. Sullivan, Olmstedville, N.Y., in place of E. C. Sullivan, retired.
 Muriel M. Bonini, Oscawana, N.Y., in place of D. L. Clair, deceased.
 Rosoe C. Odell, Pleasantville, N.Y., in place of L. D. Olmsted, deceased.
 George L. Clemons, Port Henry, N.Y., in place of L. J. Hollister, Jr., retired.
 Howard B. Stikney, Prattsburg, N.Y., in place of G. L. Patch, retired.
 David W. Jayne, Remsenburg, N.Y., in place of H. I. Raynor, retired.
 Clifford D. Nellis, Saint Johnsville, N.Y., in place of E. S. Bierman, retired.
 William J. Dunson, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., in place of J. T. Bryant, deceased.

Dorothy E. Burr, Savona, N.Y., in place of E. E. Mulliken, deceased.
 Angelo P. Rizzleri, Seneca Falls, N.Y., in place of T. J. Riley, retired.
 Joseph F. Patrick, Sidney Center, N.Y., in place of D. L. Hoy, removed.
 George H. Martin, Slingerlands, N.Y., in place of W. P. Degenar, retired.
 Bessie M. Sischo, Stockton, N.Y., in place of B. C. Putnam, transferred.
 Lucy B. Manglass, Tomkins Cove, N.Y., in place of J. M. James, retired.
 Joseph N. Vogel, Walkill, N.Y., in place of C. H. McLean, retired.
 Joseph J. Giordano, West Islip, N.Y., Office established September 15, 1958.
 Dorann E. Oldenburg, West Lebanon, N.Y., in place of R. E. Watkins, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Howard G. Crissman, Aberdeen, N.C., in place of E. E. Maurer, removed.
 Carlyle P. Matheson, Andrews, N.C., in place of Galusha Pullum, removed.
 Guy E. Snyder, Bakersville, N.C., in place of J. F. Greene, resigned.
 Alfred B. Woodard, Bayboro, N.C., in place of H. A. Miller, resigned.
 Glenn O. Pasour, Bessemer City, N.C., in place of R. M. Kiser, deceased.
 Lyle B. Cook, Boone, N.C., in place of J. E. Brown, Jr., removed.
 Melvin H. Crisp, Brasstown, N.C., in place of Iowa Green, retired.
 Vernon P. Fullbright, Brevard, N.C., in place of T. C. Galloway, retired.
 Ray Wright, Bryson City, N.C., in place of W. T. Martin, retired.
 James R. Frady, Candler, N.C., in place of B. E. Brenton, resigned.
 Clarence W. Burrell, Canton, N.C., in place of W. C. Hill, retired.
 Arlie R. Cox, Central Falls, N.C., in place of A. M. York, retired.
 J. Howard Crowell, Concord, N.C., in place of B. E. Harris, resigned.
 Maude M. Gullidge, Culberson, N.C., in place of C. T. Hagood, retired.
 Clifton W. Crispe, Cullowhee, N.C., in place of B. B. Long, retired.
 Jay T. Baker, Dallas, N.C., in place of G. L. Friday, resigned.
 Clifford O. Scott, Dobson, N.C., in place of R. L. Folger, removed.
 Raymond H. Hoots, Edneyville, N.C., in place of J. W. Nesbitt, retired.
 Sion Chester Rogers, Elizabethtown, N.C., in place of J. K. Clark, retired.
 John O. Gettys, Ellenboro, N.C., in place of W. C. Stockton, resigned.
 Alton B. Parker, Fairmont, N.C., in place of T. S. Teague, retired.
 Burl L. Orr, Fontana Dam, N.C., in place of B. Q. Cable, transferred.
 Willard W. Reavis, Hamptonville, N.C., in place of B. F. Gough, retired.
 Wallace K. Crawford, Hayesville, N.C., in place of F. R. Jones, retired.
 Carl L. Talley, Highlands, N.C., in place of C. C. Potts, retired.
 Maude T. Brown, Hillsboro, N.C., in place of T. E. Bivins, resigned.
 Norman A. Randall, Leicester, N.C., in place of M. H. Current, retired.
 Roby J. Maley, Lexington, N.C., in place of S. J. Smith, retired.
 Kirby W. Greene, Jr., Linwood, N.C., in place of F. H. Shoaf, transferred.
 Wayne Jefferson Edwards, Marble, N.C., in place of B. H. Mintz, retired.
 F. Ray Frisby, Marshall, N.C., in place of Grace Freeman, retired.
 Eriean S. Stevens, Mayodan, N.C., in place of J. V. Highfill, retired.
 Harveleigh M. White, Method, N.C., in place of A. T. White, deceased.
 Lucile R. Eagle, Misenheimer, N.C., in place of C. A. Dry, resigned.
 Worth T. Hendricks, Mocksville, N.C., in place of Daisy Holthouser, transferred.

Katie B. Miller, Moyock, N.C., in place of M. F. Dunston, retired.
 Elvin C. Cox, Ramseur, N.C., in place of C. B. Craven, removed.
 Coy S. Lewis, Jr., Robbins, N.C., in place of G. E. Walker, deceased.
 Carroll O. Jenkins, Robbinsville, N.C., in place of W. G. Carver, removed.
 Carl G. Underwood, Sr., St. Pauls, N.C., in place of B. R. Stone, resigned.
 Edward V. Gore, Jr., Shallotte, N.C., in place of I. B. Parker, retired.
 Charles C. Small, Sophia, N.C., in place of D. R. Bulla, retired.
 Maxwell G. Rush, Southern Pines, N.C., in place of A. G. Pierce, resigned.
 William V. Langley, Staley, N.C., in place of M. I. Siler, retired.
 Martin T. Southard, Stokesdale, N.C., in place of H. G. Cook, retired.
 Don D. Cogdill, Jr., Sylva, N.C., in place of T. W. Ashe, retired.
 Enos R. Boyd, Waynesville, N.C., in place of J. H. Howell, retired.
 Howell W. Ratcliff, Weaverville, N.C., in place of Kate Reagan, retired.
 Josiah A. Maulsby, Jr., Whiteville, N.C., in place of A. E. Powell, retired.
 Joseph Howard Revis, Whittier, N.C., in place of M. P. Williams, retired.
 Julius C. Vogt, Wilson, N.C., in place of G. T. Fulghum, retired.
 Charles M. Taylor, Winnabow, N.C., in place of J. J. Henry, resigned.
 M. Vance Hickman, Winston-Salem, N.C., in place of W. B. Booe, resigned.
 Joseph H. Poindexter, Yadkinville, N.C., in place of W. F. Van Hoy, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Albert Maier, Ashley, N. Dak., in place of M. B. Johnson, retired.
 Johnnie H. Halvorson, Glenfield, N. Dak., in place of Lottie Posey, retired.
 Dora H. Loeppke, Heaton, N. Dak., in place of J. C. Stuart, resigned.
 Verna L. Becker, Inkster, N. Dak., in place of M. F. Scouton, transferred.
 Louis J. Wanner, New England, N. Dak., in place of F. S. Kenny, retired.
 Albert E. Storhoff, Nome, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Bakke, resigned.
 Frank V. Jansky, Ross, N. Dak., in place of L. T. Breeling, retired.
 Clifford W. Hackett, Sarles, N. Dak., in place of C. L. George, retired.
 Hazel F. Elness, Sterling, N. Dak., in place of E. M. Ryan, resigned.

OHIO

Edward E. Bickhard, Antwerp, Ohio, in place of M. E. Bakle, retired.
 Orlan L. Hines, Ashville, Ohio, in place of S. L. Smith, deceased.
 Gay W. Smyth, Bergholz, Ohio, in place of M. M. Morrow, retired.
 Harriett R. Vasbinder, Brinkhaven, Ohio, in place of M. A. Power, retired.
 Charles A. Roemer, Brunswick, Ohio, in place of Jeanette Long, retired.
 Richard W. Olinger, Dayton, Ohio, in place of G. H. Mundhenk, retired.
 Harold T. Deselms, Freeport, Ohio, in place of K. E. Caldwell, transferred.
 Thomas S. McCrea, Fresno, Ohio, in place of C. H. Barth, transferred.
 Ernest W. Jones, Glouster, Ohio, in place of D. P. Mooney, retired.
 Virginia G. Bortel, Grand Rapids, Ohio, in place of J. P. Minnick, retired.
 Irvn E. Scott, Kinsman, Ohio, in place of J. W. Fulton, Jr., resigned.
 V. Kathryn Whisler, Laurelville, Ohio, in place of L. M. Lappen, retired.
 Richard J. Neuhardt, Lewisville, Ohio, in place of C. R. Pollen, removed.
 Charles R. Scott, Lodi, Ohio, in place of V. A. Miner, retired.
 Frederick B. Gatch, Milford, Ohio, in place of F. W. White, retired.

Paul F. Thomas, Millersport, Ohio, in place of H. D. Bowers, retired.
 Robert J. Davis, Minerva, Ohio, in place of C. A. Hart, retired.
 C. Emil Sidle, Nashport, Ohio, in place of W. A. Braller, retired.
 Dorothy B. Smith, New Burlington, Ohio, in place of E. G. Miller, retired.
 James W. Speakman, Paris, Ohio, in place of E. F. Kintner, retired.
 Leo C. Blackburn, Portsmouth, Ohio, in place of F. E. Smith, resigned.
 Marvin D. Wolford, Rawson, Ohio, in place of Pearl Burket, retired.
 Orvil C. Hoover, Salem, Ohio, in place of L. D. Beardmore, deceased.
 Clarence J. Loch, Salineville, Ohio, in place of M. F. Mulheran, retired.
 Robert L. Rhodes, South Charleston, Ohio, in place of J. L. Carr, retired.
 Vernon J. Burkett, Jr., Sullivan, Ohio, in place of T. U. Kerr, deceased.
 Gordon R. Lancker, Toledo, Ohio, in place of W. P. Kilcorse, deceased.
 Harold H. Haggard, Urbana, Ohio, in place of P. H. Gifford, deceased.
 Clair R. Guthrie, Waynesfield, Ohio, in place of L. L. Newland, deceased.
 Russell H. Miller, Yellow Springs, Ohio, in place of H. J. Grote, retired.
 Chester W. Bailey, Youngstown, Ohio, in place of J. E. Doyle, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

N. Berniece Henderson, Braggs, Okla., in place of L. B. Williams, retired.
 Marguerite L. McDonald, Bokoshe, Okla., in place of O. C. Broking, retired.
 Jetie E. Kirby, Eufaula, Okla., in place of J. L. McKinney, retired.
 David L. Ratliff, Fort Cobb, Okla., in place of T. E. Henderson, transferred.
 E. Herman Evans, Fort Gibson, Okla., in place of L. B. Rogers, deceased.
 Virgil W. Morris, Gotebo, Okla., in place of C. B. Bolar, transferred.
 Tom F. Bonner, Idabel, Okla., in place of Mona Rawlings, transferred.
 Edward E. Weeks, Indianola, Okla., in place of J. H. York, resigned.
 Henry D. Friend, Oklahoma City, Okla., in place of F. M. Shaw, deceased.
 Gerald D. Carlin, Picher, Okla., in place of G. E. Raouls, retired.
 Guy W. Willibey, Sapulpa, Okla., in place of G. B. Grigsby, resigned.
 Isaac L. Thomson, Valliant, Okla., in place of A. M. Mills, resigned.

OREGON

Martha H. Anderson, Gardiner, Oreg., in place of V. A. Grubb, deceased.
 William H. Fair, Stayton, Oreg., in place of G. E. Neibert, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Carl J. Tonkin, Akeley, Pa., in place of L. J. Hale, deceased.
 Walter H. Grier, Sr., Beaver Brook, Pa., in place of J. D. McNells, retired.
 Arthur J. Rodgers, Jr., Blue Ball, Pa., in place of H. B. Bower, retired.
 Walter F. Rhine, Canonsburg, Pa., in place of S. J. Bondi, removed.
 Robert J. Talley, Chadds Ford, Pa., in place of W. E. Miller III, transferred.
 Edwin K. Oaks, Cherry Tree, Pa., in place of J. C. Dunlap, retired.
 John M. Harshaw, Jr., Conneaut Lake, Pa., in place of J. I. Cleveland, retired.
 Margaret E. Fink, Conyngham, Pa., in place of R. A. Reisenweaver, resigned.
 Robert G. Burgan, Cresson, Pa., in place of C. R. Tobin, removed.
 Emma Jane Kimmel, Dalmatia, Pa., in place of P. L. Tressler, retired.
 Curtis A. Miller, Dillsburg, Pa., in place of R. K. Hartman, resigned.
 William C. Hoffman, Dingmans Ferry, Pa., in place of L. S. Seymour, deceased.

Stanley H. Ward, East McKeesport, Pa., in place of G. J. Hoke, deceased.
 Lyle T. Streeter, Easton, Pa., in place of H. C. Shultz, retired.
 Warren S. H. Reppert, Egypt, Pa., in place of E. A. Breinig, retired.
 Jacob G. Appler, Gettysburg, Pa., in place of L. E. Oyler, deceased.
 Edna Mae Harrison, Gwynedd, Pa., in place of Elizabeth Tramontina, resigned.
 Robert C. Yeagley, Holtwood, Pa., in place of A. E. LeFever, resigned.
 Leonard Farkas, Hostetter, Pa., in place of C. R. Andros, resigned.
 Carl E. Duble, Hummelstown, Pa., in place of L. W. Flisler, retired.
 Donald R. Springer, Hunkers, Pa., in place of L. J. Biggerstaff, resigned.
 Margaret Jane Knight, Industry, Pa., in place of A. W. Ewing, retired.
 Nancy H. Houston, Jamison, Pa., in place of M. C. DeCurtis, deceased.
 Victor J. Westerberg, Kane, Pa., in place of J. G. O'Connor, deceased.
 Lawrence C. Viehdorfer, Karthaus, Pa., in place of Leslie Ditty, removed.
 Harry E. Himes, Jr., Kittanning, Pa., in place of J. P. King, retired.
 George K. Bilger, Kreamer, Pa., in place of C. G. Hummel, removed.
 Joseph J. Damiano, Lattimer Mines, Pa., in place of W. H. Hunsinger, deceased.
 Donald J. Hart, Laughlinton, Pa., in place of I. M. Ziders, retired.
 Marie J. Schoppa, Locust Gap, Pa., in place of J. J. McDonnell, removed.
 William G. Fultz, Jr., Mammoth, Pa., in place of J. M. Tarosky, removed.
 Charles V. Jones, Marysville, Pa., in place of J. S. Raisner, removed.
 Steward H. Hartman, Mechanicsburg, Pa., in place of G. C. Dietz, transferred.
 Gorman Lester Dull, Mill Run, Pa., in place of E. S. Colborn, retired.
 L. Ramond Moore, Modena, Pa., in place of E. E. Morris, retired.
 Robert W. Stahl, Mount Pleasant, Pa., in place of Clark Queer, resigned.
 John A. Schultz, Neshaminy, Pa., in place of P. M. Severns, retired.
 Eleanor M. Johnston, New Alexandria, Pa., in place of M. H. Miller, retired.
 Miller L. Kerr, New Castle, Pa., in place of W. R. Hanna, deceased.
 Raymond Carlson, New Stanton, Pa., in place of E. A. Cox, retired.
 Samuel H. Auman, Paxinos, Pa., in place of S. F. Snyder, retired.
 Paul R. Buchler, Port Carbon, Pa., in place of E. J. Donahue, retired.
 Glenn I. Gegogaine, Reno, Pa., in place of Susan Breene, retired.
 Robert V. Webster, Roaring Branch, Pa., in place of W. L. Holmes, retired.
 Henry H. Arnold, Robertsdale, Pa., in place of Margaret Truax, resigned.
 Lester I. Helst, Robeson, Pa., in place of B. M. Kintzer, retired.
 Dorothy S. Hull, Rutledge, Pa., in place of Viola Cleland, retired.
 Lisle Robert Johns, Shelocta, Pa., in place of M. E. Thomas, resigned.
 Harry K. Barnett, Sipesville, Pa., in place of C. E. Holder, resigned.
 Rudolph Simitz, Spinnerstown, Pa., in place of Laura Lancaster, resigned.
 John M. Holland, Starrucca, Pa., in place of H. S. Glover, deceased.
 Edgar F. Benner, State College, Pa., in place of R. J. Miller, retired.
 Norman W. Abbott, Sugargrove, Pa., in place of H. A. Rathburn, retired.
 Robert A. Yeager, Sunbury, Pa., in place of Charles Kline, retired.
 Robert C. Guth, Vanderbilt, Pa., in place of G. E. Reed, retired.
 Charles W. J. Whitcroft, Villanova, Pa., in place of M. J. Winters, retired.
 Leona P. Waters, Wiconisco, Pa., in place of S. R. Kilinger, resigned.

Ross P. Petrone, Jr., Wildwood, Pa., in place of E. C. Hardt, retired.
 James J. Brogan, Sr., Woodlyn, Pa., in place of S. C. K. Miecznik, transferred.
 William J. Zepp, York Springs, Pa., in place of P. E. Trump, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Anardi Agosto Baquero, Canovanas, P.R., in place of Carmen Villalobos, retired.
 Oscar Rios Santiago, Corozal, P.R., in place of A. M. Bou, retired.
 Enrique Pardo, Ensenada, P.R., in place of J. C. de Vidal, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Robert S. Hirst, Ashaway, R.I., in place of J. E. Murray, deceased.
 Raymond A. Piccolo, Bradford, R.I., in place of T. F. Eldridge, deceased.
 Henry K. Mook, Charlestown, R.I., in place of G. W. Short, resigned.
 Edward C. Borders, Foster Center, R.I., in place of H. A. H. Nichols, deceased.
 Antone Marion, Jr., Little Compton, R.I., in place of P. W. Martin, resigned.
 Donald C. Shemick, North Scituate, R.I., in place of E. L. Clark, retired.
 Reginald L. Campbell, Tiverton, R.I., in place of C. S. Holding, removed.
 Richard J. Vitullo, Warren, R.I., in place of Fred Beauchaine, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Henry F. Rucker, Bath, S.C., in place of M. K. Ricker, resigned.
 H. R. Ford Cherry, Jr., Enoree, S.C., in place of L. O. Thornton, retired.
 W. Robert Cooper, Jr., Lane, S.C., in place of J. A. Montgomery, retired.
 Louise R. McLeod, Rembert, S.C., in place of T. M. Moore, retired.
 Herbert H. Crosland, Jr., York, S.C., in place of G. C. Cartwright, retired.
 Earle W. Crosby, Jr., Smoaks, S.C., in place of W. A. Linder, transferred.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Eldon H. Robbins, Carthage, S. Dak., in place of J. H. Coughlin, retired.
 Cecil L. Fitzgerald, Rockham, S. Dak., in place of C. R. Dean, retired.
 Clarence L. Grohne, Warner, S. Dak., in place of C. A. Wulff, retired.

TENNESSEE

Lee N. Ruch, Belvidere, Tenn., in place of Clyde Zimmerman, transferred.
 Allie Louise W. Anderson, Charlotte, Tenn., in place of H. B. Crow, removed.
 Elmer J. Atkinson, Clarkrange, Tenn., in place of E. M. Peters, retired.
 Paul D. Tolley, Decaturville, Tenn., in place of J. W. Stout, retired.
 Reuben P. Taylor, Gleason, Tenn., in place of W. L. Newberry, retired.
 Howard F. Newell, Harrison, Tenn., in place of L. G. Wilson, resigned.
 E. Nell Muzzall, Henry, Tenn., in place of M. B. Curry, transferred.
 Leon W. Crews, Hollow Rock, Tenn., in place of W. R. Rice, retired.
 Dorothy M. Hunter, Huntland, Tenn., in place of A. E. Staples, retired.
 William F. Parrott, LaFollette, Tenn., in place of J. M. Carden, Jr., removed.
 Paul R. Ledbetter, Obion, Tenn., in place of H. B. Fox, deceased.
 M. Frances Long, Palmer, Tenn., in place of E. R. Overturf, retired.
 Basil Hubert Nunley, Riceville, Tenn., in place of W. H. Higginbotham, retired.
 Robert A. Emerson, Saulsbery, Tenn., in place of E. L. Goddard, deceased.
 Clarence H. Davis, Signal Mountain, Tenn., in place of Harry Robinson, retired.
 Thomas R. Carothers, Wartrace, Tenn., in place of A. S. Shriver, retired.

TEXAS

George D. FitzSimmons, Jr., Alice, Tex., in place of M. A. Mullen, removed.
 Dudley B. Lawson, Alto, Tex., in place of J. B. Thorn, Jr., transferred.
 Albert A. Hubbard, Alvarado, Tex., in place of E. P. Robinson, retired.
 John Clarence Stockton, Alvord, Tex., in place of W. E. Howell, transferred.
 Harold S. Roberts, Andrews, Tex., in place of M. M. Burkett, retired.
 Sam E. Henderson, Atlanta, Tex., in place of W. S. Clements, transferred.
 James Q. Pennington, Bluegrove, Tex., in place of R. O. Childs, removed.
 Earl F. Stubblefield, Bogata, Tex., in place of W. G. King, retired.
 Whittaker D. Bains, Jr., Brookshire, Tex., in place of W. D. Bains, retired.
 Benjamin W. Pearce, Center, Tex., in place of S. E. Burns, deceased.
 Charles L. Jones, Chandler, Tex., in place of B. C. Bass, retired.
 Carroll L. Byrd, Childress, Tex., in place of J. A. Hilburn, retired.
 Homer B. Adams, College Station, Tex., in place of T. O. Walton, retired.
 Arlene M. Morris, Colorado City, Tex., in place of S. A. Palmer, retired.
 Thurmon O. Storey, Deport, Tex., in place of C. H. Nobles, retired.
 Homer R. Granberry, Douglassville, Tex., in place of E. E. McMillian, Jr., removed.
 John D. Zahn, Farwell, Tex., in place of N. N. Lokey, resigned.
 Wilbur W. Mueller, Flatonia, Tex., in place of W. J. Bludworth, retired.
 Howard W. Curtis, Galena Park, Tex., in place of E. P. Minnock, removed.
 James D. Wheeler, Jr., Garland, Tex., in place of F. B. Crush, resigned.
 Grover C. Gibbs, Jr., Glen Rose, Tex., in place of W. E. Porter, retired.
 Charles M. Martinson, Jr., Jasper, Tex., in place of H. R. Hancock, transferred.
 J. Austin Rigney, Keller, Tex., in place of Alex Jones, retired.
 Montie F. Cameron, Kirkland, Tex., in place of R. L. Toft, transferred.
 Percy J. Bergeron, League City, Tex., in place of G. M. Wright, transferred.
 Samuel J. Morse, Jr., Linden, Tex., in place of N. L. Stanley, transferred.
 John H. Garrett, Lone Star, Tex., in place of A. C. Mestayer, resigned.
 Chester E. Maxey, Lorenzo, Tex., in place of L. M. Laird, deceased.
 Eugene Mallory, Mineola, Tex., in place of D. S. Lankford, retired.
 Issac J. Newman, Moody, Tex., in place of B. W. Newman, transferred.
 Lloyd A. Adams, Mount Pleasant, Tex., in place of A. B. Gilpin, deceased.
 Horace W. McAdams, Muleshoe, Tex., in place of A. J. Gardner, transferred.
 Hugh Clifford Ryan, Pasadena, Tex., in place of C. T. Coolidge, retired.
 Ralph R. Richardson, Pecan Gap, Tex., in place of U. B. Walker, retired.
 Henry W. Lester, Pflugerville, Tex., in place of G. L. Fowler, deceased.
 Kyle C. Elam, Port Arthur, Tex., in place of F. C. Toups, deceased.
 John J. Hanna, Jr., Quanah, Tex., in place of C. G. Conley, deceased.
 Ocie K. Milner, Jr., Quitman, Tex., in place of J. T. Morse, transferred.
 Jess W. Cole, Ranger, Tex., in place of A. E. Crawley, retired.
 William H. Brown, Red Oak, Tex., in place of V. G. Evans, retired.
 Joy S. Morris, Rosenberg, Tex., in place of L. O. Senkel, transferred.
 Corolee J. Wismar, Sabine Pass, Tex., in place of D. F. Wiess, resigned.
 James D. Baldwin, Seagoville, Tex., in place of C. O. Bruce, retired.
 Lenard R. Miller, Talco, Tex., in place of G. L. Barber, retired.
 Edgar Harris, Timpson, Tex., in place of J. J. Compton, retired.

Clara P. Landers, Van Horn, Tex., in place of C. M. Bean, retired.
 Charles Allen, Wellington, Tex., in place of R. F. Curry, retired.
 Raymond J. Hruska, West, Tex., in place of J. D. Wilkinson, removed.
 Viola D. Hamby, Wimberly, Tex., in place of Rena Snodgrass, retired.
 David F. Renfro, Zavalla, Tex., in place of C. A. Barge, Jr., transferred.

UTAH

Mable A. Winstead, Castle Gate, Utah, in place of J. W. Nielsen, retired.
 Myrtle H. Davis, Mexican Hat, Utah, in place of office established March 9, 1957.
 Howard D. Knight, Parowan, Utah, in place of Ivan Decker, removed.

VERMONT

Esther L. Sweatt, Craftsbury Common, Vt., in place of B. W. Farrar, retired.
 William H. Jenks, Danville, Vt., in place of M. R. McDonald, retired.
 Paul T. Williams, East Corinth, Vt., in place of L. L. Worthley, retired.
 Donald R. Dayton, East Middlebury, Vt., in place of C. M. Morgan, retired.
 Winston M. Churchill, Graniteville, Vt., in place of A. J. Carbonneau, resigned.
 Velmore O. Forest, Lunenburg, Vt., in place of D. W. Brown, retired.
 Wendell E. Morse, North Ferrisburg, Vt., in place of S. M. Hicks, deceased.
 Alden F. Atwood, Orwell, Vt., in place of M. D. Wolcott, deceased.
 Lyndell C. Wood, South Royalton, Vt., in place of G. M. Goodrich, retired.
 Virginia A. Peterson, South Ryegate, Vt., in place of G. F. Rabioli, resigned.
 Ellery G. Giles, Wardsboro, Vt., in place of T. P. Staples, deceased.
 Sheridan P. Dow, Waterville, Vt., in place of O. P. Shattuck, deceased.
 Chanley H. May, Wilmington, Vt., in place of C. M. Hall, retired.

VIRGINIA

Winfrey W. Grizzard, Amelia Court House, Va., in place of L. O. Scott, deceased.
 Richard L. Wingfield, Appomattox, Va., in place of E. L. Smith, retired.
 Bessie C. Townshend, Bluemont, Va., in place of R. E. Denny, resigned.
 Mary E. Lynch, Bowling Green, Va., in place of F. G. Beale, retired.
 Carroll D. Harrison, Cartersville, Va., in place of L. A. Baker, retired.
 Wilbur F. Fitzgerald, Cheriton, Va., in place of W. M. Upshur, Jr., deceased.
 Franklin C. Wilson, Churchville, Va., in place of R. H. Bear, retired.
 John M. Corstaphney, Clifton Forge, Va., in place of J. N. Cahoon, retired.
 Beulah J. Skeens, Dante, Va., in place of R. S. Griffith, Jr., resigned.
 Noble Conley Bishop, Duffield, Va., in place of E. P. Tompkins, retired.
 John R. Pritchard, Jr., Emporia, Va., in place of R. M. Owen, deceased.
 Charles W. Harris, Jr., Fairfax, Va., in place of S. S. Swart, retired.
 Jo Pierson Horne, Fort Blackmore, Va., in place of E. C. Turner, resigned.
 William C. Deming, Front Royal, Va., in place of A. O. Haley, retired.
 Harry G. Penley, Gate City, Va., in place of H. B. Quillen, Jr., resigned.
 Martin Luther Garraghty, Goode, Va., in place of J. S. McCauley, retired.
 Virginia G. Kiser, Grundy, Va., in place of P. V. Dennis, Jr., resigned.
 Charles H. Arrington, Haysi, Va., in place of I. M. Baker, retired.
 John C. Raiford, Ivor, Va., in place of E. W. Pittman, transferred.
 Thelma E. Addington, Nickelsville, Va., in place of R. L. McConnell, retired.
 Tecumseh S. Dalton, Pulaski, Va., in place of E. P. Whitman, retired.

Willie W. Smith, Sedley, Va., in place of M. V. Owen, retired.

James M. Rodgers, Shipman, Va., in place of M. W. Sherman, retired.

William R. Holt, South Boston, Va., in place of C. B. Lovelace, retired.

Carl A. Parsons, Jr., Sugar Grove, Va., in place of E. M. Calhoun, deceased.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Charles E. Clarke, Frederiksted, V.I., in place of Adele Berg, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Cloyce G. Johnson, Dayton, Wash., in place of C. H. McCauley, resigned.

E. Beth Williams, Hadlock, Wash., in place of M. M. Learned, retired.

Gordon W. Rux, Lake Stevens, Wash., in place of E. F. Pardee, deceased.

Elma M. Sarchet, Lamont, Wash., in place of D. J. Sarchet, deceased.

Harold P. Dow, Sunnyside, Wash., in place of W. K. Munson, deceased.

John C. Morgan, Jr., Suquamish, Wash., in place of L. C. Tompkins, retired.

Harvey L. Jones, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishburne, retired.

Allen H. Grant, Tracyton, Wash., in place of E. E. Riddell, retired.

Orville K. Allen, Wenatchee, Wash., in place of J. F. Lester, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Margaret M. McCormick, Anawalt, W. Va., in place of Wash Hornick, Jr., resigned.

Ruby L. Teets, Aurora, W. Va., in place of G. R. Mason, resigned.

Amos L. Whittington, Buffalo, W. Va., in place of E. K. Beltz, resigned.

Sally L. Eller, Capels, W. Va., in place of M. A. Arnold, resigned.

Maurice B. Morrison, Charlton Heights, W. Va., in place of M. S. Robinson, resigned.

Nettie L. Hurd, Craigsville, W. Va., in place of S. B. Herold, retired.

Robert F. Wilson, Decota, W. Va., in place of M. I. Jackson, resigned.

Veon C. Cox, East Rainelle, W. Va., in place of U. W. Grimes, retired.

Helen L. Buchanan, Gilbert, W. Va., in place of H. A. Buchanan, resigned.

Mary Virginia Earman, Harpers Ferry, W. Va., in place of M. E. Marquette, retired.

Edward L. Chrisman, Kearneysville, W. Va., in place of W. B. Hammond, retired.

Mason H. Myers, McComas, W. Va., in place of B. S. Watts, retired.

Ernest M. Townsend, Madison, W. Va., in place of A. T. Miller, retired.

Carl F. Nichols, Middleborne, W. Va., in place of H. H. Crumrine, deceased.

Erva Winston Cooper, Milton, W. Va., in place of D. J. Blackwood, retired.

Dodd M. Fisher, Mount Storm, W. Va., in place of T. E. Schaeffer, retired.

George B. Jordan, Ripley, W. Va., in place of H. E. Starcher, removed.

Claude G. Pownall, Romney, W. Va., in place of C. J. Powell, retired.

Dillard R. Walker, Stanaford, W. Va., in place of W. L. Warden, resigned.

Margaret E. Martin, Stirrat, W. Va., in place of S. S. Goode, retired.

Victor J. Robinson, Tams, W. Va., in place of R. F. Wildey, resigned.

Harold R. Wiles, Tunnelton, W. Va., in place of J. F. Graham, retired.

Robert C. Fenton III, Williamstown, W. Va., in place of J. L. Henderson, retired.

George O. Mauk, Yolyn, W. Va., in place of Geraldine Chambers, removed.

WISCONSIN

Inez Myrtle Rautio, Amberg, Wis., in place of A. S. Port, retired.

Milton L. Dickinson, Augusta, Wis., in place of T. F. Boehr, retired.

Ellsworth L. Thompson, Black River Falls, Wis., in place of P. W. Dickey, retired.

Raymond E. Anderson, Deer Park, Wis., in place of L. A. Elden, retired.

Roy L. Fergot, Edgar, Wis., in place of F. J. Shortner, retired.

Phoebe J. Pinkley, Fountain City, Wis., in place of W. R. Hartley, retired.

Matilda J. Loden, Granville, Wis., in place of H. M. Pfeil, resigned.

Roland J. Anderson, Hazelhurst, Wis., in place of H. C. Lowe, retired.

Elmer E. Lidicker, Jefferson, Wis., in place of A. F. Hammes, deceased.

Raymond F. Fredrickson, Junction City, Wis., in place of L. B. Kitowski, resigned.

Kenneth R. Jacobs, Knapp, Wis., in place of J. D. Purvis, transferred.

Richard C. Coffen, Lake Tomahawk, Wis., in place of E. L. Saykally, deceased.

John C. Pribnow, Loyal, Wis., in place of L. M. Meyer, deceased.

John F. Whitmore, Madison, Wis., in place of E. C. Cooper, retired.

Shirleigh L. Collins, Melrose, Wis., in place of E. D. Young, resigned.

Delmer A. Vesely, Milan, Wis., in place of J. J. Schreiber, retired.

Harley L. Prell, New Richmond, Wis., in place of L. N. Hughes, retired.

Harry V. Cooper, Patch Grove, Wis., in place of Grace Harper, deceased.

Beverley J. Farrell, Readstown, Wis., in place of O. L. Prestegard, transferred.

Arnold W. Langner, Sr., Sheboygan Falls, Wis., in place of R. N. Bowser, failed to return from military duty.

Sylvester J. Penning, Stockbridge, Wis., in place of K. M. Pottle, retired.

Robert C. Herman, Thorp, Wis., in place of W. S. Wagner, retired.

Earl J. Murray, Webster, Wis., in place of E. D. Fahland, retired.

WYOMING

Johnnie A. Thon, Lusk, Wyo., in place of A. B. Mills, retired.

Charles R. Sheehan, Rawlins, Wyo., in place of H. S. Cashman, resigned.

Harold V. Baas, Sheridan, Wyo., in place of J. R. Gage, resigned.

Warren H. Moore, Worland, Wyo., in place of P. F. McClure, deceased.

Marguerite A. Braziel, Yoder, Wyo., in place of C. V. Malone, transferred.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 40: 8: *The word of our God shall stand forever.*

Almighty God, whatever the duties and responsibilities may be ours during this day, wilt Thou bestow upon us the blessings of Thy constant care and Thy un-failing presence.

Wilt Thou free our minds from anxiety and our hearts from fear, lifting them by Thy grace out of doubt into faith and out of despair into hope.

Help us to see and lay hold of the treasures of each passing hour and inspire us to share them cheerfully with Thy needy children.

When night draws nigh and the evening shadows gather round about us may we have the blessed remembrance of Thy companionship and the joy of knowing that we have had some part in building a better world.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 7, 1960, was read and approved.

THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS A. JENKINS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme sorrow that I announce the death of former Congressman Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ironton, and the 10th Ohio District, on December 21, last.

Mr. Jenkins served for 34 years as a Member of this House, retiring because of ill health at the end of the 85th Congress. It is my understanding he served longer in the House of Representatives than did any other Member from Ohio.

Born in Oak Hill, Jackson County, Ohio, on October 23, 1880, of poor but honest and humble Welsh immigrant parents, Tom Jenkins' life was one of accomplishment, which again demonstrates the opportunity America and our system of government afford to all who wish to work hard and live an honest and upright life.

As a boy, Tom worked in the coal mines to earn money for an education. Graduating from Providence University, he taught school for a while, then studied law at Ohio State University, and was admitted to the bar in 1907. He was elected prosecuting attorney of Lawrence County for two terms, and later—in 1922—was chosen to serve as State senator. It was my honor and my privilege, as Lieutenant Governor, to swear Tom Jenkins into office. Two years later, in 1924, he was elected by the people of the 10th Congressional District of Ohio, to represent them in the 69th Congress, where he continued to serve until his retirement. At that time he was the second ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House. It had long been his desire to live to become chairman of that great committee, and to thus follow in the footsteps of another great Ohioan, once chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—William McKinley.

In his early career in Congress, Mr. Jenkins served as a member of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee and was the author of several legislative measures of importance in connection with our national welfare. He was also a member of the Insular Affairs Committee and for a short time a member of the District of Columbia Committee. He was named chairman of the Food Study Committee, and during the time he served—from 1944 to 1946—did splendid work. At the time of his retirement, Mr. Jenkins was also a member of the very important Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Always taking a deep interest in his party's affairs, Tom Jenkins served as a delegate to many State conventions in Ohio and to several Republican national conventions. For years he was the beloved dean of the Ohio delegation.

He was a kindly man, yet a frank and forthright individual. He had the courage of his convictions and the ability to convince others that his was the right position. Long one of the leaders of the House of Representatives, he served his State and country well. A man of character, ability, and with a great record of accomplishment, his name will long live in our State and national history.

At the time of death, Tom Jenkins left behind him his beloved wife, Mabel, and one sister. To Mrs. Jenkins and to his sister, we of the Ohio delegation—and I am sure I speak for the full membership of the House—extend our sincere sympathy in the great loss which has been theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that other Members of the House who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, like those who have preceded me I also admired and respected our late colleague and friend, Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio. He always greeted me with a warmth and friendliness that was characteristic of his fine spirit and personality.

His passing is met with sorrow by those who knew and respected him as a friend and colleague.

I should like to join with others in conveying an expression of sympathy to Mrs. Jenkins and the members of his family in their bereavement.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to put into words the thoughts that rise in one's mind when trying to write out something to say about a man you had such deep and sincere affection for as I had for Tom Jenkins. He was one of the finest men I met when I came to Congress and a real deep and true friendship, founded on instant respect for each other, was started. He was a man who accomplished much because he knew that to be a leader he had first to be the servant of all. His courage and courtesy were matched only by his wisdom and knowledge of men and his efficient and effective service was crowned by his humble spirit. He wanted to help wherever he could and he did help many.

I glory in having had his friendship and as time goes by his wisdom and his gentleness will always be precious memories.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed brother, the Honorable Tom Jenkins, of Ironton, Ohio. In my book, Tom Jenkins was one of nature's noblemen. I knew him when I first came to Congress, 17 years ago, because Tom has many relatives in my hometown of Wenatchee, Wash.

Tom Jenkins was one of the kindest men it has ever been my privilege to know, and he certainly wrote a record in his 34 years of service here in this House.

I wish to join the rest of my colleagues in extending heartfelt sympathies to Mrs. Jenkins and Tom's family.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in paying tribute to one of Ohio's most beloved political figures—and a man whose long and distinguished service in this body was rivaled only by yourself and a few other members—the late Thomas A. Jenkins.

Tom represented the district which is just across the Ohio River from mine, and I truthfully believe that he was almost as well known in West Virginia as he was in his homeland. One still hears much favorable mention of his name and devoted career of public service on both sides of the river.

Tom Jenkins rose from humble beginnings in his hometown of Oak Hill, Ohio, to render almost three generations of loyal service to the American people, and his district, his State, and his Nation will miss him.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House in eulogy of the late Honorable Thomas A. Jenkins.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad privilege to join with my colleagues from Ohio and indeed with all those who knew the Honorable Thomas Jenkins in paying tribute to his memory in this Chamber where he served for so many eventful years.

It was I who succeeded Tom Jenkins as the Representative from the 10th District of Ohio when he was, regrettably, forced to retire because of the illness which eventually led to his death only slightly more than 2 weeks ago. If I have learned one thing since I stepped into his office—I do not say his shoes for they will remain unfilled—it is that if I can learn to serve the people of my district as he served them I need have no fear when I am called upon to look them in the eyes or to shake their hands. For his countless friends in our eight counties of Ohio did not wait until his passing to impress upon me the high regard they held for his qualities and his character. The esteem and affection with which he was universally regarded shone through wherever his name was mentioned and in whatever company. There was no conscious effort to so impress me. It was simply an honest and deep-seated feeling of admiration and friendship which showed itself spontaneously and which, as with all true emotion, could not be repressed.

Tom Jenkins' devotion to his people knew no bounds of party, of station in life, of religion, or of color. This I know from the testimony of those who knew him and who learned to love him because of this very quality. In every nook and corner of the 10th Ohio District I have met people, strangers to me, who felt themselves indebted to him because of some favor, large or small, or of some accomplishment he performed for them or for their area. Such testimony to his service came from Democrats and from Republicans and from those with no party affiliation; it came from Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and those with no professed religion; it came from farmers,

from pensioners, from workmen, from businessmen, from politicians, from lawyers, and from clergymen. There were few indeed who did not have reason to thank Tom Jenkins for something he had done in his 34 years of service in the House of Representatives.

Whether it was a little back country road which needed resurfacing or the building of a huge dam and reservoir, no job was too large or too small for Tom Jenkins to lend his support if it could be shown that it was needed by a few or many of his constituents. The Tom Jenkins Dam which backs up Burr Oak Lake and provides recreational facilities and water supplies for thousands of our people stands as a monument to his memory. So too do a great many small projects which he pushed to completion. The mighty Ohio River has felt the impress of his achievements, but equally important to many of those he served were the conservation and improvement works he sponsored along its tributaries and back waters. But it is not only in these enduring physical works that his memory will remain alive in our district. He will be remembered longer for the works of mercy, of charity, and of service to humanity which stand as his monument in the hearts of those who loved him and whom he loved.

Tom Jenkins first came to Washington 35 years ago as a young man in his forties. He lived to be reelected 17 times through good times and bad; through wars and depressions; through the Democratic landslides of the New Deal days, when in 1936 he was the only Republican Congressman elected from Ohio, and the Eisenhower victories of the fifties. No combination of political, economic, or international circumstances could shake Tom Jenkins from the seat which was his because he held it by the birthright of faith and love.

His closeness to the people who voted for him unfailingly stemmed from his birth as 1 of 13 children of a Jackson County farmer and miner, from his own initiation at the tender age of 10 into work as a miner in the local mines, from his early teaching career in the county schools, from his self-supported education at Ohio State University, from his practice of law among his own people, and from his long engagements in political campaigns on the premise that he wanted to serve people rather than party and justice rather than personal gain.

That is the legacy Tom Jenkins leaves behind him. It is a legacy of faith and love. While he had no children of his own to share in it, it will be treasured by the several generations whom he cared for as though they were his own—for in a larger sense they were his own. Not the least among those who will nurture this legacy in his fond widow, Mrs. Mabel Wynne Jenkins, to whom I extend my deep sympathy. Mrs. Moeller and I join with her in honoring the cherished memory of her beloved husband.

Mr. Speaker, as a fitting conclusion to these remarks I include in the RECORD an editorial of eulogy to Tom Jenkins which appeared in the Wellston, Ohio, Telegram on December 24, 1959, the date

on which his earthly remains were committed to his native Ohio soil:

PEOPLE HAD FAITH IN TOM JENKINS AND HE NEVER FAILED THEM

The passing of Thomas A. Jenkins in a Columbus sanatorium Monday night, marked the end of an era in this 10th District. Really, it came to a close a year ago, when he was stricken. He tried to withdraw his candidacy for 18th term, but the day was late: all he could do was ask the people who had honored him so often, to spare him now and vote for some other candidate. Even so he lacked little more than 600 votes of being nominated. They knew full well he could never serve again, but they were loathe to leave him.

He went to Washington the first time in 1924, a young man in his early forties. Who could forget that campaign while he was striving to upset Congressman Israel M. Foster's political appellation. And so he did upset Lizzie.

For 34 years thereafter he kept that seat among the mighty in Washington. To win 17 elections in a row in a district firmly committed to the two-term tradition was a great achievement. He was not without opposition by others ambitious to serve in Washington, sometimes Republicans, often by Democrats. He wintered through the New Deal landslides unscathed, when Republican Congressmen were being knocked out like tenpins.

How did he do it?

Tom Jenkins was no intellectual prodigy, and he himself would be first to concede it. Once at a political rally in Wellston when Attorney General Gilbert Bettman was running for U.S. Senator, Jenkins stole the show. Bettman belonged to the intelligent and made an address filled with political profundities. Then came Tom's turn:

He made it short, telling that among the 450 Congressmen in Washington, he was just average, "no professor of U.S. history, no great authority on constitutional law," he admitted, "but just a smalltown lawyer. I excel in one thing only" he said, "all Representatives in Washington would agree that none take care of their constituents' interests so well and so promptly, as Tom Jenkins."

And the audience stood up and cheered him, because Tom Jenkins had the political sense to appear no better than his audience. He knew almost every voter in this district and could call him by his first name.

So he went back every 2 years, time and again; always accumulating seniority, that invisible asset that gives a few old-timers the best committee assignments, that puts their bills ahead for an early vote. That is the difference between a one-termer and Tom Jenkins' 17 terms.

For many years he was a member of the all-powerful Ways and Means Committee that keeps tight control of the purse strings. It writes the tax bills that provides the money for most Government activities. He was on other powerful committees. Yet he introduced few bills, and his name rarely labeled any new law.

But when he wanted something he usually got it in due time. Probably his greatest accomplishment was as a member of the joint committee on new post office buildings in Washington.

Once several years ago, we were standing with him in his reception room in the House Office Building, looking out of a west window toward the White House a mile distant. It was an inspiring view. Two broad avenues, Constitution and Pennsylvania, traversed the green Mall as straight as a gun-sight. Magnificent buildings of everlasting granite were spotted here and there to shelter Government departments. There were other buildings too, the National Archives, and the National Art Gallery.

It was far different from the Washington of 40 years before when these avenues were lined with rows of shoddy stores and shabby little one-story structures.

Then Tom spoke his thoughts: "If we never did much else, I know how much we did in making Washington over, in making it the most beautiful capital in the world." And for that he deserves to be forever remembered. As long as those granite blocks stand one on another, and the green grass grows, and the flowers are blooming between, Tom Jenkins' impress on Washington can never fade.

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

Mr. MOELLER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are all grieved by the passing of our late colleague and beloved friend, Thomas H. Jenkins, of Ohio. Tom Jenkins was one of the most serious-minded Members of this body, a man of great capacity, who made his marked contribution to the deliberations, consideration and accomplishments of this great body. Over and above that, he was a gentleman at all times. His outlook on life was one of understanding mind. He possessed a nobility of character that profoundly impressed his colleagues.

Tom Jenkins and I served on the Ways and Means Committee before I was elected the leader of my party in this body. Throughout the years our friendship has been very close, a friendship that I valued very much and which I shall always treasure.

To his loved ones I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement. I know they derive great consolation from the fact that he served in this body with such distinction. He was truly a great American who earned the respect, the confidence, and the friendship of all his colleagues.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, Tom Jenkins was part of the Ohio political scene for 50 years and in that time he made many friends and few, if any, enemies. This was because of his sterling character and rugged individualism. On the national scene he was respected and admired for the same reasons. As a member of the important Ways and Means Committee for 25 years, he contributed much to significant tax legislation.

I shall always remember him for his intense devotion to Congress and particularly the House of Representatives. He believed that it was the most important part of our Government because it was in closer touch with the people. He was an honest, dedicated public servant and I join with his host of friends in mourning his loss and expressing my sympathy to Mrs. Jenkins.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly saddened when I learned of the passing of our former colleague, the Honorable Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio. I knew that he had been ill and that his passing was not unexpected. However, we are never ready for news of this kind.

I first met Tom Jenkins when I came to this House in the 77th Congress. At that time he was looked upon as one of the outstanding leaders of the House, due to his long and brilliant service. I came to rely upon him for advice and

counsel and always found him anxious to be of any help possible.

He had a brother who had formerly lived in Colorado, and who served as manager of the chamber of commerce in Pueblo, which is in my district. He was always interested in Colorado and matters affecting our State.

Tom Jenkins was a real friend and I shall cherish happy memories of our association together in Congress. I had the highest respect and admiration for his character and ability. He was a genial person and I have greatly missed his presence with us.

I consider Tom Jenkins one of the most distinguished Americans it has been my pleasure to meet. It was a real privilege to serve with him in the House. His passing is an irreparable loss to all of us.

I extend my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Jenkins, the sister, and the other members of the family.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, an intimate association of more than a third of a century ended last month with the death of the late Congressman Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ohio. We entered the House at the same time, the beginning of the 69th Congress after being first elected on the same day in November 1924. During the 34 years of his service, Tom Jenkins became one of my closest and most beloved friends. He was a man who possessed great talents, yet never lost the common touch.

Tom Jenkins came up the hard way. As a boy, he worked in his neighborhood coal mines to earn money for an education in college and law school. He understood the problems of the ordinary citizen and was ever mindful of their needs. His schooling for the public service was obtained as prosecuting attorney and as a State senator before being elected to the House. During his long service in this body, I watched his progress up the ladder of experience. He became a high ranking member of the great Ways and Means Committee and in the latter part of his service, I was glad to select him for service on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

He was a plain man. He cared little for the tinsel of social life. The completeness with which he devoted himself to his work for his constituency, the State of Ohio and the Nation was an inspiration to many of the younger Members of the House.

A great public servant has gone to his reward. To his beloved wife and his sister, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in these first days of the new session, we have been shocked at the news of the death of former Congressman Thomas Jenkins who from 1924 until 1959 represented Ohio's 10th District here with great distinction.

Tom Jenkins became a legend in his own lifetime. The people of his district admired, respected, and loved this man who served them with courage, devotion, and imagination through a tumultuous and crisis-ridden three and one-half decades in his Nation's history. Their feelings were fully shared by all

of us who had the honor to serve with him here.

The problems and issues of importance in Tom Jenkins' district are the same in many respects as those which interest the people of the neighboring seven counties of Ohio's 15th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. When I came to Congress 5 years ago, this interest in common problems served to bring us together immediately. Tom's helpful advice drawn from his rich experience in public service and his friendship were of lasting value to me.

I wish to pay tribute to this dedicated statesman who gave so much to the people of his district and to the Nation. To Mrs. Jenkins and his fine family I want to join with my colleagues here in offering my sympathy in the profound loss they have suffered.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the early days of last month the Nation sustained a serious loss in the passing of a great and patriotic statesman, our friend and colleague, Thomas A. Jenkins. He had served with distinction, devotion, and wisdom in the House of Representatives for a period of 35 years. His public service actually covered a span of a half a century because of the previous offices he held as prosecuting attorney and State senator in his beloved State of Ohio.

It was my rich privilege to serve with this great American as one of his colleagues on the House Committee on Ways and Means. During the time of our mutual service I had opportunity to observe Mr. Jenkins' able work and I found him to be a man who addressed himself to his duties with compassionate understanding of the problems of all our citizens and with a dedicated comprehension of the basic concepts of human freedom, economic opportunity, and national strength—concepts that were inherent in the founding of our Republic that have been strengthened because of Tom Jenkins' work in our midst.

One important principle that motivated the endeavors of this great American was his insistence on fairness and equity for all the people. He worked diligently and with ability to try to improve our Federal tax structure so that its application to our citizens would be without discrimination and without unwarranted burden. In this connection it was my privilege to serve with him as a cosponsor of legislation that was known across the breadth of the land as the Jenkins-Keogh bill. This legislation was designed to alleviate the discriminatory treatment contained in existing law against self-employed individuals in providing for their retirement security. Tom Jenkins believed with conviction in the principle embodied in this bill because he recognized its justice and the merit it contained for the benefit of the American farmer, storekeeper, professional man, and the millions of other self-employed Americans.

Mr. Jenkins and I first joined in sponsoring this legislation in January 1953 at which time Mr. Jenkins introduced H.R. 10 and I was privileged to cosponsor H.R. 11. After years of perseverance and work in behalf of this constructive meas-

ure, we now seem to be on the threshold of what I hope will be the enactment of this proposal into law. If we are successful to this end, a large measure of the credit must go to our esteemed late colleague, Tom Jenkins.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that Tom Jenkins will not be able to continue to serve in this distinguished body on the occasion of the final approval of his bill. I regret, Mr. Speaker, this great American's untimely passing, but I am grateful for the privilege that was mine in serving with him.

THE LATE HONORABLE HUBERT ELLIS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the late Representative Hubert Ellis, who died on December 3, 1959, and who represented the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia for three terms from 1943 to 1949.

The Honorable Hubert Summers Ellis was born in Hurricane, Putnam County, W. Va., July 6, 1887. He attended public schools and went on to attend Marshall College in Huntington, W. Va.

Between the years before World War I, 1910-17, Mr. Ellis was engaged in banking and selling. During the First World War he served overseas as first lieutenant in the 150th Field Artillery, 42d Division. He was first elected to Congress in 1942, and served in the 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses.

Hubert Ellis served his country effectively in both war and peace. After being in uniform during World War I, and serving in this body during World War II, Representative Ellis played an outstanding role in veterans' affairs. He was one of those outstanding citizens who felt that the veterans in peacetime have a continuing obligation to their country.

Hubert Ellis was one of the early members of Huntington Post 16 of the American Legion. That splendid post has had a most interesting history of special leadership in the community of Huntington. An example of that leadership is the fact that it was the post which helped spearhead the movement for a statewide high school band festival, held regularly in Huntington for many years.

Mr. Ellis served as West Virginia Department Commander of the American Legion in 1933 and 1934.

In his home city of Huntington, Representative Ellis is especially remembered for his successful efforts in laying the groundwork for the erection of the splendid new Federal office building there. He secured a congressional appropriation for the purchase of the site, and when this amount proved too small, he helped raise locally by subscription the required additional amount for the purchase of the land.

Mr. Ellis was instrumental in securing the location in Huntington of a war plant of the Navy, which was leased to the Sylvania Electric Products Co. After the war, he was one of the earliest advocates of securing full peacetime use of the Syl-

vania plant, on which the General Services Administration is now accepting bids.

Mr. Ellis was a spokesman for his home community in securing the initial Federal approval of funds for what is today the magnificent Tri-State Airport, a facility which is continuing to be developed as a key air transportation facility serving the States of West Virginia, Kentucky and Ohio.

Hubert Ellis was a patriot, a man of sober judgment, a man who was not found wanting for the attributes which go to make a great Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

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

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly join in the sentiments expressed by Congressman KEN HECHLER concerning the recent passing of the Honorable Hubert Ellis, a distinguished West Virginian, who enjoyed the privilege of representing West Virginia's Fourth Congressional District in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Ellis served with my late husband. His passing is a great loss to our home State, and I extend sincerest sympathy to his family.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, Hubert Ellis was a very dear friend of mine. We came to Congress at the same time and were sworn in together on January 3, 1943. Hubert was a very sincere and hardworking Member of this body.

I wish to join my colleagues in extending deepest sympathy to Mrs. Ellis and to the Ellis family.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, this small, but nonetheless sincere, tribute is offered in memory of a famous West Virginian who passed away last month—former Congressman Hubert Ellis, born in Hurricane, Putnam County, W. Va.

After an interesting career in banking and selling, and serving overseas as a 1st lieutenant in World War I, he came to Congress as a Member of the 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses.

Although I never knew Congressman Ellis personally, I have great respect for his devotion to God and country, and the good works he did in Congress.

To his family I extend deepest sympathy.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regretted the death of our good friend and colleague, Hubert Ellis, of West Virginia. He was a rugged American patriot, who served his country well in both war and peace. Serving overseas as an artillery lieutenant in World War I, he was closely associated with veterans' affairs. Following his election to Congress in 1943, he was elected to membership on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs where he rendered outstanding service. He believed our country had a continuing obligation to the men who fought to defend America and was intensely interested in their welfare. He was deeply devoted to the progress of West Virginia and was an able advocate wherever its interests were concerned.

In the death of Hubert Ellis, West Virginia and the Nation have lost an outstanding citizen. Those of us who were privileged to serve with him have lost a dear friend. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to our late colleague, the Honorable Hubert Ellis, who died on December 3, 1959.

Mr. Ellis represented the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia in the 77th, 78th, 79th, and 80th Congresses. It was our privilege to serve together in the 79th Congress.

Hubert Ellis was a warm and considerate man, a highly respected public servant, who served faithfully his State and the country.

To Mrs. Ellis and the other members of his family I extend my sincere sympathy.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILL E. NEAL

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I am sad to report to my colleagues the passing of a distinguished Member of this body during the 83d and 85th Congresses, Dr. Will E. Neal, of Huntington, W. Va., who died on November 12, 1959.

Dr. Neal was born October 14, 1875, in Lawrence County, Ohio. He was graduated from Proctorville High School in 1894. He was awarded the bachelor of science degree from National Normal University, Lebanon, Ohio, in 1900. He received his medical degree at the University of Cincinnati in Ohio in 1906, after which for more than 50 years he was engaged in general practice of medicine in Huntington.

It is typical of Dr. Neal's human sense of balance and sense of humor that in his official biography in the Congressional Directory he should have included this phrase, "general practice of medicine in Huntington since 1907 with a rest period of 3 years as mayor of Huntington and occasional foreign travel periods since 1945." Of course, Dr. Neal was being facetious when he referred to a "rest period" since he never rested in his unselfish effort to help his fellow man, whether as a healing physician or in the art of statesmanship.

Representative Neal was a long-time member of the Huntington Park Board, 1931-52; a member of the West Virginia Public Health Council, 1936-40. At the age of 75 he was elected to the House of Delegates of the West Virginia Legislature, being the only Republican on Huntington's five-member slate who was elected to the house of delegates in 1950.

He served in this body from 1953 to 1955, and again from 1957 to 1959. During the period when he was out of Congress, Dr. Neal served as a medical consultant to the Foreign Operations Administration in Afghanistan and Nepal.

Dr. Neal in his service to his community, State and Nation was proud of the fact that he was a constructive conservative. He had deep and rocklike convictions. Yet he had that rare quality of being able to disagree without being disagreeable. I never knew a man

with so many friends—warm friends whom he collected over many years. I do not think there is or was a single man in Huntington, W. Va., who had more friends, and he made friends by his unselfish service and also through the gentle words and kind deeds with which he cheered and strengthened those he met along the way.

Mr. Speaker, I include the fine remarks of Rev. Garrett H. Evans, of the First Methodist Church of Huntington, at the funeral of Dr. Neal:

We are gathered here today to pay tribute to a truly great man Dr. Will E. Neal. You know that, in part, far better than I do. Many of you were his patients, and are aware of the fact that he practiced medicine as a calling and as an art, lifting it far above mere professionalism. Many of you worked with him as he gave himself as a public servant. With dedication, devotion, and humor he brought to politics the integrity which it deserves.

One reads with awe of the many accomplishments and interests of this man, remembering, too, that he was a devoted husband and father. It is with gratitude that we remember his integrity and his compassion.

William Channing once wrote: "The greatest man is he who chooses the right with invincible resolution; who resists the sorest temptations from within and from without; who bears the heaviest burdens cheerfully; who is calmest in storms; and is most fearless under menace and frowns; and whose reliance on truth, on virtue, and on God is most unflinching."

By these or any other standards, Dr. Will Neal was a great man. He was great because he never sought greatness. From the brief period in which I knew him, and from the things you his friends have told me, I am sure I can say that here is a man who found himself because he lost himself, in the sense that Jesus used that figure of speech.

I am sure, too, that Dr. Neal was able to do all that he did because he took into account the reality of God. He was a man of faith. He obviously believed the Biblical teaching that at the center of the universe there is a righteous power to whom every human being owes allegiance as the source of life and law. No man is perfect, and undoubtedly Dr. Neal made mistakes—but no man ever questioned his integrity, for he took into account the divine will that is forever present and at work in our world.

Now death has closed one chapter of his life. A poet, upon the death of her father, wrote:

"A giant pine, magnificent and old,
Stood stanch against the sky and all
around
Shed beauty, grace and power. Within its
fold
Birds, safely reared their young. The
velvet ground
Beneath was gentle, and the cooling shade
Gave cheer to passers-by. Its towering
arms
A landmark stood, erect and unafraid,
As if to say, 'Fear naught from life's
alarms.'
"It fell one day. Where it had dauntless
stood
Was loneliness and void. But men who
passed
Paid tribute—said, "To know this life was
good
It left its mark on me. Its work stands
fast."
And so it lives. Such life no bonds can
hold—
This giant pine, magnificent and old."

The memory of the living man remains, and shall have its influence. But greater

than that, his soul lives. We can bury the body, but we cannot bury the soul. You have heard read in the ritual today the great expressions of our Christian faith as recorded in the Scriptures. In the wisdom of Solomon, an apocryphal book, this truth is repeated:

"For God created man to be immortal, and made him in the image of his own eternity—the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and there can no evil touch them. In the sight of the unwise, they seem to die, and their going from us is thought to be destruction; but they are in peace, and their hope is full of immortality; for God hath proved them and found them worthy of himself."

Here is the comfort for the family that bears a loneliness which can never be removed. Here is the hope that transcends any despair. Here is the challenge that brings us all face to face with the ultimate reality of both life and death. We are grateful for the promises of God: and we are grateful for this man who demonstrated them in his life. We know that "God has proved him, and found him worthy of himself."

Mr. Speaker, I also include at this point in the RECORD the statement of the Governor of the State of West Virginia, The Honorable Cecil H. Underwood, on the passing of Dr. Neal:

Dr. Neal represented my district in Congress. In addition to being my Congressman and a colleague in the house of delegates in 1951, he was a close personal friend. He was a distinguished physician, a dedicated public servant and a man who understood people and their problems. West Virginia will miss him. Mrs. Underwood and I extend our sympathy to Mrs. Neal and family.

Mr. Speaker, one of Dr. Neal's personal traits is worthy of mention at this point because it so typified the man and his nature. So many of us have experienced the thrill of walking down the street, having Dr. Neal take us by the arm, and share his friendly greeting with scores of others as we walked along. That was symbolic of his whole life as he took countless others by the arm and helped them, unselfishly, cheerfully, and tirelessly.

I extend my deepest personal sympathy to his widow, the former Miss Susan Witten, and his three sons, Dr. William L. Neal, Dr. Thomas E. Neal, and Joe Neal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I fully and completely agree with the feelings expressed by the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, Congressman HECHLER, in connection with the recent passing of Dr. Will Neal, an outstanding legislator, who formerly represented the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia.

I had the honor to serve with Dr. Neal, and his passing is a grievous loss to each of us. He will be greatly missed by his many friends. To Mrs. Neal and his family I can only extend deepest sympathy.

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

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that today I bespeak the sentiments of a majority of West Virginians here on the floor of the House, as well as an impressive number of fellow citizens in my native State, when I rise to the sad privilege of trying to put into weak words the tremendous sense of loss we all feel at the passing of the Honorable Will E. Neal, for two terms a Member of this House.

Our late and beloved colleague was a man who had a long and honorable service to his fellow man.

By profession he was a medical doctor, a proud and happy man in the certain knowledge that from the moral earth which has nurtured so many of our distinguished men of affairs he had risen through his own efforts to an outstanding place in his chosen profession.

By avocation, he was a humanitarian, intensely interested in the spiritual equation as well as the medical diagnosis and its eventual prognosis. His avocation was no better stressed than at one time when he answered a critic who had crossly emphasized that he wasted too much time with people who were politically incapable of helping further his public career.

His reply to the critic expressed, I think, his philosophy of life and living, in amity and harmony with his fellow men and women.

You never waste time when you are dealing with men and women and the problems of all human existence.

He was born October 12, 1875, in modest circumstances in Lawrence County, Ohio. From the outset of his mature life, he demonstrated a natural gift for hard work, close application to the old precepts of moral living, and close study of the best to be found in the outpourings of the great minds of the past.

He very early demonstrated his interest in politics when, on the first occasion he was privileged to exercise his vote, he walked during his lunch hour from the country school where he was teaching to vote for President William McKinley.

This political awareness continued throughout his life, and, if he had any regret of which I am aware, I would say he deplored and was dismayed at the manner in which small men in high public office, both locally and otherwise, tended to debase the ideals of the Republic's Founding Fathers and serve their own ends, ambitions, and tastes at the expense of the basic essentials of our free system of self-government.

After obtaining his medical education at the University of Cincinnati, from his home he commuted weekly to tend to a small grocery store at Hanging Rock, Ohio. Later he moved across the Ohio River from his place of birth to nearby Huntington, W. Va., a city of promise and youthful vigor.

His rise was rapid in his profession. He was regarded by his peers in medicine as an outstanding physician. He was firmly established in his chosen work and he and the former Miss Sue Witten, of

Marietta, Ohio, were busy at the task of raising a family, taking part in civic affairs jointly, and savoring the strength and phenomenal growth of the city of Huntington, when the first call to public service came.

He was chosen for two successive terms as Huntington's mayor.

It is here that I would like to recite the story from one of his intimates of the unfortunate aftermath of his first venture in politics.

He had retired from the mayor's office just as the great depression of the late twenties arose to plague all of our people. As the story comes to me from one who knows, Dr. Neal related that he found, at the conclusion of his last term, that he had endorsed obligations for his friends to the extent of a figure slightly less than \$80,000.

"I stayed up for an entire night," he related in his mild fashion, "debating whether or not to stand by my commitments, or to take the easy way of repudiation. My honor won the night and within 2 years, I had retired those debts at the expense of often working around the clock."

It was the mark of this man that he never took the easy way but honored his commitments to the fullest extent, not only in his professional capacity but in his personal and political life, as well.

Just prior to the great war with the Axis, Dr. Neal retired—in a sense. However, he could always be located in his office, at the rolltop desk he had first purchased as a young medical man. And it is no secret that his waiting room was always full.

Then came the days of the conflict, and Dr. Neal returned to active practice just as before, vigorously, compassionately, and with the innate skill of the born physician.

After the war, his pursuits were varied. He and Mrs. Neal visited the battlefields of France where one of their four sons had been lost on D-day in Normandy. They traveled extensively elsewhere, and, as always, our late colleague continued to demonstrate his keen curiosity about how the rest of humanity fared.

His travels included a visit to Australia and adjacent regions. He could discuss with great clarity and authority the problems of people and places far beyond the ordinary mind.

In 1950, he was once again called to the task of public service. At the importunities of many of his friends, he sought and won a term in the West Virginia House of Delegates. His career there was distinguished by his consuming devotion to his duty and his abounding concern with the time-tested principles of the Republic.

Two years later, he was called to an office which, in my belief and in his as well, constitutes one of the most important in our Nation—Member of the House of Representatives.

During his first term, he was a member of the House Committee on Public Works. From this position, he was a diligent advocate of constructive public works programs in the Nation. He was farsighted enough to see that ill-advised public works programs are false economy

and those who temporarily benefit eventually rue the day they proposed schemes which impair the public credit, create inflation, and, in a great sense, erode still further the people's will to self-reliance in their ability to solve their own collective problems.

His record during the second session he served here is well known to most of you. You will remember his unflinching courtesy, his gentle manner of speaking in public speech and private conversation, and the courtesy which always shines strongly when it is inborn and not artificially acquired.

Friends are scarce to come by. It is a sad thing, but too few of us can assess properly the scope and circumstance of our real circle of friendship.

But it is my pleasure, in the sense of a sad duty, to note for the RECORD and the stimulation of the memories of my colleagues of the life and career of a man who fought a good fight, ran a swift and fair race, and kept in mind, always, the words of the poet, Scott:

Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Will Neal was a member of the same committee as myself for a number of years.

There I had a chance to know of his character and integrity in the many ways that are given to Congressmen.

Many of these sessions were closed to the public. In those sessions, usually a man's inner thinking comes out. From all of my experiences with Dr. Neal, I came not only to respect him but to love him for the kind of person that he really was.

He came to Congress late in life. However, in spite of this, his mind was always open to ideas and new avenues of progress for America. I have never known a man more sincere in what he believed was good for his country.

I know many of us missed Dr. Neal when he failed to return to the Congress in January. On one visit to Washington since then, he came to see me and reflected the same sweet temperament which always characterized him while a Member of Congress. I know that many of us who knew him so well will miss him, not only as a Member of Congress, but as a friend.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I too want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Dr. Will Neal who we all knew so well and loved so dearly.

I wish to join my colleagues in extending my sincere sympathy to Mrs. Neal and the Neal family.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Will C. Neal came to Congress after a successful career in the practice of medicine and after devoting a good deal of his time from year to year to public service.

He was a straightforward man, one who was always on the job meeting his responsibilities and looking after the interests of his people. He was a very fine, high-grade citizen, and one whom it was my privilege to know very well.

I was very sorry to hear that he had passed away, and I wish to extend to his widow and his family my sincerest and deepest sympathy.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest respect and admiration that I recall the days when former Congressman Will E. Neal walked these halls of Congress. During his service in the 83d and 85th Congresses, he worked diligently and stood fast on his convictions. Although we were not of the same political party, I nevertheless appreciated his sincerity and devotion to duty. As a co-member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee he impressed me with his warm personality and ability to understand and work with his colleagues.

Dr. Neal left this world last November. I miss his quiet manner and his gentle words of wisdom, but I shall long remember him and be grateful that he passed my way. My sincere sympathy goes to Mrs. Neal, who, I am sure, was the doctor's inspiration; and to his three sons and several grandchildren.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a tone of sadness and sincere regret that I join with my colleagues this afternoon to pay tribute to our former colleague and my good friend, Dr. Will Neal. Many of you in the Chamber this afternoon served with Dr. Neal in the 83d Congress, but it was not my privilege to know him until he was elected in the 85th Congress.

My association with him was quite close as we served together as minority members on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Not only did we serve together, but we were seated side by side during many of the hearings and it was through my acquaintance with him in that way that I developed a profound respect and admiration for him. Doc Neal was a kindly person. I never knew him to be critical to another Member's point of view nor to even slightly antagonize a witness before the committee, even though the witness was presenting a position in direct conflict to the philosophy of our departed friend. With this kindness though was a conviction of standing by what he thought to be in the best interest of his constituents and to be right in his learned judgment.

Further, he was a well informed Member of Congress. The wealth of his experience in dealing with people as their family doctor gave him a keen insight into human nature that better qualified him to understand people and to appreciate their problems. His expert ability to combine this infinite understanding of people with the knowledge he was ever seeking imminently qualified him to be a Congressman.

Dr. Neal's professional experience also enabled him to make an unusual contribution to the subcommittee upon which he served. This was subcommittee No. 3, having jurisdiction over health and science. All members of the full committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce were eager to have the personal views of Dr. Neal, especially upon legislation from the subcommittee dealing with matters affecting public health. We could rely on his judgment and recommendations as being impartial based on complete information and further substantiated by his long professional experience as a general practitioner.

We certainly missed this gentle but persuasive voice in the 1st session of the 86th Congress. We shall further miss that voice and counsel knowing that we will not see him again in this world. Even though he will physically not be with us, the memory of his service and fine association will remain forever in the minds of the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but further than that to the entire membership of this House.

As a friend, I want to extend my sincere condolences to his wife, children and grandchildren and also to his many close personal friends in the State of West Virginia.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who had the privilege of serving in this body with the late Dr. Will E. Neal have been saddened by the news of his death. A distinguished physician, he carried on the general practice of medicine in his home community of Huntington for more than 50 years. A deep interest in public affairs led him to stand for election as mayor of his city, an office which he held for 3 years. Further service in the West Virginia Legislature led to his first election to Congress. He served with distinction in the House for two terms. During this time his associates learned to appreciate his sterling character, his fine abilities and his devotion to the work of the House. West Virginia and the Nation have lost a fine citizen, and we, his former colleagues, have lost a good friend. I extend my deepest sympathy to his widow and family.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I express at this time my condolences to Mrs. Neal, the wife of our former colleague, Dr. Will E. Neal and to say that it was with sadness and regret that I read of his passing.

Quiet, meditative, gentle and compassionate, he typified that combination of human qualities so seldom found in one person, namely the characteristics of the statesman and the physician.

Keen of mind, sound of judgment, and rich in years, he served his constituency and his country with dedication and devotion.

I shall miss his friendly presence in the House and I shall think of him often for he was a fine gentleman who one long remembers.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I join in paying tribute to our late colleague, Dr. Will E. Neal, who represented the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia during the 83d and 85th Congresses.

A hard, conscientious worker, Dr. Neal was an outstanding public servant, a man greatly admired and respected by all who knew him and by all who were associated with him. By formal training, he was a doctor, a profession which he practiced with honor for over 50 years. His complete, unselfish interest in the welfare of others led him into public service where he served with distinction his community, his State, his Nation.

As a young man, after completing his medical studies, Dr. Neal established himself in the growing city of Huntington, W. Va., across the Ohio River from

his place of birth. From his busy medical practice, he found time to devote to the civic affairs of his community. He served his city as mayor for two successive terms. In 1950, at the age of 75, he was elected to the West Virginia Legislature. From 1953 to 1955, and again from 1957 to 1959, he was a Member of this body.

Will Neal loved people. He loved his country. His life was dedicated to his fellowman and exemplified the true meaning of the word "humanitarian."

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to Mrs. Neal and the other members of his family.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Will E. Neal symbolized an unselfishness that needs to be popularized and perpetuated if America is to reap the full advantage of her human potential. Dr. Neal practiced medicine for 45 years before becoming a Member of the House of Representatives. Rather than turn to an easy life of retirement, he chose to serve where his experience and aptitude might be of further value to his community, his district, and his country.

Dr. Neal's terms of office were in the highest tradition of one who devotes his life to the brotherhood of man. His mature thought, careful deliberation, and independent conclusions produced a record of outstanding contributions in Congress. I often talked with him about matters before the House which he insisted upon considering from all perspectives, with careful study and hours of pondering constitutional implications, so that his final decision would be certain to be in the interest of the general welfare. He did not respond to hard sell approaches to issues because he felt that careful diagnosis of every problem was a prerequisite to proper voting on all legislation.

Our departed colleague was a gentleman, a scholar, and a patriot. His equanimity, judgment, and sincerity were respected by everyone regardless of party affiliation.

The thought occurs to me that Dr. Neal's life needs to be portrayed more thoroughly among our peoples, if only to dispense with the notion that a person's active participation in business, government, and the sciences should normally cease when he reaches the twilight of his career on earth. Here was a man who had passed the three-quarter-century mark before his election to Congress the first time. His keen intellect and quick step belied those years, while, unfortunately a vast majority in our midst resign themselves to a life of inactivity long before they approach that age level. By assuming Dr. Neal's vigorous attitude and optimistic temperament, countless others might find far more enjoyment and opportunity for accomplishment in their upper years.

With the passing of Dr. Neal we have lost a firm friend, a solid Christian, and a dedicated patriot. He will be mourned far and wide, not only by the multitude of men, women, and children whom he attended in his extensive medical practice, but by every American who appreciates his devotion to duty while a Member of the Congress of the United States.

FEDERAL RESERVE'S PAYMENT TO THE TREASURY OF \$266 MILLION OF SURPLUS FUNDS REPRESENTS ONLY PARTIAL REFORM—INTRODUCING A NEW BILL TO CANCEL \$15 BILLION OF FEDERAL SECURITIES AND BRING ABOUT OTHER REFORMS IN THE HANDLING OF PUBLIC FUNDS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to cancel \$15 billion of Federal securities. These securities are in the hands of the Federal Reserve banks, and they have already been paid for once. If we cancel these securities, we will save the taxpayers huge amounts of unnecessary interest charges which the taxpayers are now paying. We will also make it impossible for the taxpayers to be required to pay for these debt obligations again when they become due.

Mr. Speaker, last week the Federal Reserve System took a step which it should have taken years ago. It made a payment to the Treasury out of one of its so-called surplus funds. In this instance the payment amounted to \$266 million, and the receipt of payment by the Treasury will, it appears, enable the Treasury to balance its budget in the fiscal year ending June 30 and possibly even end the year with a surplus.

Actually, the amount of this payment represents only a short step. The Federal Reserve should have paid, and should now pay all of its surplus funds into the Treasury. In this case the Treasury would receive not just \$266 million, but approximately \$1 billion.

For several years now I have urged that the Federal Reserve's practice of building up surplus funds be stopped and that its surplus already built up be paid into the Treasury where the funds can be used to help balance the budget and possibly retire some of the national debt. In the present Congress the bill introduced by me on this subject—H.R. 8301—on July 20 of last year calls for the Federal Reserve System to make a total payment of \$1 billion from its surplus funds. This bill is still needed and should be enacted. While the voluntary reform which the Federal Reserve people have now announced is good as far as it goes, it does not go far enough. And by stopping short, with a \$266 million payment when they should have made a \$1 billion payment, the Federal Reserve people have shown considerably less than a full understanding of the Treasury's need for its money, and considerably less than a full understanding of good management of the public's money. These surplus funds lie idle and uninvested at the very time the Treasury is deeply in debt and paying a fabulous rate of interest on the borrowed money.

THE FED HAS NO NEED FOR SURPLUS FUNDS

The Federal Reserve System has no need for any surplus funds whatever. There is no conceivable emergency which could arise by which it would need surplus funds. This fact has been more than amply demonstrated by testimony of almost all members of the present Board of Governors, including Chairman Martin. It has been my privilege to ask these gentlemen about the need for surplus funds, and none of them has been able to think of any real need for them. The best argument they have been able to give for keeping surplus funds is that it looks nice to have the System's published balance sheets show a surplus, because the general public is accustomed to seeing a surplus of some amount reported in the condition statements of the private banks and in the balance sheets of the nonfinancial corporations. Thus the essence of the argument is this: Since those members of the general public who spend their time reading the balance sheets expect private corporations to be holding surplus funds at any given time, these people should have the pleasure of seeing a surplus item in the Federal Reserve's balance sheet, even though in the case of the Federal Reserve holding the surplus funds serves no other purpose and is making a dent in the pocketbooks of the taxpayers, including the taxpayers who may read the Federal Reserve's balance sheet.

THE FED'S INCOME IS SEVERAL TIMES AS GREAT AS ITS NEEDS

How do these surplus funds arise?

In the first place, the Federal Reserve System receives its income from interest payments made by the Treasury on Government bonds and other Federal obligations which the Federal Reserve is holding. It is holding at the present time approximately \$27 billion, face value, of Federal debt.

From these current interest payments, the Federal Reserve meets its expenses, which are mostly the cost of providing free services to the member banks of the Federal Reserve System. Even so, the Federal Reserve has each year huge sums left over after expenses. In fact, its annual interest income is several times the amount of its annual expenses. Consequently, at the end of each year it turns back to the Treasury most of its income after expenses. In fact, in recent years it has followed the practice of turning back 90 percent, but holding out 10 percent which it puts into a surplus fund.

It seems to me that good management of the public's money dictates two reforms:

First, all of these surplus funds should, as I have indicated, be paid back to the Treasury and paid back promptly. There is no excuse for the Federal Reserve's holding public money idle and unused when the public is having to pay interest on borrowed money.

Second, the Federal Reserve System should not collect such huge amounts of interest payments in the first place. It is now collecting these payments and holding them until the end of the year before

returning them to the Treasury, which means that the taxpayers are paying a year's interest on the funds by reason of the fact that the funds are being held idle when they could, instead, be used to retire an equivalent amount of debt. At the end of last year, the Federal Reserve System turned back to the Treasury \$645 million of interest payments accumulated throughout the year.

NEW BILL WOULD SAVE THE TAXPAYERS' MONEY IN TWO WAYS

Today I am introducing a bill which calls for the Federal Reserve System to turn over to the Treasury for cancellation \$15 billion of U.S. bonds and other debt obligations which it is holding. The bill would also require the Secretary of the Treasury to issue to the Federal Reserve System, in place of these interest-bearing obligations, a non-interest-bearing demand note in the amount of \$15 billion.

Several good practical effects would result from the passage of this bill:

First. As has been indicated, the bill would bring about a reduction in the cost of the debt. It would allow the Treasury to use, on a current basis, funds now going to make interest payments on \$15 billion of debt. It would thus save the taxpayers the interest costs on an equivalent amount of money over the long period which the Federal Reserve holds this money before returning the money.

Second. The bill would have some tendency to reduce the general level of interest rates, for the simple reason that the Treasury would have less debt outstanding and, in carrying on refunding operations, would be less at the mercy of the operators of the so-called money market.

BILL WOULD PROVIDE AN IMPORTANT SAFEGUARD AGAINST THE FEDERAL RESERVES GIVING AWAY PUBLIC ASSETS

Third. The bill would provide an important safeguard against the possibility the Federal Reserve System might transfer some of its Federal securities to the private banks. Any reduction in the amount of Federal debt obligations which the Federal Reserve is holding necessarily amounts to a free gift of these securities, or the free gift of an equivalent amount of the securities, to the private banks. Acquiring Government debt obligations involves no cost to the private commercial banks. It does, however, make a difference to the taxpayer whether the Federal Reserve holds Federal debt obligations or whether the private banks hold them. In one case the interest payments come back into the Treasury, and in the other case, the interest payments go into bank profits.

Last year the Federal Reserve authorities recommended a bill to revise the reserve requirements of member banks—the so-called vault cash bill—which, as originally recommended, would have given the Federal Reserve both the mechanical authority and the moral support of Congress for transferring huge quantities of the securities it is holding over to the private banks. Any such transfer would, as I have indicated,

necessarily be on a cost-free basis to the private banks. In passing the vault cash bill, however, Congress tacked on expressions of legislative intent which condemn any idea that the Federal Reserve might reduce its holdings of Federal securities. Nevertheless, the present Federal Reserve authorities have a way of taking the bit into their own teeth and doing what they please to do, notwithstanding laws and expressions of congressional intent. They have come to believe that the Federal Reserve System is a fourth branch of the Government which stands over and above the three constitutional branches of the Government. They have, in fact, openly declared themselves to be independent of the Government, and they have had considerable support for this view from the head of the executive branch. And in many other ways their actions suggest they feel they are not subject to the laws that govern mortal men. So, just in case the Federal Reserve authorities get it into their heads to reduce their holdings of Federal securities despite the recent and clear congressional mandate to the contrary, having \$15 billion less of marketable Government debt obligations would make such an idea much less tempting. At least there would be \$15 billion less of Government securities which could be given away. Since the new obligations which the Federal Reserve would receive in exchange for these \$15 billion of securities would be non-interest-bearing, there would be no temptation to give them away and no temptation to the commercial bankers to try to acquire them.

The bill would reduce the amount of the Federal debt subject to the debt limitation by \$15 billion, since only interest-bearing obligations are subject to the debt limitation.

In conclusion, H.R. 8301, to require the Federal Reserve to turn its surplus funds back into the Treasury, is a badly needed piece of legislation. And the new bill which I have introduced today to cancel \$15 billion of the Federal debt held by the Federal Reserve System is also a badly needed piece of legislation. I hope it will be given favorable consideration.

The bill I have introduced today is as follows:

H.R. 9511

A bill to provide for the retirement of \$15,000,000,000 of the interest-bearing debt of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall direct each Federal Reserve bank to transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury an amount of interest-bearing obligations of the United States held by it such that the aggregate book value (the value at which such securities are carried on the books of the Federal Reserve banks as assets) of the obligations so transferred shall equal \$15,000,000,000. Such transfers shall be effected not later than 15 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel and retire the obligations transferred to him pursuant to the first section of this Act, and shall issue to each Federal Reserve

bank a nontransferable, non-interest-bearing demand note of the United States payable to such bank in an amount equal to the book value of the obligations of the United States transferred from such bank.

The Wall Street Journal of last Thursday, January 7, carried a lucid account of the Federal Reserve's payments to the Treasury from its surplus funds and from its excess income of last year. I will insert this in the RECORD for those who may be interested in the details this account contains:

FEDERAL RESERVE PAYS TREASURY \$266 MILLION—IT MAY BALANCE BUDGET—RESERVE BANKS TURN OVER SUMS THEY DECIDED AREN'T NEEDED IN THEIR SURPLUS ACCOUNTS

WASHINGTON.—The Federal Reserve System handed the Treasury a year-end bonus of \$266 million that will help the administration balance the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30—and might even result in a surplus.

The \$266 million comes from a decision by the Federal Reserve Board, in consultation with the 12 Reserve banks, to pay the Treasury certain amounts of money they decided were over and above their surplus needs.

Treasury officials insisted they were not told about the payment until about a week ago, so that the money is a "windfall" for the administration.

In November, administration officials were taking a gloomy view of their chances to balance the budget for the current fiscal period. While spending had been calculated, as of mid-September, at \$78.9 billion and revenues at \$79 billion for a \$100 million surplus, officials figured the 116-day steel strike had knocked the budget in the red by as much as \$600 million.

Since then, as business has snapped back better than expected in the wake of the steel strike, these same officials have been sounding a happier note. Lately, they have been figuring they either would hit a balance or come close to it.

With an extra \$266 million in their laps, however, their chances of balancing the budget—or even ending up with a surplus—are that much improved.

The \$266 million windfall came about because the Reserve System decided it had been putting more money than needed into the surplus accounts at the Reserve banks.

The Federal Reserve System regularly pays the Treasury all of its net earnings that are left after dividends and after provision for building up surplus to 100 percent of subscribed capital at those banks where surplus was below that amount. This latter provision amounts to about 10 percent of net earnings.

The Reserve Board concluded that keeping surplus at the level of subscribed capital would be enough. So it changed the practice of adding about 10 percent of the annual net earnings of the Federal Reserve banks to the surplus accounts, and to pay to the Treasury the amounts by which surplus accounts topped subscribed capital.

This meant, a spokesman said, a payment to the Treasury for 1959 of \$911 million instead of the \$645 million it ordinarily would have received.

LOYALTY OATH

Mr. JONES of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the past week I received a letter which I presume was mailed to every other Member of Congress soliciting support for legislation seeking repeal of that provision of the National Defense Education Act which requires a loyalty oath and an affidavit disclaiming belief in or support of any organization which seeks the overthrow of the the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

At this time I want to go on record as being unequivocally opposed to the repeal of that portion of the act under which this Congress has authorized and appropriated money for the use of students.

As I wrote in reply to the letter I received:

Any American should welcome the opportunity to proclaim and/or reaffirm his loyalty to the United States of America and I cannot help being suspicious of those who for any reason would attempt to avoid such expression.

Mr. Speaker, instead of attempting to find ways to discourage public expression of the support of our Government, I feel that we should encourage our young people particularly to have a deeper sense of loyalty, and a greater appreciation of the heritage which is theirs to nurture and preserve.

Each week at service club meetings and at thousands of other meetings and gatherings throughout the land, millions of Americans are proud to stand, facing the flag, and repeat together the pledge of allegiance to the flag. On such occasions we are reminded of the freedoms which we enjoy as Americans, and I believe all true Americans are inspired as they repeat:

I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

And inclosing, Mr. Speaker, I ask you and other Americans, what possible objection can anyone who claims or professes to be a loyal American citizen, have to signing this oath which states:

I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.

And what stigma can be attached to the affirmation contained in this affidavit:

I, _____, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I do not believe in, and am not a member of and do not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.

CAN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY ADJUST TO ARMS REDUCTION?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the economic consequences associated with possible disarmament have attracted much attention.

I commend to the attention of the Members the January 4 release of the National Planning Association, which provides a very affirmative answer to the question: "Can the American economy adjust to arms reduction?" which follows:

JOINT STATEMENT ON CAN THE AMERICAN ECONOMY ADJUST TO ARMS REDUCTION?

The National Planning Association has repeatedly stated that the American economy is productive enough to afford those national security programs which may be needed both to deter a major attack and to prevent local incidents. We believe it is of equal importance to emphasize that the American economy can also stand substantial arms reduction.

Current negotiations related to world arms limitations may or may not lead to dependable international controls and reduced military budgets. We will argue in this statement that plans should be developed for dealing with the economic consequences of material arms reductions.

These considerations are intended to establish that there is no valid economic argument that arms reduction would bring about economic depression. The potential increase in nondefense supply of goods and services due to economic growth could be several times larger than the increase due to a substantial reduction in armaments. In this statement we shall state the reasons why we believe the task is manageable and enumerate four phases which we believe require detailed study and planning.

1. Let us assume that an agreement providing for substantial arms reduction could become effective, for instance 5 years from now. We are now spending \$46 billion per year for national security. Within a 5-year period, with no change in present programs, this amount may well exceed \$50 billion annually (in present prices). Even a total disarmament would not mean that these \$50 billion would disappear entirely from the budget. There would be expenditures for the liquidation of contractual obligations. Quite possibly a national and an international police force would be established which would require financial support. And in all likelihood there would be substantial expenditures for international inspection and control machinery.

At present there are large expenditures classified under national security which would have to be continued and perhaps increased in the event of arms reduction. National security expenditures now include roughly \$5 billion in support of research and development activities. This represents almost 90 percent of all Federal research expenditures and more than half of all research outlays, private or public, in the United States. Many of these research projects have peacetime aspects and could be reoriented. Also the whole nuclear energy program (including the nuclear power program) and the mutual security program are classified as national security expenditures and would be continued, although with a change in emphasis.

Thus, even a comprehensive agreement regarding the reduction of armaments would not mean a complete elimination of what are now termed the national security expenditures from the budget. It would not be unreasonable to assume that with substantial reorientations, such expenditures would be reduced by only one-half (to a total of \$25 billion) by 1965.

2. There are a great many urgent programs in fields other than national security in

which only slow progress is being made due to budgetary limitations. It has been widely recognized that education, health, and training programs are deficient and that our programs for conservation and development of water and other natural resources do not begin to meet the prospective needs (in part, because of the high cost of national security).

While we have embarked on a comprehensive road construction program, our airports and other air facilities are still far from meeting the requirements of the jet age, not to speak of the rocket age.

The spectacular metropolitan and suburban developments have created manifold problems which require an imaginative approach for which no precedence exists in any of the present programs.

The following tabulation presents estimates of cumulative outlays over a 5-year period by Federal, State, and local areas if deficiencies in a few selected areas are to be wiped out and if needed improvements are to be made.

Cumulative expenditure requirements for selected nondefense Government programs over the next 5 years

	Billions of dollars
Education:	
Classroom construction.....	16
Current operation.....	14
Total	30
Highways and skyways.....	75
Urban renewal, slum clearance, low-cost housing and community redevelopment	100
Water supply and conservation.....	60
Health and hospitals.....	35
Other programs (air pollution, research and development, etc.).....	30
Total	330

We do not pretend that these estimates are precise. They represent an evaluation of what would be required to overcome existing backlogs, to provide for anticipated needs over the next 5 years and to allow for essential improvements in these program areas. The estimates are based on reports and studies of private organizations and government agencies for these particular fields. They are quoted to give an idea of the order of magnitude.

Present spending of the Federal, State, and local governments on these programs amounts to about \$30 billion per year. Continuation of this same rate of spending would still leave us at the end of a 5-year period with glaring deficiencies. Even assuming continuation of present national security programs some increase in outlays for these nondefense programs would be possible. It may well be that increased spending on all nondefense programs five years hence may rise from the current level of about \$50 billion to almost \$80 billion without any substantial reduction in armaments. With arms reduction total nondefense outlays may well be increased to \$90 billion. Reduction in armaments, therefore, would make it possible to devote \$10 billion per year more to those purposes where serious deficiencies exist than would be possible if present defense programs had to be continued. Of the \$25 billion reduction in national security expenditures, \$10 billion might be offset by an increase in highly desirable, nondefense related programs.

3. There is a possibility that arms reduction might be associated with a greatly expanded program for credits and technical assistance in support of foreign economic development. Such support may in part take the form not of offsetting budget expenditures but possibly of an increase in public or private capital export. We have no basis for estimating a particular magnitude for such an item but the possibility

of such an increase in outlays offsetting a part of the reduction in defense spending should be kept in mind.

4. After reorientation of some of the national security programs and increases in nondefense programs, \$15 billion would be left for increases in private expenditures. Our projections of private expenditures for individual consumption, domestic business investment, and capital export in 1965 (assuming continuation of present national security programs) amount to \$500 billion. Therefore, a 3-percent increase in these private expenditures would be needed to bring about a complete offset for the reduction in armament spending. Considering that the total Federal, State, and local budgets would be reduced by \$15 billion, a tax reduction of about 7 percent would become feasible. There seems to be little question that with tax reduction an increase in private spending or capital investments would be very likely. Assuming that the whole amount would be available for additional consumer spending, this would make a difference of 2 percent between spendable income, with and without disarmament in 1965.

If politically feasible, a reduction in armament would be highly desirable economically. It would allow the shift of resources from defense production and defense services to urgent peacetime tasks and would permit tax reduction along with the resulting increase in greater consumer satisfaction. However, the magnitude, seen in the perspective of the economy as a whole, should not be exaggerated. With a satisfactory rate of growth (let us say 4 percent per year) production of goods and services in 1965 should be more than \$100 billion (in present dollars) above present levels. This means that with defense expenditures remaining at present levels, \$100 billion will be available for additional consumption, business investment, or nondefense Government services. With a reduction in national security expenditures as detailed in this statement, the possible increase in these goods and services would not be \$100 billion, but \$125 billion. But economic growth would lead to an increase in the potential supply of nondefense goods and services several times larger than the increase resulting from a substantial reduction in armaments.

This reasoning should not be interpreted, however, as suggesting that the transition from an armament race to disarmament would be an easy matter. First, our estimates imply shifts of production from one industry to other industries, often also from one region to another with all ensuing problems of readjustment. These shifts will not come about easily. We need a careful exploration of the areas in which high priority Government programs could take the place of defense procurement and defense employment. There should be advance planning in each of the crucial areas in order to prevent hardship and serious dislocations. There should be consideration as to which of these programs could best be done by the Federal Government, which best by State and local governments. Also the problem of tax resources would require consideration. A reduction in defense spending might permit Federal tax reduction while a considerable part of the increase in nondefense programs might be in areas which were under the traditional jurisdiction of State and local governments.

Some people may feel that disarmament is such a remote possibility that it is not worth while to spend any effort in that direction. To that we answer that none of this work would be in vain. In a period of protracted high-level armament we must make some progress on these nondefense programs anyway. The main difference is merely one of the speed with which we can proceed.

Moreover, unless we have a convincing economic plan for disarmament we cannot

forcefully answer the argument that we fear arms reduction because it may cause a breakdown of our economic system. In the contest between the rival economic, social, and political systems at times the threat of increased armament will be used, at times the promise of disarmament will be used and has been used. Competitive coexistence requires us to be prepared for both strategies.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AND STANDING COMMITTEES SIGNING THE STATEMENT

H. Christian Sonne, chairman of the board, president, South Ridge Corp.

Frank Altschul, chairman of the board, General American Investors Co.

Stanley Andrews, executive director, National Project in Agricultural Communications, Michigan State College.

John A. Baker, director, legislative services, National Farmers Union.

Solomon Barkin, director of research, Textile Workers' Union of America, AFL-CIO.

William L. Batt, Philadelphia, Pa.

J. A. Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America.

Murray R. Benedict, professor of agricultural economics, University of California.

D. O. Bowman, Crown Zellerbach Corp.

J. A. Brownlow, president, metal trades department, AFL-CIO.

Otis Brubaker, director, research department, United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO.

Robert K. Buck, Waukegan, Iowa.

Harry A. Bullis, Minneapolis, Minn.

T. C. Carroll, president emeritus, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Ways Employees, AFL-CIO.

Jacob Clayman, international representative, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

Harlan Cleveland, dean, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University.

Myron M. Cowen, Washington, D.C.

Thomas Craven, Washington, D.C.

Harry W. Culbreth, vice president, Nationwide Insurance.

August Dahme, Aberdeen, S. Dak.

Robert W. Dowling, president, City Investing Co.

Mrs. Katherine Ellickson, assistant director, department of social security, AFL-CIO.

Guy Emerson, Samuel H. Kress Foundation.

Grover W. Ensley, executive vice president, National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.

Ray Eppert, president, Burroughs Corp.

Arval L. Erikson, economic adviser, Oscar Mayer & Co.

Robert Faegre, president, Minnesota & Ontario Paper Co.

Joseph Fichter, farm consultant, Oxford, Ohio.

Sander Genis, manager, Minnesota Joint Board, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Paul S. Gerot, president, the Pillsbury Co.

Carter Goodrich, professor of economics, Columbia University.

W. E. Hamilton, director of research, American Farm Bureau Federation.

J. B. S. Hardman, New York, N.Y.

Rufus C. Harris, president, Mercer University.

A. F. Hartung, international president, International Woodworkers of America, AFL-CIO.

Albert Hayes, international president, International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO.

Leland Hazard, director-consultant, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

August Heckscher, director, the Twentieth Century Fund.

Oscar Heline, Marcus, Iowa.

H. Struve Hensel, Washington, D.C.

A. C. Hoffman, vice president, Kraft Foods.

H. M. Horner, chairman of the board, United Aircraft Corp.

Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.

David Kaplan, New York, N.Y.

E. W. Kieckhefer, editor and publisher, the Daily Plainsman.

Alan Kirk, chairman of the board, Mercast Corp.

O. A. Knight, president, Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers' International Union.

Albrecht M. Lederer, president, A. M. Lederer & Co., Inc.

D. M. Levitt, president, D.C.A. Food Industries, Inc.

J. L. Locke, president, Fisher Flouring Mills Co.

T. G. MacGowan, director of advance planning, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.

Stanley Marcus, president, Neiman-Marcus Co.

John K. Meskimen, Director, Office of Labor Affairs, International Cooperation Administration.

Donald Murphy, director, editorial research, Wallace Farmer.

George Nebolsine, Coudert Brothers.

Lowry Nelson, professor of rural sociology, New York State College of Agriculture, Cornell University.

William H. Nicholls, chairman, Department of Economics and Business Administration, Vanderbilt University.

R. J. Odegard, O. J. Odegard Potato Co.

Charlton Ogburn, New York, N.Y.

Lithgow Osborne, president, the American-Scandinavian Foundation.

Charles Palmer, president, Palmer, Inc.

James Patton, president, National Farmers Union.

Miles Pennybacker, president, Voltarc Tubes, Inc.

Eric Peterson, Bradenton, Fla.

Charles Phillips, president, Bates College.

Clarence Pickett, honorary secretary, American Friends Service Committee, Inc.

Emil Rieve, chairman of the executive council, Textile Workers' Union of America, AFL-CIO.

Beardsley Ruml, New York, N. Y.

Stanley Rutenberg, director, Department of Research, AFL-CIO.

Adolph Schmidt, vice president, T. Mellon & Sons.

James Schramm, vice president, J. S. Schramm Co.

Ted F. Silvey, AFL-CIO Research Department.

Fred Smith, vice president, the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Lauren Soth, the Des Moines Register and Tribune.

Charles Symington, chairman of the executive committee, Symington Wayne Corp.

Wayne Chatfield Taylor, Heathsville, Va.

Lazare Teper, director, Research Department, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL-CIO.

Fletcher Waller, vice president, Bell & Howell.

J. Carlton Ward, Jr., president, Vitro Corp. of America.

Ralph Watkins, director of economic studies, Brookings Institution.

William Wavmack, Adel, Iowa.

George Weaver, assistant to the president, International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL-CIO.

Frank Welch, dean, College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky.

Walter Wheeler, president, Pitney Bowes, Inc.

Robert Whitney, president, Marketing Audits Institute.

David Williams, director, research and education, Americans for Democratic Action.

David Williamson, Chestertown, Md.

David Winton, chairman of the board, Winton Lumber Co.

Obed Wyum, Rutland, N. Dak.

Ralph Yohe, editor, the Wisconsin Agriculturist.

Arnold Zander, international president, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO.

HON. GORDON CANFIELD, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, when our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, GORDON CANFIELD, announced he would not run again for reelection, the thousands of people who love and respect him were a bit stunned and perplexed. They felt that as he had played such an active role in the affairs of our Government, it was unthinkable he should not continue as a part of it. For 17 years he served as secretary to the Member of Congress whom he succeeded and he is now completing his 20th year as an elected Member. A total of 37 years of association with Congress is a long time. He will be sorely missed but his example of courage, honest thinking, sense of fairplay, and his heart of friendship will long endure. His departure will be a loss to the Nation as well as to his many friends in Congress.

The people of his State of New Jersey recognize his worth and the loss to the State that his decision will mean and I am pleased to insert as part of my remarks editorials from the following New Jersey newspapers: Paterson Evening News, Passaic Herald News, Bergen Evening Record, and Newark Evening News:

[From the Paterson Evening News, Dec. 16, 1959]

GORDON CANFIELD RETIRES AND THE DISTRICT LOSES "A CHAMP"

Things won't be the same in Passaic County politics from here on in—at least, in the even years of congressional elections.

GORDON CANFIELD has been the Congressman from this Eighth District through a generation, and only the youngish oldtimer will be able to recall that it was his "boss," the late George N. Seger, who was his predecessor. That was 20 years ago.

Thus, for well-nigh two decades CANFIELD has served us in Washington, and as a public servant and as a Republican candidate every 2 years he was a veritable champion. In the Republican heydays and in the lean years when the magic name of Franklin D. Roosevelt was cutting down Republicans the people remembered GORDON CANFIELD's benefices and he was always top man on his ticket. Some good candidates fell by the wayside before the CANFIELD juggernaut.

The answer was Congressman CANFIELD's dedicated service and, in truth, it was this around-the-clock devotion which has finally determined him to retire from the political wars. To have continued in the only way he knows how to campaign or to serve in office might have permanently impaired his health.

So who can quarrel with his decision not to run again, in spite of the void he will leave

and the heart tug his decision to retire inspires? He has certainly earned the right to call it a day as a candidate after 37 years in Washington.

What was the secret of Congressman CANFIELD's unmatched success? It was being with and for people. It could just as well have been coined in his name when it was said that to have a friend one must be a friend.

Just a few years ago an overexuberant Democratic candidate, seeking to probe the CANFIELD success secret, came up with the bombastic charge that all the Congressman had to offer was his friendship for the little man. That did it—touched off such an atomic indignation among the rank and file of the voters that the ingenious candidate was snowed under.

The "little man" was there at the polls to vote for his friend. It has always been so—no letter unanswered, no opportunity for service ignored. Thousands knew his friendly intercession, his always solicitous concern for the people of his district.

During World War II, Congressman CANFIELD became restive at home. So he shipped aboard a freighter, made the rounds of the camps where his hometown boys were serving, comforted them, brought messages back to anxious loved ones. He braved the dangers of the sea, walked in the historical London blitz, was horrified at the Nazi slaughterhouse in Buchenwald. Here was one man who knew firsthand what he talked about to his people, and they believed in him.

In Congress, Mr. CANFIELD stood up and was counted. He was one of the first to warn of the threat of communism, because he had seen its creeping infection spreading when he was in Europe. He fought for proper defenses, for recognition of missile preparedness. He alone of all Republican candidates was endorsed by labor which constantly was on the Democratic side.

But he was no rubberstamp for any man or any cause. He had courage.

And so when GORDON CANFIELD decides now he cannot rally the strength of another vigorous campaign with all its exactions, when he feels he would like to nestle home with his faithful family and rest a bit on the laurels he has earned, who among us will say him "nay"?

The Eighth District yields him to the inexorability of time only in Congress.

There will be other opportunities for service for this man of decency, integrity, and dedication.

Meantime, all people of good will, regardless of politics, will wish him well as he begins his final year of service in Congress, and among these the News is happy to be counted as delighted that through all his years of matchless service we were his staunch and unremitting supporters.

Of him it will be said with truth, "Well done, thou true and faithful servant."

[From the Passaic Herald-News, Dec. 16, 1959]

GORDON CANFIELD'S RETIREMENT

The retirement of GORDON CANFIELD at the conclusion of his present term in the House of Representatives will mark the end of an era for thousands of Passaic County voters. Mr. CANFIELD's principal asset during a political career which dates back to 1924 has been an ability to make deep and lasting friendships. To many Democrats as well as Republicans in the Eighth Congressional District, the man they know as "GORDON" is a dear friend in whose reelection they have always taken a personal interest.

The same warm feeling toward Mr. CANFIELD is evident in the Congress. In 1955, upon his return after a lengthy absence due to illness, touching tributes were paid to him

by Congressmen of both parties. They also like the unassuming, hard-working, and always helpful GORDON CANFIELD.

Mr. CANFIELD began his Washington career as secretary to the late Congressman Seger, of Passaic. He had been a reporter on the old Passaic Daily News. When "the chief" died, Mr. CANFIELD was recognized as the logical successor. In 1958, Mr. CANFIELD was reelected for his 10th consecutive term. Even though his district is smaller than Passaic County, West Milford and Ringwood being in another district, Mr. CANFIELD polled nearly 10,000 votes more than the top vote-getter among the county candidates, a striking testimony to his popularity. The only time he ever came close to defeat was in 1948 when Charles S. Joelson trailed him by a mere 150 votes.

The legislative interests of Mr. CANFIELD have been the kind that do not make headlines. His particular fields were appropriations, the postal service, the Coast Guard, narcotics, and social security. He is credited with being responsible for the first appropriation to send Government narcotics agents abroad to fight the illicit narcotics traffic at its sources. He was in the forefront for years of those who advocated postal rates.

Mr. CANFIELD is better known for his helpfulness than for his legislation. He helped Clifton to obtain part of the Federal Government's quarantine station tract for a school site. His selection of candidates for appointment to the service academies by means of examinations and interviews conducted by outstanding citizens had popular approval. He was instrumental in unraveling redtape for refugees. One of Mr. CANFIELD's Democratic opponents helped to win his reelection by charging Mr. CANFIELD with only doing little things for little people.

Mr. CANFIELD will take with him into retirement at the end of next year the best wishes of a host who prize GORDON as their friend.

[From the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., Dec. 19, 1959]

AN OUTSIDE PAIR OF SHOES

Passaic County, as almost everyone knows, has gone Democratic almost all the way—freeholders, assembly, State senator. Yet for 10 consecutive terms the Eighth Congressional District, which embraces all of Passaic County except Ringwood and West Milford (in the Seventh), has returned GORDON CANFIELD to Congress, often by impressive majorities.

There's a reason of course. It can be simply stated. GORDON CANFIELD has been a good Congressman. He has just announced he will not run for reelection after his term expires next year. And, while he has earned the right to retirement, Passaic will lose the services of a valued and capable official.

Mr. CANFIELD typifies why party labels do not mean much when voters select their Congressman. Yet few present Members of Congress have been so peculiarly qualified, so carefully prepared for the position. Mr. CANFIELD, a former newspaperman, was secretary to the late Representative George Seger (Republican, Eighth). Mr. Seger coached him painstakingly as his successor apparent; so when Mr. CANFIELD finally did become a Member of the House he knew at the start more about the job than most Members ever learn. And he knew the value of prompt replies to mail, of patient listening, of constant mixing, of elaborate personal interest in every constituent's least contact with government.

Mr. CANFIELD may rarely have been spectacular, but he is thoroughly sound. In all the good connotations of the words, he is the old pro.

[From the Newark Evening News, Newark, N.J., Dec. 21, 1959]

AFTER 10 TERMS

Representative GORDON CANFIELD, the Passaic County Republican who is retiring from Congress after 10 terms, knew a lot about his job before he took it over. He had put in 17 years as a congressional secretary, and his experience paid off in service to his constituency.

When the dean of the New Jersey delegation leaves Washington next year the State will lose an influential voice on the House Appropriations Committee, where he is recognized as an expert in Treasury and Post Office Department matters. He ranks high not only in seniority, with all of its effectiveness in Washington, but in esteem as well.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that his colleagues, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. GLENN, Mr. WALLHAUSER, and Mr. RODINO, all from New Jersey, may extend their remarks immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, we are fortunate in one respect, Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute today to our colleague, GORDON CANFIELD. We are not saying goodbye quiet yet. We shall have him with us for many months to come—to enjoy the warmth of his friendship, the richness of his experience, the generosity of his thoughtfulness and kindness.

I speak from a wealth of personal experience when I cite these qualities. On numberless occasions during my 3 years as a Member of this body, I called on GORDON CANFIELD for help, advice, and information. Never did I come away disappointed. On the contrary, each experience served to impress upon me more deeply an awareness of a really remarkable person—a man who combines the highest ideals of public service with a practical, working wisdom in the ways of politics and government.

I have never known an instance, Mr. Speaker, when GORDON CANFIELD did not know exactly what he was doing and exactly why he was doing it. In a legislative body where procedures are necessarily complex and involved, our colleague has the sure and certain touch, the precise sense of timing, the unerring aim of a skilled parliamentarian.

Despite his mastery of legislative methods, however, GORDON CANFIELD has never sacrificed the purposes and ends of government to the means. His skills have always been in the service of his ideals and the interests of the people he represents. This is the hallmark of responsible politics, the test of effective representative government.

Mr. Speaker, rather than anticipate the tremendous loss to this body that GORDON CANFIELD's departure will mean, it behooves us today to salute a great Congressman and to congratulate ourselves that he will remain with us throughout the crucial session ahead.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I heard of the retirement at the end of this session of our esteemed colleague, the Honorable GORDON CANFIELD, through an editorial

appearing in the Paterson Evening News on December 16, 1959.

This was a beautiful editorial, and has been entered in the RECORD by one of my colleagues of New Jersey. GORDON CANFIELD has been one of my dearest personal friends in my few years in Congress. As a younger member of the New Jersey congressional delegation, I have gone to him from time to time for guidance and help. With his years of experience, his kind and considerate personality, and his smiling radiance, his advice was sound, logical, and always given with a pat on the back, and I felt better after talking with my dear friend, GORDON.

While he was one of the busiest Members of Congress, he somehow found more time than the rest of us to be on the floor of the House so that invariably when we of our New Jersey delegation would appear in the middle of procedure or debate, it was GORDON CANFIELD who would brief us with a short rundown of what was occurring.

The Nation and the State of New Jersey are going to suffer a great loss upon the retirement of Representative CANFIELD, and we of the New Jersey delegation, who have looked to him as our leader, are going to find it difficult to carry on without him.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, as one proceeds through this life the cementing of fine human relationships becomes most important to many of us, and I feel that I have been accorded a high privilege and rare honor to have met, and I hope to have formed a fast friendship with the Honorable GORDON CANFIELD, who has just announced that he will not stand for reelection to this august body after 37 years of service divided between his membership and service to a Member.

I have benefited—as I am certain many others have as well—from his advice and good counsel. However, more important than this, is the outstanding dedicated service that he has rendered to his constituents, to the State of New Jersey, and to the Nation. I salute him as the dean of the New Jersey delegation in this body.

My hope and prayer for him for the future, in which Mrs. Wallhauser joins me, is that he may enjoy years of continuing service to his fellow man and that he and his family will enjoy good health and all of the things that a man of his good character so richly deserves.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my regrets that my very good friend, GORDON CANFIELD, has announced his intention to retire at the end of this session.

Congressman CANFIELD is the dean of our New Jersey delegation. For 20 years he has served in Congress with the highest sense of duty and responsibility. He has been known to all of us as a valued friend, a conscientious legislator, and a dedicated public servant.

To his district, he is known as one whose greatest concern has always been the people and their welfare. His constituents regard him not only as their Representative, but as their devoted friend. They know that he will spare no

effort in their behalf, and that he is always ready with a sympathetic ear and a helping hand.

Congressman CANFIELD has earned his retirement, and we cannot begrudge it to him. But we in the House, and particularly those of us in the New Jersey delegation, will miss his presence and comradeship.

Though he, too, may miss his friends in the House, and the legislative life of which he has been so much a part, it is my earnest hope that he enjoys this new period of his life to the fullest. He will now be able to spend more time with the charming Mrs. Canfield, and to do all those many things which Congressmen miss. We wish him success and fulfillment in his well-earned retirement.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest experiences of my first year in the Congress of the United States was my association with GORDON CANFIELD, dean of the New Jersey delegation. I soon found the personal qualities which for over 37 years endeared him to the people of the Eighth District of New Jersey. His patience, understanding of human nature, his willingness to help wherever possible, his very real love of his fellow man, combined with personal integrity, knowledge of law, devotion to duty, and reverence for the ideals of the American system of government and way of life make him a truly great representative of the people.

I personally shall miss his sage advice and warm comradeship but, more important than my personal loss, is the loss to those whom he served the best—his constituents, his State, and his country.

Speaking for myself and as the Representative of all of the people of the First District of the State of New Jersey, I extend to GORDON CANFIELD our thanks for his outstanding accomplishments in the Halls of Congress and our best wishes for health and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, it was with great regret that I heard last month that our distinguished colleague from New Jersey, Mr. CANFIELD, has decided to terminate his services on Capitol Hill after 37 years as Congressman and secretary.

When I first came to the Hill 20 years ago, as a secretary myself, I had the privilege of living with GORDON at the home of the late, and deeply lamented, former Clerk of the House of Representatives, John Andrews, who was born in my hometown of Salem, Mass.

Many deep associations on the Hill are formed as the result of long tedious work together on committees. GORDON and I did not have such an opportunity. Our relationship was a personal one that evolved into a deeper one with the passage of time. His life with its share of sorrows and blessings became sources of concern and delight for me as he faced different experiences.

He will be missed by all who knew him. He was most friendly, considerate, and cordial in his relations with others. Yet, he was of an independent mind and tenacious in his honest convictions. He was ever ready to listen to any contrary

view but remained firm in his former belief if the arguments to the contrary were not persuasive. There will always be room, and there will always be a great need, for men in the Congress like GORDON CANFIELD.

It is my hope and prayer that he, his charming wife, Dorothy, and his family have many long years of health and happiness ahead. It would be a fitting reward for a man who gave too much of himself in an effort to serve his constituency and his country while he labored here.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the distinguished majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be no legislative program for the balance of this week. We are going to meet every day at least until Thursday—I will not go beyond that—because there is a very important discharge petition on civil rights on the Clerk's desk, so that all Members, both Democrats and Republicans, will have an opportunity to sign the petition.

Mr. HOEVEN. May I inquire whether there will be a session on tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; there will be a session on tomorrow, Wednesday, and Thursday.

Mr. HOEVEN. There will be no legislative business on tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be no legislative business for the balance of the week. Members may govern themselves accordingly. The important business is, if they are going to sign the discharge petition, they may have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. HOEVEN. May I inquire with reference to Tuesday for the reason a Republican conference is to be held in this Chamber at 2 o'clock. I hope we may have finished our business by that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Every effort will be made to cooperate.

Mr. GROSS. What about the home rule petition; is that unimportant?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. All discharge petitions are important. I particularly refer to civil rights because President Eisenhower stressed it so strongly in his message on the state of the Union the other day. We would welcome at least 50 Republican Members signing the petition. At least that number would be welcome.

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

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

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to find out who is entitled to credit for settling that steel strike.

THE LATE WILLIAM C. HULL

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on December 23 of last year, the United States lost one of its most competent and dedicated public servants with the death of William C. Hull, who had filled the post of executive assistant to the Civil Service Commissioners since October 18, 1917. Bill Hull, who served under 9 Presidents and 30 Civil Service Commissioners, became a true friend and trusted adviser to innumerable key Government officials and Members of Congress during his 52 years in Washington. I myself have counted Bill Hull among my close friends for many years.

Having started as a \$360-a-year messenger in 1908, Bill Hull advanced rapidly, and was appointed executive assistant only 9 years later. His competence was matched only by his enthusiasm for his job. He turned down all suggestions that he accept some higher paid position with the statement: "I've loved my work, and I've never thought of changing or retiring."

Bill Hull's dedicated service did not go unnoticed. He gained countless friends and became generally known as "Mr. Civil Service." Washington veterans knew, and newcomers soon found out, that Bill Hull had the answers to all civil service questions. He received frequent, lavish, and deserved praise from superiors, colleagues, Members of Congress, and civic organizations, all of whom found him very agreeable to deal with, as well as absolutely authoritative.

In private life, Bill Hull was a very active and public spirited citizen of Arlington. He worked for the community chest and the Red Cross, and was secretary of the Leeway Citizens Association and past president of the Arlington Civic Federation. In addition, he was vice president of the Arlington Hospital Association at the time of his death.

Bill Hull's death leaves a gaping void in the lives of his family and of his many friends. It also leaves a memory, however, that will serve as an inspiration to future generations of Government employees.

CONGRESSIONAL ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to establish a Congressional Elections Commission composed of three members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. No more than two members of this Commission shall be-

long to the same political party and membership thereof shall be representative of the various geographical areas of the United States. Each member of the Commission shall be appointed for 9 years.

The Commission is authorized to make and maintain temporary and permanent registers of voters having qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is situated, to participate in primary, special, and general elections in the various congressional districts. Qualifications, however, shall be uniform for all persons and without regard to race, color, or national origin.

The Commission is authorized to conduct registration of voters pursuant to the act and to conduct primary, general, and special elections for the Senate and the House of Representatives, first, whenever requested by duly empowered officials of the State in which the congressional district is located, or, second, when the Commission determines that, unless such election is conducted by the Commission, persons having the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature of the State in which the congressional district is situated are likely to be denied their right to vote in such primary, special, or general elections and to have their votes fairly counted.

Whenever the Commission conducts such election it shall be the sole primary, special, or general election for the congressional district for Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and shall be made without limitation by State, local laws or ordinances regarding elections, election procedures, and so forth, the results thereof to be final, subject only to adequate provision for judicial review of elections to protect the rights of all parties.

This legislation is identical to that introduced by Senators HART, McNAMARA, and others. It is the only way to really guarantee full and adequate protection to all citizens of their right to vote in elections so essential to democracy.

Other measures pending will not attack the problem of guaranteeing citizens both the right to vote and their full civil rights so well or completely as this measure. Enactment of this bill will be the most significant advance possible in the field of civil rights and will make sure that citizens will have a right to vote in congressional and senatorial elections.

There is adequate basis in the Constitution and laws of the United States for this legislation. Elections to the Senate and House of Representatives are constitutionally the province of the Federal Government, and only by reason of inaction of the Federal Government and delegation of authority have been conducted by the States. Legislation of this sort was recommended by a substantial majority of members of the Civil Rights Commission, including some from the South.

In many States qualified voters are being denied the right to vote. Legisla-

tion of this sort is now imperative, 90 years after the adoption of the 15th amendment guaranteeing the rights of all citizens to vote without regard to race, color, or national origin. I intend to push vigorously for enactment of this legislation during this session of Congress and will seek to have it appended to the civil rights bill now pending before the Rules Committee when it comes to the floor for amendment and vote.

THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN AND THE HONORABLE LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas was the host to the American Medical Association's national convention in Dallas December 1. On that day several thousand doctors from all States in the Union were welcomed by two distinguished Texans, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker of the House, and the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democratic leader of the Senate.

The speakers were presented by Dr. Louis M. Orr, president of the AMA. In his address, Speaker RAYBURN told the doctors that in all his experience in Congress he had "never seen a man or a woman in that Congress that would acknowledge or say that he or she was for socialized medicine."

The Speaker stated frankly, however, that he had been disturbed and had been a little bit out of humor over the term "socialized medicine," which, he added, "nobody can define."

"There are enough people in the House of Representatives and in the Senate who are opposed to these things to stop them always," he said, "but sometimes there has to be an alternative, and that is when we would like to sit down with you and discuss it with you."

The Speaker urged the doctors to speak for themselves and not through some "hired man" in appearances before congressional committees, because the committees and the House of Representatives "are the best juries that I have ever seen a person tried before."

Doctors, he said, should be more active in civic affairs and politics; should "study your Government" and strive to get better government, by getting "good men and women" elected at the polls.

The Speaker's address, which follows, was direct and the doctors gave him a tremendous ovation at its conclusion. Republican and Democratic doctors alike showered him with compliments on his forthrightness.

REMARKS OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION BY THE HONORABLE SAM RAYBURN, DALLAS, TEX., DECEMBER 1, 1959

Mr. Chairman, President Orr, Senator Johnson, and members of this great association, as was indicated here, I have been around quite a while. People have been good to me and I love them for it. Whether I have been good to them is a matter for

them to decide. I am 39 past. I was never sick in my life, but if there was ever a place where I thought it would be fortunate to become ill it would be right here this morning.

How they would argue across my bed I don't know, but lawyers do that right across the table from each other.

I am happy to be here, and I am happy that you came to Texas.

LYNDON said something about long speeches, and I told him I would take a very few minutes. He said, "Well you said that one time and I was sitting there and you took 30 minutes."

I am glad to speak this morning. To tell the truth, I would rather speak before breakfast than after dinner. I go to many meetings where there is a head table with 30 or 40 people, and I would have to introduce all of them. Some of them want to make a speech, because sometimes there are a good many of their constituents there. Many times I have sat until 11 o'clock, and at that time of night your food is dead in your body, and physically and mentally you are numb.

I was very much interested in President Orr's remarks. I served on one committee in the Congress of the United States for 24 years, a very important one. I was chairman of it 5 years. When I became Speaker I gave up committees.

What we were searching for in that committee all the time was information, and there are groups that come before the committees that are the hardest people on earth to get any information out of because, in the case of these great big concerns, the men who have built those concerns up don't come; they hire some fellow who comes to make a speech to be published in the journal that comes out next to make them a reputation, and they give the committees of Congress little or no information.

Every time a man establishes the reputation of giving the committees of Congress meat when he comes there, he is listened to and he is always welcomed back.

I shouldn't say this because they have been too good to me, but the committees of the House of Representatives and the House of Representatives are the best juries that I have ever seen a person tried before. Those of us who have been there a long time and who love the institution want everybody that comes there to make good. They absolutely suspend judgment on them, give them a fair opportunity and a sympathetic hearing, and when they have had their opportunity, those who hear them are not off many percent in their judgment.

It is the same way with you gentlemen coming before the Congress of the United States. Come yourselves—don't send somebody—because if you do not understand the questions that affect medicine and its practice, some fellow sitting in an office somewhere can't understand it right quick.

I have been more or less disturbed and a little bit out of humor about some talk that has been going around the country for several years, people talking about something that nobody can define. I have served with more than 2,700 men and women since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives in a little more than 46 years. I have never seen a man or a woman in that Congress that would acknowledge or say that he or she was for socialized medicine. And yet sometimes there come out of Chicago documents accusing a whole party of being for socialized medicine.

The first time I talked to one of your presidents, Dr. Gunnar Gundersen, I believe I referred to this matter, and he said it is a wornout, frazzled-out term. He said, "I never have used it, and I never intend to."

There are enough people in the House of Representatives and in the Senate who are opposed to these things to stop them always,

but sometimes there has to be an alternative, and that is when we would like to sit down with you and discuss it with you.

Medicine is not static, because when you are static you are not moving any way except backwards, and medicine, I will say to you, in my opinion has made great progress in the discovery and treatment of diseases in the last several years, greater discoveries in its field than any profession that I know anything about.

I am sorry that it is so hard for brilliant young men to get into medical schools. I don't know exactly why it is, but they write me all the time and ask me to give them a recommendation as to character because I have known their fathers and mothers, that they may establish a character to get into medical school.

I don't know what you are going to do about it. I don't know whether you have the teachers that are competent, whether you can get them together, whether you have the accoutrements, whether you have the rooms in these medical schools, to take in more pupils, but I say this to you, that I think something has got to be done about it. What it is I don't know. Maybe I need your advice about it.

The other sciences and the other professions are bidding high, very high, for the brilliant young men and young women who come out of our colleges and our universities, and they are going to take that line which is very attractive. It is very attractive in compensation—any of the sciences now are. I hope that out of this group of brilliant young men and women that are doctors there will be formed a program that will get these people to make doctors.

I have had something to do with doctors all my life. I had a brother who was a country and a town doctor. He went in a buggy or on horseback in the backland lanes of north Texas any time they called him. He didn't have any office hours, but he had a telephone, and they could get to him.

Of course, now you have got to take people to hospitals, if there are hospitals, and there are not enough of them, and many of your communities will not provide them.

I want to speak to you about another matter for a moment. I was happy that your president referred to it. Just the same as I said before about coming before the committees of Congress yourself, not by some hired man, the same thing applies to politics and government. Don't read and believe some leaf that comes to you, probably written by some prejudiced person. Most of them, of course, would be Republicans, but some of them might be Democrats. I do not free all Democrats from that category, either, because there are a few of them that I don't agree with on everything.

Time was when everybody was a politician. When this Government came into existence, the man on the farm, the man in the shop, the man in the office, was a politician. He knew something about it. We had a simple government, and I often marvel at what was done in Philadelphia in 4 short months, from May 1787 to September.

What would you think today if a group of men having to do with something that affected the people, a political issue, were to meet in a room like this, 59 of them, lock the doors, and not let a picture be taken in there or a stenographer be present or a radio or a television? They would say that they were trying to put something over on the people. But if it had not been for James Madison and his notes published 30 years after the convention adjourned, we would have had no history of the happenings in that convention.

They met there with the great Washington as their chairman, and somebody one time said that wherever George Washington sat, there was the head of the table. Thomas Jefferson quarreled with Alexander Hamilton

across the desk from Washington for a time, but he said that when George Washington had the facts he had the most unflinching judgment of any man he had ever known.

They brought forth a document there, as I have said, in four short months, and it was done by young men, too.

There was one old man in the convention, and that was Benjamin Franklin. He was 81. The great lawyer, Wilson, from Pennsylvania, was 65. George Washington, covered with honors and gratitude by all the people, was 55. James Madison, known as the father of the Constitution, was 36. He came to that convention having read every constitution that had ever been written in any time before that. Alexander Hamilton was 30 years of age. A man named Pinkney from South Carolina came to that convention with a completed proposal for a constitution in his pocket. He was 29 years of age.

They had lived, they had studied, they had thought about politics and government.

I speak to thousands of young people every year. They come to Washington by the thousands, senior classes from high schools and colleges and universities, and one of the saddening things to me is that there are fewer good historians in the United States, even about United States history, than any other thing I know. I tell them, You should study United States history and government in the grade school, in the high school, in the college, in the university and in the rest of your life, and then you won't know too much about it.

You know, the great British statesman Gladstone said that our Constitution was the greatest document ever struck off at one time by the hand and brain of man. I agree with that a hundred percent.

Do you know something? Every time somebody starts out to do something for what I call "the folks" without demagoguery, somebody says, "You are pushing the country into socialism" or "You are changing our form of government."

The people of this country have been so wise that they have not changed that Constitution in its fundamentals one iota. The first 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights were agreed upon by many of the leaders before all the colonies, the 13, ratified that Constitution, and since then it has been amended only 12 times. One of the amendments, the famous 18th amendment, has been repealed. Not one of those amendments affected one particle the principles written into our Constitution in 1787 because our fathers started out a new theory and a new practice in government.

Oh, the Greeks one time thought they were going to have a democracy. They called everybody in, and they tried to write laws and they found out that could not be done. A pure democracy wouldn't work. But these American men said, "We are going to have a democracy in a republic; we are going to have a representative democracy; we are going to fix it so that everybody doesn't go to a convention or a legislature, but we will fix it so that they can choose their representative to go to the legislatures and to the Congress and there represent them and write their laws."

If they are not pleased with that House Member they elect, they can take him out in 2 years. If they are not pleased with the President they can take him out in 4 years. If they are not pleased with a Senator they can take him out in 6 years.

They so arranged it that a third of the Senators come up for election each 2 years. That truly is what they dreamed and what they wrote, they made this a representative government.

Again I say to you, men of intelligence, men who have made their marks in their communities as you have, men who are trusted and men who are loved, if you will

allow your constituents to love you, you can be a great force, a great influence for better government. What you have to do to get better government is to get good men and good women voted for and elected at the polls.

There are a lot of things I could talk to you about, but I do hope you study government. Do not take someone else's word for it. You are as smart and maybe smarter than they are.

I could talk about our international situation, about which I am considerably humiliated and disappointed. I know this, that if I run for office it does not do me any good to be second because I am never sworn into that office.

The Congress of the United States has appropriated billions to make us first, and we are not. We have some bickering among the various departments in Washington, in the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps. We thought we would stop that by passing a law that we thought was going to unify the services and maybe have one man at the head of it.

Of course, the President has the high responsibility over the Secretary of Defense. But there are still jealousies, there are still bickerings. I have been hoping that when we gave them all the money they asked for; gave them the kind of law they asked for, and put a man at the head of it who is supposed to be the head, that someday some man will get in there who will take these warring factions by the scruff of the neck and say, "Get together or get."

Well, I am happy to be with you. I say I have always liked doctors. I had the finest brother that ever lived who was a doctor. I think in all probability the doctor is the first man I ever saw, and I have been seeing them ever since. As I say, I have not needed them because I have never been sick in my life, and I can give you a prescription to give some of your folks, the greatest medicine in the world, and that is a reasonable amount of exercise, all the sunshine you can take, and all the rest you can take away from your labors.

When I am in Washington my burden is pretty heavy. I have 436 other fellows and women to deal with every day. Fifty of them are standing on the floor of the House clamoring for recognition at one time, and I have to study which one I am going to turn loose first, but the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives are just a cross section of the people of the United States who sent them. They are just as good and no better. They are supposed to express their will and their sentiments, and I say if they do not, they take them out every 2 years. But it is your responsibility, it is the responsibility of every citizen under the flag to go to the polls every opportunity he has and vote and elect men and women who will carry out your hopes, your aspirations, and your ambitions, and to rear a group of young men and women in this land whose shoulders will be broad enough, hearts big enough, minds keen enough to know this Government, to carry it on, to serve it, to protect it, and to perpetuate the finest and the freest government that ever blessed mankind.

PROPOSAL TO CANCEL GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has just remarked that we should cancel \$15 billion worth of bonds now held by the Federal Reserve bank on the grounds that they had been paid for.

It is true that they have been paid for but by whom? They have been paid for by the Federal Reserve bank and are therefore owned by the Federal Reserve. If we had the authority to confiscate Federal Reserve funds why not confiscate the social security bonds and all other bonds owned by Federal agencies.

The Treasury does not own the bonds any more than it owns your bonds or my bonds or any workers' bonds or any insurance company's bonds.

It would be completely illegal and unconstitutional to confiscate these bonds.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 540 APPLIES MONROE DOCTRINE TO COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday I introduced a joint resolution to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World. It has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs where I hope it will receive prompt consideration.

Under date of December 30, 1959, I wrote President Eisenhower requesting administration support for the joint resolution and asked him to endeavor to place a declaration of its doctrine on the agenda of the 11th meeting of American States. This meeting was originally scheduled for Quito, Ecuador, next month, but has since been postponed to an indefinite date.

Simply stated, the joint resolution does the following:

First. Recognizes the vital danger to all American nations of a direct or indirect intervention by international communism into any one of them.

Second. Reaffirms the Monroe Doctrine's warning to European nations to keep hands off the two American continents.

Third. Applies the Monroe Doctrine to international communism, whether operating openly or under subversive disguise.

Fourth. Labels any direct or indirect intervention by international communism anywhere in the New World as a danger to peace and security of all American states justifying immediate exercise of these nations' inherent right of self-defense.

Fifth. Authorizes immediate individual or collective self-defense action by the American nations to forestall subversive intervention by international communism anywhere in the Americas.

Sixth. Provides for an inter-American administration of any American nation so rescued from international communism pending restoration of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Threats by international communism to leapfrog the Atlantic and take over countries of the Western Hemisphere both by infiltration of existing governments and by seizing control of liberal revolutionary movements constitutes a clear and present danger. The joint resolution embodies a program of action to meet that danger.

If the Communist efforts to control countries on the American Continents are not thwarted, the United States will become subject to destructive sneak attack from Red missile bases almost within sight of our own southern cities.

Communist regimes in the Caribbean, Central or South America, or any of them, would not alone imperil the United States and its American neighbors. By thus exposing the United States to attack from the south, the relative power of the free world and the Communist empire would be so drastically unbalanced that all Western nations and thus Western civilization itself could be overwhelmed and destroyed.

Each year hundreds of Latin Americans receive revolutionary training in Moscow and are sent back to work ceaselessly to subvert their lawful governments and replace them with regimes dominated and controlled by the international Communist conspiracy.

Their work is apparent today in Panama where our sovereignty over the vital canal is being harassed. The Cuban revolutionary movement daily evidences greater and greater subservience to agents of international communism. The cancer of communism in Latin America was exposed to world view in Peru where Vice President Nixon was mobbed and in Venezuela where he was stoned and spat upon.

The manipulations of international communism in the New World approach closer and closer to obvious intervention upon our continents.

For too long we, as a nation, have left the initiative to Communist enemies dedicated to our destruction. We have waited for their blows to fall, and then only improvised some hasty action to fend them off. In this atomic age only a few microseconds of attack warning may be available to defenders. They are far too short for us any longer to tolerate the possibility of military surprise from missile bases south of our borders controlled by international communism.

This Nation must develop, enunciate, and pursue forthright and effective policies within the inter-American peace structure that will actually keep international communism off the American Continents. In asking for prompt congressional and prompt administration action

on the doctrine of the joint resolution, I am seeking U.S. initiative and action to stop the Reds now, before it is too late. Unless we do so, we permit the stage to be set for a series of Red "back door" takeovers that eventually could engulf not only the Americas, ourselves, but the entire free world as well.

It is our duty to act now and to act decisively to forestall this threat.

It is in our tradition of initiative to achieve and preserve freedom begun in 1776 that we do so.

It is possible for us so to act wholly within the framework of accepted international law and principles.

The joint resolution was carefully drafted with that duty, that tradition, and that possibility in mind. It was conceived by Prof. Samuel Flagg Bemis, Yale University, an outstanding historian and authority on diplomatic relations of the Americas.

The joint resolution incorporates and extends to present facts and situations a long series of inter-American diplomatic policies and declarations from the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 onward.

As did the Monroe Doctrine at its announcement, so today this new doctrine might well boldly symbolize the decisive leadership and firm determination by the United States that alone can forward President Eisenhower's magnificent crusade for peace and friendship in freedom.

Rooted basically in the Monroe Doctrine declaring any attempt on the part of European powers to extend their systems to any portion of the Western Hemisphere as dangerous to U.S. peace and safety, the joint resolution also draws on article 51 of the United Nations Charter recognizing the inherent right of national self-defense and upon inter-American treaties and diplomatic precedents.

The joint resolution spells out clearly what has not been clear before. Namely, that intervention in an American state by international communism is not a mere internal matter pertaining to the victim nation alone, and thus subject to the good-neighbor policy's inhibition against interference by one American state in the internal affairs of another. The joint resolution recognizes and declares that in law as well as in fact such action constitutes a foreign intervention prohibited by the Monroe Doctrine. As such, it is clearly labeled by the joint resolution as a threat to peace and security, and thus subject to counter-intervention and restoration of a free government to the people.

A corollary to the Monroe Doctrine was announced in 1859 by President Grant prohibiting transfer of any existing European New World colonies between them, lest such transfer upset the balance of power against the security of the United States.

Implementation of this corollary by the American states when Hitler's armies overran Europe furnishes precedent for a portion of the joint resolution. In 1939 the American foreign ministers announced there would be no recognition of German claims to oc-

cupied countries' New World colonies. In July 1940 Congress enacted a joint resolution carrying out the foreign ministers' pronouncement. Later, in 1940, the foreign ministers met again, at Havana, and gave a mandate to any one or more of the American Republics on their own initiative to step in, act quickly, and forestall any attempted German takeovers. By convention they also provided for an inter-American committee to administer the rescued territory pending restoration of a free government. These "prompt action" and "provisional government" precedents are found in the joint resolution.

Postwar, by 1947, the need became apparent for orderly procedures to meet certain new dangers to the sovereignty and political independence of American states. These dangers were, first, aggression from each other, or from outside the continent, which is not an armed attack, and second, any other fact or situation that might disturb the peace of the Americas. Based on the self-defense provisions of article 51 of the United Nations Charter, appropriate procedures were adopted for consultation through the Organization of American States, to be followed by such action as might be decided upon by two-thirds agreement. They were made part of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance signed at Rio de Janeiro in 1947, commonly known as the Rio Pact.

The joint resolution incorporates the Rio Pact's acknowledgement that aggression may exist even though it is not in the form of armed attack, and its acknowledgment that other facts or situations also may exist which are dangerous to American peace.

The joint resolution also takes cognizance of the declaration of Washington, 1951, and the declaration of Caracas, 1954, which characterize direct or indirect intervention of international communism in any American state as constituting colonization by a non-American power and thus a violation of its sovereignty and political independence.

However, the joint resolution rejects as inadequate to cope with present dangers the Rio Pact's cumbersome procedure of meeting, deciding, and ratifying a course of action by two-thirds of the foreign ministers of the American states. Delay in forestalling intervention by international communism might well be fatal. Realistically recognizing this, the joint resolution returns to the 1940 Havana precedents for a legal basis for immediate forestalling action to be taken before, not after the fact. It also is this Havana precedent upon which I have based my request to the President to place the joint resolution's doctrine before the Quito Conference in February.

The foregoing review—from the Monroe Doctrine onward—of 137 years of decisive and effective action by the American Republics to protect themselves from dangers from without presents a clear pattern of developing and extending basic policies to meet new and altered threats. It also presents a precedent, a basis in law and an inspiration for equally courageous and intelligent action today. To

that end I seek U.S. action both by the Congress and by the President to implement the doctrine of the joint resolution.

The text of the proposed joint resolution is as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 540

Joint resolution to forestall intervention, domination, control and colonization by international communism in the New World and for other purposes

Whereas the intervention of international communism directly or indirectly in an American republic would constitute a fact or situation threatening the sovereignty and political independence of the states of the entire New World; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, have long since ceased to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power or powers; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, would be in effect such a colonization by a non-American power or powers, and would violate the sovereignty and political independence of an American state; and

Whereas such a fact or situation extended to any portions of this hemisphere would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States and the American continents; and

Whereas in the rapidly developing contingencies of the atomic age there might not be time to assemble a meeting of the Inter-American Organ of Consultation to provide for joint action to repel the danger, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States hereby

Resolve, That if such a fact or situation should present a sudden emergency, then any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance would be justified, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in taking steps to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World.

In case of such defensive measures having been taken by the defending state or states, it or they should report to the Inter-American Organ of Consultation, to the end that an emergency committee, after the manner provided by the Convention of Havana of 1940, be set up for the provisional administration of the state thus defended, pending its restoration to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Just 2 days ago a violent attack both upon the proposed joint resolution and me was made by the semi-official Cuban newspaper *Revolucion*. This quick and violent opposition to a proposal to keep international communism from leap-frogging the Atlantic has but two interpretations. Either it stems from irresponsible oblivion to the dangers of Communist infiltration and subversion in the Americas, or, it represents the official Communist negative reaction to any proposal to thwart its aggressive designs on the New World.

Both the dialectic in which the Cuban newspaper's verbal attack was couched and the quick heat with which it was made reveals the Castro regime has been hit at a sensitive, vulnerable spot. No American nation fears or objects to the Monroe Doctrine's warning to European nations to keep hands-off American

countries. None should fear or object to applying the same warning specifically to international communism operating under subversive disguises.

The source of this attack on the joint resolution is an argument for its prompt passage as well as cumulative evidence of a degree of non-Cuban control and domination of that nation's originally liberal revolutionary movement.

STRIKING AT THE TRUTH IN THE STEEL SETTLEMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time to share with my colleagues some of our feelings and thoughts about the settlement of the steel strike—not from the viewpoint of the terms per se of the settlement, but rather from the viewpoint that the political claims and overtones flowing from the resolution of the strike are patently misleading and, indeed, unfortunate. The steelworkers and the steel union settled and won the strike, and nobody else. But it could have been done so much earlier with so much less cost and suffering except for the unyielding stubbornness of management and a national leadership willing to play politics with our economic welfare.

Perhaps I can best sum up my views by saying it is another striking example of a leadership which is willing to take the second-best course and is attempting to offset this by claiming singular or first-class accomplishments.

Let me say at this point that I believe that the important thing in this election year is not to place before the American people a false, shallow image, but rather to make sure that the American people realize that if they are willing to accept second-best decisions, they will be placing their stamp of approval on a policy of assuring that as a nation we will be second best, instead of best, in virtually everything. I am not willing to accept this second-best philosophy of doing things along the lines of least resistance, and I join my colleagues who feel as I do in fighting against approaches, programs, and concepts of leadership which will have America assuming a second-best posture. We will document this in many fields in the weeks to come.

The steel strike was an example of what I mean. It took place in a basic industry affecting the vitals of the American economy. And it would have been logical, at the outset, for the administration to have acted resolutely and with real leadership. We were faced with the fact months ago that the leadership was failing to evaluate the facts for the American public. To be sure, figures were furnished. However, publishing cold, impersonal figures without proper analysis and application does not do the job of qualitative leadership the American people have a right to expect, and which was certainly demanded in this needlessly drawn out labor-management dispute.

The administration had wittingly or unwittingly given the steel industry its main propaganda weapon behind which it hid—the false issue of inflation, unexplained. And, indeed, the administration's priority push in 1959 for harsh, restrictive labor legislation, in which it met with success, no doubt stiffened the determination of the steel industry. The industry undoubtedly thought that organized labor had been discredited enough for the public to view labor's leadership proposals with lack of sympathy and even suspicion, and that this attitude had likewise seeped down into the pores of the union workers in the steel plants.

This, of course, did not happen. When the fact became crystal clear from polls both by management and the union that the striking union members supported the union leadership, then the settlement was achieved, at a cost to the steel companies much greater than would have been the case if an earlier settlement had been concluded—as witness the Kaiser settlement. Some of you may have read the story in the Washington Evening Star of January 10, 1960, by correspondent Lee M. Cohen.

Not only did the stubbornness of management prove ill advised, but this stubbornness was dramatically costly to the workers involved in the shutdown, and also to thousands of others affected by it, especially small business concerns.

There is a truism in labor-management relations that we should not overlook or slight in our thinking. It is this: A labor union, in negotiating a perishable item, that is, the daily wages and working conditions of men and women, never gets more, however arrived at, than the strength the union commands. And if this truism is recognized, then I think it becomes patently clear that the situation is being twisted in an effort to give the steel settlement a political flavor to enrich certain political fortunes. Let no one be misled that the United Steelworkers of America was handed a favorable decision on a silver platter by certain men in public life. It would, in my opinion, be a grave error for union members themselves and the public in general to fall into such a pattern of thinking.

Yet, no one can deny that a well-planned effort has been made, and will continue to be made, to give, as I have said, a political flavor to enrich certain political fortunes. And I cannot help but believe, Mr. Speaker, that when the public realizes that a great national dispute involving a great national industry was so unashamedly maneuvered, at a high sacrifice to the Nation, that the ultimate effect will be public resentment against such a second-rate leadership job.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am happy to yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California for the statement he is making in regard to the political propaganda over who should take credit for settling the steel strike.

The minds of the American public must well remember the pleas of the steel union leaders 6 months ago for the President to appoint a factfinding board so the public would know the true facts involved. Ex-Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, George Allen, and other steel officials were advising the White House to not interfere with negotiations that were completely one sided. Six months ago Big Steel was spearheading the drive to starve out the workers. They thought that after 116 days plus 80 days under Taft-Hartley injunction the steelworkers would gladly accept the company's last offer when the election took place. By December steel management realized the steelworkers were solid behind their union.

I recall when I went home after the Congress adjourned I attended a mass meeting of steelworkers in my district on Labor Day. I was told then that pressure was being brought to bear on the families of the steelworkers to urge a back-to-work movement in the steel industry. Millions and millions of dollars were spent in the newspapers, magazines, radio, and television to cause the families of the steelworkers to accept the companies' last offer after the Taft-Hartley law was invoked.

They were making fair progress on this until the steelworkers over the Nation realized the terrific pressure that was being brought to bear to defeat and ruin their union in this negotiation fight.

I will tell you when the steel strike was really settled. It was not Vice President Nixon, it was not the Secretary of Labor that settled the steel strike; it was the steelworkers themselves that brought about the settlement of the steel strike.

It started when Orville Kincaid, the subdistrict director of northern Indiana Steelworkers Union, called a mass meeting at Memorial Hall in Gary, Ind. David MacDonald spoke at this mass meeting. There were over 5,000 steelworkers in that hall. A vote was taken on accepting the companies' last offer. Out of the approximately 5,000 steelworkers in the hall, 3 steelworkers stood up in favor of accepting the companies' last offer.

Then is when management was convinced that the steelworkers were going to stick by their union and support their union in its fight for a fair contract involving wages and working conditions.

Let me say this, I only wish the Vice President and the White House had come into the picture last August. It would have saved thousands of steelworker families the privations and suffering they went through during this period of time.

I am glad to hear the gentleman from California take the floor today and outline the real, true facts regarding the steel labor dispute. I really believe that after the landslide vote was taken in Gary, Ind., that the companies' last offer was going to be rejected, right then is when it was decided by big steel to get the Republican candidate for President into the picture.

The White House and the Republican National Committee may think that this

political strategy may offset their all-out support for the Landrum-Griffin bill of last session.

Millions of workers throughout the Nation, especially steelworkers, cannot forget the lobbying pressures by the White House and members of the President's Cabinet preliminary to the votes on the Landrum-Griffin legislation.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am always happy to yield to my friend very briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If what the gentleman from Indiana says is factual, and I assume it is, and we are very near neighbors over in the Methodist Building and have been for years, I cannot understand why the Democratic Party and its spokesmen make so much fuss over this attempt to claim credit due, it has been said, to a Republican candidate. You just give it publicity in arguing about it—create the implication that a Republican really did settle the steel strike. Some of us, myself, for example, did not know that our candidate for Vice President, Mr. Mitchell, had settled that strike. Now you come along and are denying something that I have never heard charged. Or did I hear or read something to that effect? Of course, I have not been around all the time.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan. I am quite sure the gentleman from Michigan is in the very, very small minority, if he did not know or hear about it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, who certainly, of all the people I know, is probably the most expert witness of the truth of what he just said.

In actuality, of course, the politicians did not dictate the terms of the settlement though they are willing to give this impression. If accepted as fact, this might, at a later time, be used as a bad or ill-advised precedent, because political or leadership responsibility is not to assume the actual task of settling the terms of a dispute but to assume the responsibility to see that collective bargaining really works.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I feel we should strive to work for an improved system of labor-management relations. This cannot come about when national leadership is turned off and on for short-term political advantage to the detriment of a long-term national proposition.

Mr. Speaker, a nation is no more outwardly strong than the true sum of its inner strength. Let the day never come when we or our children will say "it might have been different if only we had known." Our people do not want to be second best to anyone in anything. Our duty, with the help of others, is to be sure they can know in time to do something about it in 1960.

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

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker and Members of the Congress, first I want to announce for those who do not know it that I am a member of Local No. 1272 of the United Steelworkers of America. In 1936 I helped to organize the steelworkers of America.

Who settled the 1959-60 steel strike?

In Washington we hear of many claiming credit for this—and in the papers and over the airways names are being dropped continuously.

Actually the answer is very simple, but very few have mentioned it at all.

The 500,000 members of the United Steelworkers of America settled the strike.

The wives of those steelworkers—like the wives of the mineworkers of former years—stood by their husbands, encouraged them, recognized the need for united action in order to maintain job security in the mills, and managed to feed and clothe their families for the duration of the strike. These women cooperated 100 percent with their husbands in the struggle for principles.

The elected officials of the local unions are to be commended too, for they kept their members informed of the facts, aware of the pitfalls, and united to the last man. They proved, by their leadership and their help, that they were worthy of the confidence the members had placed in them.

The district directors and their staffs never hesitated in assisting the local unions in their districts and were available at all times to cooperate and counsel when needed, and they served as a direct line to the international offices in specific instances.

And last, but not least, the international leadership, under the direction of McDonald, Hague, and Abel—these men awakened the public in general as to the real issue of the strike, not inflation, but "work rules and job security."

These are the people who settled the steel strike.

Management, in its effort to "inform the public of the facts," did not hesitate to spend millions of dollars. They took full-page advertisements in the Nation's newspapers, their financially sponsored newscasts never hesitated to slant certain angles of the news, both on TV and the radio. They invested heavily in propaganda.

Management even went to the membership of the union with "personal letters" in which they said they wanted "our workers to have the true facts."

The leaders of industry knew there was a difference of opinion within the union, and they did their best to capitalize on that difference. They maligned the international leaders of the union, they agitated at local union levels, they even tried to promote a back-to-work movement by the wives. All of this, however, was to no avail.

They were not successful in their attempt to brainwash either the public or the membership of the union.

What management did not know or realize was that, although a new generation of steelworkers now comprised the membership of the union, most of the present-day members are sons of former

steelworkers and former mineworkers, and their wives come from union homes, too.

The leaders of industry did not count on the solid front they found in the union. They did not know that today's union membership recognized the old saying of "solidarity forever, our union makes us strong" just as fervently as did their fathers and uncles in the yesterday.

They were so wrong, these men of management, in underestimating the strength of the union and the loyalty of the members.

Starting last June, before the contract had expired and before the strike was called, Messrs. McDonald, Hague, and Abel asked President Eisenhower to appoint an impartial board to investigate the facts on both sides of the dispute and make the facts public. The President refused their request then and again in September and in October.

Mr. Blough, of the United States Steel Corp., had continually stated that he wanted no interference from "an uninterested third party," and so the President agreed to let "collective bargaining follow its normal course."

However, when the Taft-Hartley Act was finally invoked and a board of inquiry was appointed by injunction, there was no objection by Mr. Blough or the other members of industry. But that board could not do the impossible; it was not able to move the immovable Mr. Cooper and his associates, for they believed they could destroy the union.

For some reason industry and management still felt very confident that once the men returned to the mills and work they would remain there; they would not want to go out again, nor would their families permit them to do so. The negotiating team for industry was sure that with the secret vote the leaders of the union would be repudiated and the companies' last offer would be gladly accepted.

The union sent out a sample vote ballot and the industry did a little checking of its own, too. The companies were amazed with the outcome of their survey. The men in the mills were overwhelmingly with the union leadership and they were going to refuse the last offer.

So the companies were forced to do, in January, what they had refused to do last June—they turned to the Government for help. I think it safe to say that in order to save face they appealed for intervention by a third party.

Who settled the steel strike?

The dues-paying members of the United Steelworkers of America, with the help of their wives and families and their faith in their union leadership—that is who settled the strike.

Now let us all join in singing "Men of Steel."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank my colleague.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes; I will yield for a short question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just one little question. It is somewhat like a

hypothetical question. I understand you have intimated that politics has been injected into this settlement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I did not intimate it. I meant to say it frankly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That stimulates my perhaps inactive mind. I have not finished the question. Recalling that in what was thought to be a somewhat tight campaign the Democratic Party received from John L. Lewis \$350,000, my question is: Is there anything unusual about politics or politicians or labor leaders becoming involved in labor disputes in an election year?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will say to the gentleman that the circumstances are quite different. I am sure if we go back to ancient history we could go on for some time, and I would rather talk about the present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes? The answer is obvious.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], also a member of the committee.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

I join my colleagues today only to make a few observations on the implications of the steel settlement insofar as they affect the American way of life.

We are happy to see the steelworkers back at work and more than happy to know that it means a little more of life's comforts for the steelworker and his family.

No one can take away from the workers the credit for their victory. It was an example of sacrifice and courage. No one makes money during a strike and yet, even the most severe critic must admit that the high standard of American wages has been set through the process of collective bargaining which has had to resort to the strike procedure in almost every breakthrough to higher ground in our national scale of living.

However, this is no time to review the history of the American labor movement or the trials and tribulations of the men who have headed the historical strikes and negotiations of the past two generations.

It is sufficient to say that Dave McDonald was faced with one of the toughest situations in our recent labor-relations history.

The steel strike, either by design or accident, came hard on the heels of the greatest expose against labor unions in our entire history. For months, the public had been hammered with stories of corruption, wrongdoing, malpractice and almost everything that would tend to create the belief that labor leaders were selfish, arrogant, crooked, detestable and un-American.

Congress, always willing to be re-elected, and seeking the popular side of an issue, overwhelmingly passed the Landrum-Griffin version—the Kennedy labor reform bill.

In the face of all this public reaction against labor unions, fomented by the McClellan committee activities, McDonald and the steelworkers ran into a stonewall attitude on the part of steel

management who had worked up a program based upon the expediency of the moment.

This program was aimed at cutting the heart out of all future labor contracts. The fight was based upon an attempt to take away from the unions any right to discuss, negotiate or in any way interfere with work rules, layoffs, job changes, production quotas, age limits, seniority preferences in job selections and others heretofore subjects of labor-management relations.

This was not a single effort on the part of the steel companies. It was and is part of a well conceived, well financed plan of action by organized management that extends beyond the borders of this great country.

Following are just a couple of stories out of *Business Week*, November 28, 1959, issue:

DU PONT SUBSIDIARY IN ARGENTINA SETTLES STRIKE WITH 30 PERCENT

A U.S. chemical subsidiary lost a lot of production this fall when it got caught in a crossfire between the Argentine Government and labor. The uproar quieted down this week, and output has resumed.

President Frondizi's regime is committed to holding the line against inflationary wage increases. Last June, when employees of Ducilo S. A. du Pont's synthetic fiber producer, demanded wage increases, the company offered a 30 percent across-the-board raise, if accompanied by changes in work practices that would increase productivity.

The union refused the productivity demand but did not strike until September, when 2,500 workers went out as part of the general textile strike called by the Argentine textile workers union to protest government economic policies. Before the strike, slow-downs practically paralyzed the company.

The Argentine Government ordered the Ducilo workers to negotiate an agreement, but union leaders refused to show up for mediation meetings. The Minister of Labor then declared the strike illegal.

Last month Ducilo dismissed the workers. When the company started recruiting a new labor force strikers lit bonfires on roads to the plant, stoned buildings, and attacked job applicants.

Later in the same issue we read this:

British labor's campaign for a shorter workweek (*Business Week*, Nov. 7, 1959, p. 138) moved forward on one front this week but got stopped cold on another.

Ford Motor Co., Ltd., agreed to cut the work week from 42 to 41½ hours without loss of earnings. The company refused to grant a third week of vacation with pay and asked the union to cooperate in getting better output and workshop discipline.

In contrast, the shipbuilding industry turned down union demands, saying labor had not shown readiness to eliminate restrictive labor practices.

In the past, the industry, threatened with a strike, has given in to labor demands. This time, observes *Bellevue* management will be adamant.

You will note the parallel lines in the situation here, in Argentina, and in England. Governments, holding what they call the line against inflationary wage increases, management dealing for complete control over production, hours, quotas, and so forth.

It appears that American producers who have moved into foreign countries are going to use their concessions in

other countries to break down the American standards of labor-management relations as we know them to be.

If Big Steel could succeed in their organized plan to take the unions out of management practices where they affected the welfare of the union member, then it would not be long before the union member awakened to the practical fact that his union membership was more of an honorary membership than a forceful, mutually beneficial association of fellow workers.

With laws pertaining to minimum wages, maximum hours, unemployment compensation, injured workmen's compensation, social security, retirement benefits, unfair labor practices plus Walsh-Healey, Taft-Hartley, Davis-Bacon, and the Landrum-Griffin statutes, a labor union has only wages and working conditions to really bargain for.

If management can get a few more Federal laws on seniority, vacations, maximum pay schedules to hold the imaginary inflation line and then get the steel companies' formula on production practices about the only thing the unions will have left will be the right to hold a parade on Labor Day.

While all of this was going on, the public knew little of the terrific pressures McDonald and his steelworkers were under. Almost every medium of public expression was yelling for a settlement at any price—preferably the company version.

Men in the labor movement, members and officers alike, know the hard facts behind the strike. They knew that the wage issue was secondary to the issue on fundamental jurisdiction on work practices.

Knowing this, the workers suffered great personal financial hardship with a strike of over 3½ months. In my extension of remarks, I expect to cover this more fully.

Then came the tussle of overinvoking the compulsory work clause of Taft-Hartley. The companies finally won the court tests and the workers were ordered back to work.

In the meantime, the company position started to disintegrate and more and more of the producing companies started individual negotiations with McDonald and the steelworkers.

Seeing their position slipping away from them, the steel companies had to have a graceful way out.

Lo and behold, America woke up one fine morning and found the strike settled. Who settled it? Who pulled the miracle? Who was the genius who got the union a raise and made the steel companies back down?

According to radio, TV, and the press, it was none other than the Republican candidate for President of the United States—the country, not the steel company—RICHARD NIXON, that great broken-political-field runner whose training in California politics running against Helen G. Douglass and his wit-matching episode with Nikita Khrushchev and his ability to dodge Venezuelan hecklers made him a qualified negotiator in a situation such as this, particularly in an election year.

How did he settle this great issue? Well, according to the TV broadcast last Thursday morning that I listened to, he did it by "laying the cards" on the table and pointing out what would happen to both labor and management if they did not sign before Congress passed some sort of a labor bill, probably an antitrust, compulsory arbitration, and a prohibitive measure against strikes in so-called basic industries.

In the face of this kind of a threat and the political advantage that would accrue to their candidate, the steel companies backed up—to a well prepared fortification in the rear—and signed up.

Labor, of course, was jubilant and McDonald won his point without losing a man.

Some partisan politicians are condemning labor for allowing the Republican candidate to grab all the glory in this great strike settlement. However, that was before McDonald disclosed that the father of the announced Democratic candidate, Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, had also played a very important behind-the-scenes part in the negotiations.

This made it nonpartisan, but it did not wipe out the grave and serious precedent set by the front page stories that could establish a new basis for settlement and negotiation in labor disputes.

I agree with McDonald of the steel union when he said "everybody likes a little help," and I also agree and applaud the help given by both Nixon and Mr. Kennedy.

But he might have been following the advice given years ago to a young man, who is in this room today, when he was seeking election to an executive position in a large international union. The only man who had enough votes to elect him was particularly and personally obnoxious to this individual. And, he did not want to seek his help. However, in speaking to an oldtime labor leader who had been successful in his own field for many years, he was given this advice. He said, "Whether you like the man or not has nothing to do with it, because in getting the election that you are after, you will be able to do some good. So, my advice to you is, deal with the devil to win, then kick the devil out." He might have been listening to that advice.

The point I want to make though is that, if the basis of the settlement was the fear of congressional action and the threat by a high Government official, that unless an agreement was reached, reprisals in the form of abusive or restrictive legislation would be invoked, then, sirs, we have drifted a long way from free enterprise and free labor.

I would be first to applaud a settlement of a strike, but by the same token, I would be the first to condemn the injection of governmental threats as a common practice in labor disputes.

We would soon get the same kind of labor relations that Russia and other freedom-suppressing nations have if the elected officials in this Government of ours can threaten any labor organization with reprisals by law and force a settlement with any industry. Today, yes, according to all that we hear, labor

has gained a point. Tomorrow they may lose a point. This is not the kind of negotiation where threats ought to be made by anybody.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for yielding to me and also for obtaining this time to comment upon the settlement of the steel strike.

Mr. Speaker, I think it might be well to review the fact that the President repeatedly over a period of 106 days said that "we have got thoroughly to test out and use the method of free bargaining." Through those 106 days the steel strikers each lost an average of about \$2,000, for what he thought was his economic right.

Now, I ask you if the steel companies themselves lost anything during those 106 days, and I will let the financial reports of the steel companies and the Wall Street Journal tell the story of their year's profits for 1959. I think you will find out that those profits as related in the Wall Street Journal will show you that the steel companies did not lose money in 1959, due to the accelerated production of steel in the first 6 months of 1959 and due to the monopolistic control of steel prices. If I buy a steel beam from the Kaiser company at Fontana, 60 miles from my home in Los Angeles, I pay the same price for it that I pay for the same type of steel beam that comes from Pittsburgh. You can call it monopoly, you can call it Pittsburgh plus, f.o.b., or anything you want, but the fact remains that there is a managed price in the steel industry which has brought to them the greatest profits that they have ever had in the history of their operation. In 1959, when they only operated at 58 percent of capacity, they made more profits than they made in any previous peacetime year, and they did not cut their price one dime. Under your old law of supply and demand, when your supply becomes plentiful, you cut prices so that you can get bigger distribution in the market, but this does not seem to hold true in the steel companies.

I want to compare the President's position that "we must not interfere with free collective bargaining in the steel strike," when he waited for 106 days while the steel companies and the wholesalers made extraordinary profits on their inventories, and the steelworkers suffered a loss, with the shipping strike where, in exactly 6 days after the shipping workers went on strike, the President invoked the Taft-Hartley Act. Six days in one instance, while he was talking about free collective bargaining, and 106 days in the other. I would like to have someone explain the consistency of the President's position in letting free collective bargaining work for 106 days in one instance and then preventing it from working after 6 days in another instance.

There is a very simple answer to that. The steel companies were not hurting during those 106 days, but you cannot stockpile shipping services. The ship-

ping firms were hurting. That is the basic difference between invoking the Taft-Hartley Act in the case of the shipping strike and not doing it in the case of the steel strike. In my opinion, this shows the completely hypocritical position of the administration.

Now there is the question of who settled the strike. That is going to be dwelt upon at length today. We know the newspapers gave two gentlemen who may be the presidential and vice presidential candidates of the Republican Party the credit for settling this strike. The newspapers are owned by Republicans and you can expect that.

I happened to ride back from Los Angeles—I think it was on the third day of January—on the same plane that carried the candidate for president of the Republican Party. The plane made a world's record of 3 hours and 39 minutes. What did the headlines say? The headlines did not carry the fact that the Boeing 707 jet made a world's record of 3 hours and 39 minutes. It carried the fact that the Vice President of the United States was riding on the plane that made the record. This is just a foretaste of what you are going to have all during 1960. Every instant, every event will be twisted to a headline in favor of the presidential candidate on the Republican ticket.

The real fact is that a poll was taken just before the settlement of the steel strikers and 96 percent of them said that they were going out on strike when the Taft-Hartley period was over.

The next thing is that certain people do not want a strike in 1960, because that is an election year and it will not set well with the people of the United States to have the theme of peace and prosperity disturbed. So undoubtedly there was some pressure upon Mr. Blough and some of the other gentlemen of the steel companies. But I want you to note very carefully that Mr. Blough and others said that, "We do not have any present plans to raise steel prices." No; they will not raise prices, in my opinion, until after the election in November. And then you are going to get your steel price rises. Do not think for a minute that you are not going to get them.

I advise any of my friends who want to read something good, to look at the January 7 edition of the Christian Science Monitor, an article entitled "Steel Executives Scowl at Contract." In one of the paragraphs it says:

In fact, it now is pretty obvious that the companies have signed new contracts at a price that would have brought settlements much sooner, and without a strike.

That is the real guts of the situation. One of the senior Senators on the other side of the Capitol quoted a noted commentator as follows:

The strike was not settled by free bargaining. It was settled by a political fix.

Mr. Lippmann was the commentator and his complete article is worth reading.

The American people are not going to be fooled in 1960, in my opinion, by the Madison Avenue publicity men.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank my colleague from California.

May I say in conclusion that so far as I am concerned the important thing for us to remember from this steel strike is not just a negative attitude but a positive attitude. There can be no question that there is a serious problem that faces the Nation to improve management-labor relations with respect to collective bargaining.

I think the important thing to remember is that if we go into this or settle this on the basis of threats or on the basis of political advantage we will be doing our country a tremendous disservice. If, on the other hand, we can approach management-labor and Government's part in these proceedings from the point of view of bringing the machinery up to date in order that it may match machinery created in other countries, and achieve greater productivity in our country, more efficiency, and a higher standard of living, then I think we will have done our job for future generations.

BOMBING ATTACKS ON SCHOOLS AND CHURCHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. IKARD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge once again that the Congress recognize the fact that our Nation's most basic and sacred principles are being challenged and threatened by the continuing predilection of an increasingly insolent lunatic fringe to settle differences of opinion by dynamite.

According to an excellent study that was published jointly by the American Friends Service Committee, the National Council of the Churches of Christ, and the Southern Regional Council, 30 homes, 4 schools, 7 churches, 4 Jewish temples, and a YWCA building were bombed in the South during the period from 1955 to 1959. In addition, there were a few bombings in the North, several unsuccessful bombing attempts in the South, and an epidemic of macabre bombing hoaxes throughout the country. The study does not include the most recent outrages, such as the bombing of the Little Rock school board last September. The sickening outbreak of swastika signs on synagogues in Germany and in the United States within the holiday season—when the spirit of good will toward men should be strongest—underscores the gravity of current conditions.

It is obvious that we are dealing with more than just a few isolated outbursts of madness. We are dealing with a small but determined group that seeks to introduce alien methods into the political and social life of America. Our Nation is deeply committed to the precept that controversies among ourselves can and must be solved peaceably within our legal framework, in which reason prevails. This precept is now being challenged by men who are contemptuous of the law and bereft of reason. They know that they cannot convince the reasonable and the civilized with their wild,

incoherent harangues. Consequently they have decided to attack civilization itself with the most destructive weapon at their disposal: dynamite.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there can be no other logical explanation for these attacks on schools and houses of worship. Such buildings are symbolic of the very essence of our civilization. The barbarians who attack them are on their way down to the level of totalitarian bully boys whose favorite hobby is the desecration of cemeteries.

The ominous nature of the destructive crimes under discussion is in itself enough to make these acts a matter of national concern. There are, however, more concrete reasons for Federal intervention. In the first place, dynamite is not an item that is likely to be readily available in most communities. It may be safely assumed that the perpetrators of the bombing crimes bring their dynamite in from remote sources, and that the explosives cross at least one State line before they reach their target. We do not permit dope to circulate freely in this country; there is no reason to be any more complacent where dynamite is concerned.

In the second place, police have found that many of the bombings are the work of dynamite experts. The conclusion is inescapable that these merchants of destruction travel from State to State in the pursuit of their evil objectives.

Nevertheless, it has been said that Federal intervention is unnecessary since the States are capable of handling the problem without Washington's assistance. Unfortunately, the record does not support this point of view. The wave of major and minor bombing incidents that started in 1954 shows few, if any, signs of abating. It is difficult to say whether local measures have been halfhearted or inept; the fact remains that they have been largely ineffective. There have been few indictments and even fewer convictions. In many instances, there is overwhelming evidence of police laxity. The record shows, for instance, that the home of a Southern lady, who had the audacity to suggest publicly that extremism might not be the only approach to race relations, was three times the target of bombing attacks in a period of four days. The first two bombs failed to explode, but the third bomb did severe damage to the lady's home. It is impossible to believe that this depravation could not have been prevented if local authorities had been adequately vigilant. It is also difficult to understand why there were no convictions in this case and in so many other cases.

The bombing epidemic is not confined to the criminals who actually put their evil theories into practice. On the fringes, there are countless shadowy figures with wicked or warped minds who perpetrate bombing hoaxes in order to disrupt classes, break up religious services, and to spread fear and terror. They, too, must be stopped.

It is up to the Congress to take the lead in ending the bombing epidemic and all its side effects. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that H.R. 465, which I introduced during the first session, will en-

able the Federal Government to deal effectively with those who would replace the rule of reason with the tyranny of terror. The bill would make it a Federal crime to import, or transport in interstate commerce, any explosive with the knowledge that it is intended for illegal use. It would also make the possession of such explosives punishable by Federal law. In addition, the bill provides for Federal prosecution of persons who knowingly impart false information regarding attempts to commit acts that are prohibited by this legislation.

Enactment of this bill will take the dynamite out of the hands of the lunatic fringe; it will restore the exclusive rule of law and order; and it will prevent the catastrophes that are bound to occur if the school and church bombers go unchecked. The situation is critical. We cannot afford to let it simmer any longer. We must act rapidly and decisively. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we do so by enacting H.R. 465.

CUBA: PATIENCE?

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

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the island of Cuba is an independent nation close to the United States in many ways. The Cuban people have the right to choose their own form of government, their governing officials, and to enact and enforce their own laws.

By revolution they sought a form of government free from oppression with guarantees of free speech, free press, free elections, and laws that would afford justice to all.

A year ago the world received word that the Castro revolution was successful, and Dr. Castro proclaimed "a new day for the people of Cuba." Everyone was hopeful, knowing, however, that there was obviously a tremendous task ahead. Constructing a free government from the rubble of civil war and the high-pitched emotions that ensue is no easy task; certainly not a part of the victory to be accomplished overnight. Such success would only emanate from justice, patience, and fortitude through the prudent leadership of responsible governing officials whose aims and actions were intelligently directed in consort with unexcelled moral conscience and acknowledged practices of good government.

Friends of Cuba and freedom-loving people the world over have watched and waited hopefully for evidences of freedom, stability, organization, and administration. Dr. Fidel Castro, the great revolutionary general, still maintains the primary responsibility for carrying out his promises. Although there have been many signs and words that have left encouragement in this regard, other actions and statements have created a state of consternation.

Recently there have been numerous cases of the questionable arrest and detention of Cubans, American citizens, and others. One such incident shocked the entire free world when Jim Bu-

chanan, a staff writer for the Miami Herald, a Knight newspaper published at Miami, Fla., was detained, imprisoned, tried, and convicted while in Havana, Cuba, covering a news assignment. After being imprisoned for 12 days without charges in a freezing cold prison cell with light rations of horrible food, Mr. Buchanan, on the 13th day, was driven some 100 miles to Pinar del Rio. There he was tried an hour after arrival and by midnight found guilty of "concealing information." A military tribunal rendered a 14-year sentence. This was suspended on condition that Mr. Buchanan, a frequent visitor and longtime friend of Cuba, leave Cuba, never to return.

Maybe the Cubans have gained much through some of the Castro reforms. I certainly hope so. But continuation of "revolutionary methods" by an administration which is extremely popular at home hardly seems justified after a period of 1 year.

Certainly the doings of our closest neighbor are of concern to all of us. Cuban-American relations have always been of particular interest to me, more so since I serve on the Inter-American Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Miami is the gateway to Latin America. Our people have prided themselves in understanding the people of Cuba and Latin America. It is this bond which has kept me from speaking before and I speak now only with compassion and hope, for we are bound historically and on fundamental principles of government. But how patient can we be? For how long? Perhaps it is better to say, how patient can the Cuban people be?

Our relations may be strained, but we as a matter of policy did not make them that way. As John S. Knight, editor and publisher of the Knight newspapers says:

We must never be tempted into believing that United States-Cuban relations have deteriorated to the point of no return. Historically, the two nations have long been friends. As so it must be again.

Top newspapers throughout the world have given page 1 prominence to a series of articles written by Jim Buchanan following his return to this country. The articles were available to the Associated Press clients over the world. The worldwide printed accounts attest to the interest in Cuba's struggle for freedom for her peoples, the freedom of the Cuban press, as well as the world's press.

Here is the story as told by Jim Buchanan in his day-by-day prison diary and articles:

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 27, 1959]

DOES CASTRO KNOW THE FEAR HE IS CREATING?—INSIDE VIEW OF GROWING CUBAN STATE

(By James Buchanan)

If you're uncertain but concerned about the road the new Cuba is taking, come with me inside one of Fidel Castro's secret police jails.

Let me introduce you to some of the Cuban citizens who have lost their liberty, their property, and may lose their lives—because of a "crime" we in the United States wouldn't recognize.

Their crime?

Nothing more than being accused of anti-Castro-activity or displaying their anti-Castro sympathies.

Not all the stories I heard night after night lying in a secret police cell block are true, of course.

Some were deliberately planted by cell "stool pigeons" to gain my confidence and see if I'd confide my thoughts about Castro's new regime.

But the stories I'll relate of neighbor spying upon neighbor in a campaign of fear and suspicion are the ones I have been able to check and authenticate since leaving my Cuban jail.

Cuba isn't yet a police state, but the network of spies and jails is being organized in a pattern that threatens to smash the hopes and prayers of thousands of Cubans.

I first began to know and love Cuba and her people 2 years ago, when a tyrant named Fulgencia Batista held an iron grip on the island and the two Castro brothers were trying to rally support in the hills of Sierra Maestra.

Eighteen months ago I lived as a newsman in those hills with Raul Castro and his troops—heard them talk of their dreams and ideals.

I was on hand in happy Havana last New Year's Day when Batista at last had fled and the people prepared to welcome a new leader with hope in their hearts.

During the past 12 months I have visited Cuba often as a reporter and noted an increasing concern that she may have traded one dictator for another, though a much more popular one.

That concern was emphasized during those first few hours after my arrest on December 10, after I had found and interviewed Austin Frank Young, an escaped anti-Castro adventurer before Cuban authorities knew his whereabouts.

I sat and waited for what I expected to be my early release.

As I waited, I got the shock of tactics once used by German SS police under Adolf Hitler getting a replay in this Cuban secret police headquarters just 90 miles from Key West, United States.

I saw long lines of informers patiently waiting, as they did night after night, to tell stories about their neighbors to Castro agents.

I saw a 14-year-old boy thrown into my cell and confined for 4 days, because a woman had accused someone with a similar name of being a member of the hated "Tiger" army, the private strong arm of ex-dictator Batista.

I watched tears come to the eyes of once respected businessmen-prisoners, as they saw their property confiscated by the government because they had spoken out of turn about the Castro regime.

Let's look first at the case of 14-year-old Armando Cruz Gonzalez. His name was supplied by a woman informer and his address given as a certain block in downtown Havana.

Armando was picked up at home and tossed in our cell. His protesting parents simply were told Armando had been a longtime member of Batista's Tigers.

I looked at our cellmate Armando, and wondered. He was a scared, fuzzy-cheeked 14-year-old.

For 4 days he was in our cell. No charges. No attorney. No visitors. And no questioning by police.

Finally, on the fifth day, he was released. "We have been unable to find your accuser," secret agents told him simply.

There are other, more frightening cases I'll discuss later.

But as I looked at Armando I wondered—does Fidel himself know how far his subordinates have gone in carrying out his every emotional whim?

It did not make me bitter, only disturbed that the men the world had hoped could lead

Cuba from the tyranny of Batista are feeding their revolution with the old fires of hate and distrust.

They are fires that are starting to kill free speech, cripple the free press, and may set Cuba back where she was in 1958 under Batista—afraid to talk, afraid to listen, afraid to act, and almost afraid to live.

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 28, 1959]

CUBAN JUSTICE BASED ON UNSUPPORTED ACCUSATIONS—INFORMERS GET IN LINE TO BETRAY NEIGHBORS

(By James Buchanan)

I can look back and see them even now in Cuba:

Men and women and children standing in line outside secret police headquarters in suburban Havana to tell officials of a neighbor's infidelity to Premier Fidel Castro.

They'll be there tonight just as they were every one of the 13 nights I watched them from the barred door of my cell.

You can roughly determine, just by looking at the length of the line, how many persons will be jailed the following day.

Jose Arago was one of these persons trapped by this frightening system of neighbor spying upon neighbor.

An intelligent, middle-aged man who owned a theater on La Rampa, Havana's fashionable shopping street, Arago made two mistakes one morning.

As he told me about it in our cellblock one night, here is how he got into trouble in less than 10 minutes:

Arago, a permanent guest of the Habana Hilton Hotel, walked into the dining room carrying a copy of the outspoken Cuban newspaper, Avance, whose Editor Jorge Zayas is one of the few newspapermen who doesn't hesitate to criticize Castro.

That was mistake No. 1, for a hotel waiter told Arago he was reading the wrong newspaper.

Mistake No. 2 came when Arago, a Columbia University student for 3 years, declared he was entitled to his own opinion.

The same afternoon he was arrested by DIER (Cuban secret police) as a counter-revolutionary.

The next morning in our cell he read in the newspaper *Revolucion*, Castro's official mouthpiece, that his theater had been confiscated by the government. The action came under a new law announced by Castro permitting his regime to take over the property of anyone arrested for counter-revolutionary activities.

At that, my cellmate proved to be more fortunate than some. A few days later Arago was permitted to walk out of jail, following his "lesson" on the new Cuban Government's justice.

He never was officially charged, never tried. Yet he lost his property for daring to speak critically of the Government to a hotel waiter.

Incredible?

Perhaps it is. But cases like these are happening hourly. The list of confiscated Cuban property is growing.

Who are these secret police with such terrible power?

They are known officially as members of the Departamento Investigacion Ejercito Revolucionario, and more informally as DIER, the revolutionary army's investigative department.

These men have the power to arrest at will, the authority to search without warrants, and the Government-given right to hold a prisoner incommunicado without charges for months without end.

Eberdo Calderon was another of my cellmates. He looked 65 but would admit to only 58 years. For 22 of them he had been a guard in the Presidential Palace, through many of Cuba's quick changing governments,

He was the type who usually runs the elevator or checks passes, the type the girls call "Pop," and the men call "Dad."

Calderon was under arrest by secret police for the fourth time since Fidel Castro moved in behind the January 1959 revolution. Calderon has yet to be charged with any crime, has yet to be told specifically why he has spent more than 6 months in jail.

His only apparent crime is that he was a palace guard under Batista, as he had been during previous regimes for 22 years.

"When I get out this time I won't try to get a boat for the United States—I'll swim," Calderon told me.

The stories of Arago and Calderon are typical, not unusual, among the thousands of similar cases which keep Cuba's jails full to overflowing.

Those chivatas who appear nightly at the jail where I was imprisoned are asked only four questions as they line up before secret police interrogators to inform on their neighbors:

"What is the name of the person you are accusing?"

"What is his address?"

"What did he do?"

"What is your name?"

Arrest follows for the accused, without any investigation of the accusations. With the arrest comes loss of liberty and property.

Caught up in such a carefully organized campaign of suspicion and hatred, freedom-loving Cubans find that a revengeful neighbor can hold their fate in his hands.

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 29, 1959]

TEENAGERS KEY TO WEIRD SYSTEM OF FAST JUSTICE

(By James Buchanan)

Those teenage kids strolling down Havana's Prado today in their baggy-kneed jeans, scuffed shoes and dirty shirts, aren't Cuban beatniks.

They're DIER agents, the gumshoes for Fidel Castro's new secret police.

While they look and act like juvenile delinquents, they are the ground roots of a new espionage system designed to pit Cuban neighbor against neighbor in a campaign of suspicion and hatred.

And while these ex-high school youngsters play detective in Havana, their much more suave counterparts represent Castro's growing police state in key cities in the United States.

They belong to a new and vindictive breed of secret police under the banner of Departamento Investigacion Ejercito Revolucionaria, Castro's investigative department, the dreaded DIER.

These DIER agents are part of a unique network which passes for a judicial system in Cuba today.

It's a system in which accuser, arresting agent, jury and judge make up a closely knit team, all coached by the same man—Fidel Castro himself.

Castro's secret police—DIER—makes the arrests. Castro's military tribunals—often made up of bearded revolutionaries with no legal training—conduct the trials, render verdicts and pass sentence.

It's a judicial system in which the fix can be put in simply on signal from the boss or one of his associates—as we'll see later.

As those who take the first step in Cuba's new system of justice, making the arrests, DIER agents are the key to Castro's growing police state.

And they are impressionistic youngsters being trained in service for their master—much as Adolf Hitler organized the youth of Nazi Germany two generations ago.

It was agents of DIER who arrested me December 10 after I had located and inter-

viewed Austin Frank Young, an anti-Castro adventurer who had escaped from Cuban jail.

In Cuba, DIER agents number in the hundreds. They bragged to me during my forced confinement that they have 100 agents working in Miami and another 50 in New York.

Those appear to be exaggerations. But DIER is extremely active in the United States. Sources in Miami say there are 35 to 50 DIER agents working here. They prowl Flagler St. and the scattered Cuban colonies near the downtown area.

In New York, an estimated 20 to 30 well-trained agents gumshoe along Amsterdam and Broadway in the 103d St. area. Similar agents are on the job in other U.S. cities with large Latin or Cuban populations.

Their assignment: to make sure the same thing doesn't happen to Castro that happened to his predecessor, Dictator Fulgencio Batista.

ADVANCE VERDICTS GIVEN

During Batista's regime, Castro and other anti-Batista elements in Cuba obtained nearly all their weapons and supplies illegally through New York and Miami. Fidel remembers that well, and doesn't intend to trust U.S. customs alone with stopping movement of anti-Castro weapons.

In Cuba itself, the most disturbing thing about the operation of the new system of justice is that little or no investigation follows arrests by DIER agents.

DIER's big brother, the military tribunals, sits in trial on the accused, often after they already have the signal for a preconceived verdict.

Take my arrest and my "trial" as an example.

Following my arrest by DIER, I sat in a secret police cell for 12 days, with no formal charges filed.

The Cuban Supreme Court had been asked to decide whether a civilian or military court had jurisdiction in my case.

On the seventh day of my imprisonment, while the Supreme Court was studying my case, Castro attacked me in a television appearance and announced that a military tribunal would try me.

"If the courts condemn Buchanan, he will be detained here. Or perhaps, what is better, the courts will order him deported, never to return to Cuba to molest us any more," Castro said.

ONLY TIMING REMAINS

The military tribunal had the signal for my case. The only question remaining was the timing.

On the 13th day of my imprisonment in Havana, I was hustled out of my cell at 4:30 p.m. and escorted to Pinar Del Rio military prison, 100 miles away.

Only after I arrived at Pinar Del Rio was I told my trial would start at 8 p.m.

I met the attorney who was to defend me just 50 minutes before my trial began.

Five military "judges" heard my case. Only one of them had any legal training. All were below 30 in age.

For 4 hours they staged a "show" for public and press to witness. At the trial's conclusion, the five judges deliberated less than 20 minutes, including the time it took to type up a lengthy explanation of their verdict.

That verdict: exactly what Castro had suggested 6 days earlier—expulsion from Cuba.

WEIRD CUBAN JUSTICE

Prosecutor Oscar Fernandez Jordain, in asking the tribunal to give me a suspended sentence on condition I leave Cuba said:

"In the interest of humanity, I ask the court to suspend sentence on this newspa-

perman so that he can report how honest and fair our trials are over here during the revolution."

My case was a testimonial that when the boss speaks in Cuba these days, even the judges listen.

This is the weird sort of Cuban justice that is gradually putting an umbrella of fear over Cuba's citizens today.

The disturbing thing for the Cuban people—the same sort of coached military tribunals that handled my case have this year ordered more than 500 Cubans executed in the bloodiest purge in their country's history.

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 30, 1959]

WORLD FREE PRESS ON TRIAL IN CUBA

(By James Buchanan)

When the Cuban guards searched me that first night in their secret police jail, they overlooked one thing—a small fountain pen filled with red ink.

Somehow this oversight became one of the most important things in my 14 days of imprisonment.

With that pen, I scratched out notes as each day ended, and even wrote a letter to my wife that I managed to smuggle out of jail.

But in the long hours I had to think about Fidel Castro's new Cuba, that pen took on a symbolic significance, too.

It helped remind me that I was the eighth newsman arrested during the past 6 months of Castro's regime—yet Fidel had been unable to lift himself above the freedom of expression.

Since my expulsion from Cuba, two other newsmen have been arrested, bringing the 6-month total to 10.

In each case, the motive for the arrests apparently was the same—to harass the newsmen in the hope it would suppress their writing about the unpleasantness of the Castro regime.

Any doubt that I was to be another guinea pig in Castro's intense campaign against the press was erased shortly after my arrest on December 10 following an interview with anti-Castro fugitive Austin Frank Young.

While I was seated in the headquarters of DIER, Castro's secret police agency, I spotted an old friend entering the building.

He was Maj. Manuel Pineiro, one of Raul Castro's close associates with whom I had spent time in the hills of Sierra Maestra as a reporter covering the Castro buildup in mid-1958.

I tried to throw my arms around Manuel in a typical Latin greeting, feeling certain he would obtain my quick release from jail.

But this man who had welcomed me as a newsman at the Castro hideaway 18 months ago, and confided in me about his dreams and ideals for the new Cuba, now turned his back on me.

In my same broken Spanish that Manuel and his friends had understood so well before, I explained to him about my unwarranted arrest for going after a touchy news story.

"Is not the same now," Manuel told me. "Is now we are in times of stress."

He walked away and in my 14 days of imprisonment, I never saw Manuel again. It was obvious he understood that the Castro regime intended to make an example out of me to teach newsmen a lesson.

Days later I heard Castro-coached Prosecutor Oscar Fernandez Jordain orate in his summation at my military trial:

"The foreign press must be taught that it cannot come to Cuba and undermine our revolution."

It was not just a scared Jim Buchanan, but the entire foreign press on trial and being warned.

Then, a few minutes later, my own attorney, Orlando de la Bordilla, showed that the courage of freedom still exists in Cuba.

A Pinar del Rio associate of the nonpolitical Havana law firm of Mario Lazo, the attorney told the tribunal:

"Cuba should be thankful for the foreign press and stop being so hypersensitive. Newspapermen must be permitted to write about what they think is bad as well as about what is good."

The military judges disagreed, of course, and found me guilty of "concealing information." My sentence, on an obvious advance signal from the boss, was expulsion from Cuba.

Commenting on that sentence the next day, Jorge Zayas, editor of Avance in Havana, and one of the few Cuban editors with the courage to criticize Castro, wrote: "American news agencies and newspapers may soon find themselves without experienced personnel to send to this country if the Cuban Government continues to arrest foreign correspondents and prohibit their return home."

In my case, Castro made sure I would not return by holding a 14-year suspended prison term over my head.

In other cases, involving foreign newsmen, he has been less forceful but nearly as effective in trying to stifle a critical press.

Ian Aitken, London Express reporter, was arrested and held overnight at the same time I was in prison.

When he was released the next day, the Express asked him to leave Cuba for his own safety.

Earlier, Jules DuBois of the Chicago Tribune, an outspoken Castro critic, had been declared persona non grata in Cuba, although not officially expelled.

The threat of physical danger to DuBois became so great his newspaper withdrew him from the country.

But while the growing Cuban police state concentrates on intimidating the foreign press, a handful of courageous editors at home are becoming more outspoken.

"Buchanan is totally innocent" of the charges, the newspaper Avance wrote during my imprisonment. And Editor Zayas chided Castro for thinking he could afford to hold me to teach a lesson to the press.

Also, in the highly respected Diario de la Marina and the hard-hitting English-language daily, Havana Times, the Cuban people got the truth about my case.

Such support, from a small but staunch segment of the Cuban press which does not have the safety of distance between it and Fidel Castro, can make an American newsmen very humble.

And it makes 14 days in jail a small price to pay to alert the world that once again Cuba is in danger of having force replace free discussion.

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 31, 1959]

MY LAST LOOK: HOPE—OR FEAR, It's UP TO FIDEL

(By James Buchanan)

The last time I saw Cuba I was escorted to a waiting plane by an armed military guard, just 7 days ago.

A youngster who serves as a DIER (secret police) guard asked me before I boarded the plane: "Are you angry with the Cuban people now?"

"No," I told him, thinking of the Cuban people as a whole, "I'm just sorry for you."

I remember now my first look at the new Cuba last January just after Dictator Fulgencio Batista fled and Fidel Castro took over.

What a change has crept over the lovely Caribbean island in these 12 months. My thoughts take the form of a letter.

I HAD HOPED TO BE WITH YOU

To the Cuban people:
This is New Year's Eve of 1959, and I am in Miami.

Weeks ago I had intended to be back in Havana tonight to celebrate the coming of the new year and the anniversary of your revolution.

But, instead, I have been banned from your country and told that I can never come back.

A year ago I reported your hopes and ambitions for the new Cuba. On January 21 I wrote in the Herald:

"Cuba's face has been lifted.
"She looks and acts like a young girl today, and not the haggard, fearful thing of less than a month ago.

"Change is apparent everywhere in the island and in every walk of life. There's happiness, and gaiety, and most of all—hope."

Those were the days when foreign newsmen were welcome in Cuba.

You were free to talk, the press was free to report. It was a calm, friendly time, and a government secure in the good wishes of its people found no reason to limit freedom of expression.

CRITICS TREATED LIKE TRAITORS

What has happened to your country since then?

In the spring, the cooling-off period began. On June 30, Maj. Pedro Luis Diaz Lanz resigned as the chief of the air force, charging Communist activity in the Government. He fled the country.

On July 17, President Manuel Urrutia was forced to resign after Fidel charged him with being a traitor to the revolution.

On October 21, Maj. Hubert Matos, a long-time Castro buddy and one of the revolutionary favorites, resigned his army post, charging Communist influence in the Government. He later was tried as a traitor and sentenced to 20 years.

On October 27 Maj. Camillo Cienfuegos, army chief of staff and second only to Fidel in popularity with you Cuban people, vanished under mysterious circumstances. The antigovernment whispers grew louder.

As the tide swung away from the regime, new laws made it possible to confiscate your property merely if you were arrested, not convicted, of counterrevolutionary activity.

Your newspapers were told they must print a statement denouncing all foreign news which is critical of the revolution.

I could go on, but the pattern is clear. No longer secure as the crises mounted, your Government resorted to more forceful attempts to stifle all criticism.

You have virtually lost your freedom to talk, except when you agree with your Government. I have lost my freedom to report because I did in your country what newspapermen have done traditionally all over the world—gone after a good news story, even when it involved someone unfriendly to the political leaders.

My editors intend to appeal my verdict and ask for exoneration by the Cuban courts. We all know, of course, that this could be granted only on signal from Fidel.

Newspaper clippings take me back on this New Year's Eve to last February, when I wrote:

"Right now Cuba is vibrant and excited, and, most important, it is speaking. . . ."

"No man fears he will be pointed out as an informer merely through the spite of a neighbor. The new Government and new army are demanding proof to go with the accusations."

But in these past months your speech has become guarded and neighbor is spying on neighbor. Your year of liberation threatens to become a year of destruction.

Few men have had the opportunity to make a nation great as has Fidel Castro.

The opportunity is still there. A few months from now the end of this chapter in the hopeful new Cuba may well be written.

Fidel himself must decide what the outcome will be—

The hope that the revolution promised all of you in January, or

The fear and hostility that many of you and I found in December.

My New Year's wish to you, my friends, is that, in spite of the disturbing trends of the last few months, Fidel may yet make the right choice for the future.

MY JAIL DIARY—JAMES BUCHANAN KEPT A HIDDEN DIARY DURING HIS 14 DAYS IN A CUBAN JAIL—HIS NOTES PROVIDE A GRAPHIC ACCOUNT OF CUBAN CELL LIFE

(By James Buchanan)

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 10, FIRST DAY

I'm in jail. Tossed in at 10:30 p.m. after hours of sitting in half a dozen DIER (military police) offices. They say I helped (Austin) Young escape and was trying to get him out of the country. They're nuts.

U.S. consul says it looks like deep trouble. I'm freezing in this 9- by 20-foot cell with six other guys. No blanket, no lights, sandwich for dinner. Other prisoners must have been here a long time—they look like hell. Where did I get the idea I'd be out in 5 hours?

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 11, SECOND DAY

Hauled me out at 8:30 a.m. to see newspaper people. Sleepless night—put me in a cellblock, this time with Young. Spent an hour looking for a hidden microphone and sizing up the six other prisoners. At least one's a DIER man hoping Young and I will talk. We aren't. Nothing to hide, anyway, but just try to tell them that. Guards like to stare at me. First prison food: black beans and rice, roots or vegetables. No appetite. Hugh Kessler, of Embassy, told me I'm to go to Pinar del Rio and be jailed there; DIER agent says it'll be La Cabana fortress. I don't go anywhere, just sit on cot and stare back at the people.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 12, THIRD DAY

Beard's beginning to itch and no talk of letting me out. Got a blanket now so last night wasn't so cold—but my clothes are getting crusty.

Made my own coffee this morning when stuff they gave us was sour and couldn't drink it. Bull newspaper fire on cell floor, heated water in tin can and poured it over coffee grounds held in a handkerchief. Not bad. Awfully thirsty. Only water comes from tap alongside toilet in corner of cell. Fellow newsmen visiting from the Herald brought oranges and they help.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 13, FOURTH DAY

Some prisoners angry today because not permitted to attend mass. Guards are bringing their girl friends and relatives to stare and giggle at us through the bars. Wonder what would happen if I threw a shoe in their faces?

Other prisoners shaving but they've refused razor to Young (the man interviewed by Buchanan) and me. Wasn't there supposed to be an office party in Miami tonight?

MONDAY, DECEMBER 14, FIFTH DAY

Friend from Herald brought me peanut butter and jelly sandwiches . . . tasted better than filet mignon.

Guards are feeding my visitors rumors about where I'll go, knowing it will get back to me, thinking it will worry me. It does. These never-washed blankets give us something to do each morning. Takes 30 minutes to pick the fuzz off my trousers.

Tonight when guards shook down our cell they slipped something under my mattress. When they'd left I found an empty matchbox. What's their idea? Anyway, I burned it immediately.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, SIXTH DAY

How many more? Feel filthy. Guards claim a radio broadcast this morning said Young's conviction had been set aside. Just propaganda to keep you on the mental rollercoaster.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16, SEVENTH DAY

Young has guards crazy. Just showed them how to make a bomb from matches, mattress wadding, and a tin cup. Claims he's going to blow door off the cell next.

Dorticos' (President of Cuba) answer to the IAPA plea for my release doesn't sound too good. But is there any other profession in the world that backs up its members like the newspapermen fighting for me?

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 17, EIGHTH DAY

One Cuban newspaper says I'll be tried in civil court, another says it will be a military tribunal. Whichever it is, I wish they'd get moving. Wonder if people still eats eggs and bacon for breakfast?

A political prisoner is known by the sacks he keeps by his bunkside. I have five. That makes me a big wheel.

More questioning by the DIER. At least this time it was by an adult, not the punk kids who make up most of this secret police.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, NINTH DAY

Had my first shave—ouch!

Found out how you file fingernails in jail. Rub them against metal side of your bed. Do only one or two a day, that way you have something to do tomorrow.

Four of new arrivals were arrested in a church. Waiting for owner of a boat to pick them up—DIER came instead. Somebody's wife talked too much.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 19, TENTH DAY

Austin Young's birthday; he's 39. He says "Friends are requested to send saws."

Tough to sleep at night. DIER seldom makes arrests before midnight, and racket goes on until 4 in the morning.

Funny how quick you can get accustomed to Cuban cigarettes. I'd give \$10 for a big hamburger with onions and a bottle of beer.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 20, ELEVENTH DAY

Is this the 10th day or the 11th? I'm losing count. How long will it be before I do like the others and start figuring a break?

Something new on menu today—fried chicken. Looked like it had been cooked by a flame thrower as it ran across the farmyard.

They're giving me, the "up" treatment today. Lieutenant Alvarez told Kessler (of U.S. Embassy) my case would be resolved with 2 to 3 days. Tomorrow they'll tell me my file has been lost. That's the "down" treatment.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 21, TWELFTH DAY

More prisoners, more monotony. Even the worst pocketbook makes good reading now.

One prisoner lost his theater, another expects to lose his alcohol plant. Fidel's confiscation scheme.

More questioning by DIER, this time by lieutenant who was jailed in Miami. He loves me. Really got mad when I wouldn't sign a statement written in Spanish.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 22, THIRTEENTH DAY

Well, no Christmas at home for sure now. They've closed the courts until January 2 or 7. Some of these guys are talking about going over the wall Christmas Eve.

I've saved a can of peanuts for a Christmas treat * * *

(Buchanan's diary ends here. Moments later he and Young, the man he interviewed, were sped 100 miles to Pinar del Rio, where

he was tried an hour after arrival, found guilty by midnight of concealing information, and ordered to leave the country. He was deported the next day, and returned to his wife in Miami 2 days before Christmas.)

The following editorials by John S. Knight and one by the Miami Herald editorial staff are objective and I think very well reflect the American attitude:

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 27, 1959]

NEWSMEN MIGHT SUCCEED WHERE DIPLOMATS FAILED

(By John S. Knight)

Miami Herald Reporter Jim Buchanan came home for Christmas, and a good one it was.

Only a few days ago, Jim was sure he would be spending the holidays in a Cuban jail. For despite widespread protests against Buchanan's arrest and detention on a trumped-up charge of "concealing facts" about the escape of anti-Castro fugitive Frank Austin Young, the wheels of justice were turning slowly.

Then suddenly and without warning, Jim was rushed before a military court in Pinar del Rio and given a 14-year suspended sentence. In the same pronouncement, a five-man military court told him to get out of Cuba within 24 hours.

Reporter Buchanan's immediate reaction was a sigh of relief. "Thank goodness," he said, "I didn't understand enough Spanish to know I had first been sentenced to 14 years at hard labor on the Isle of Pines."

Previously Buchanan had told the military tribunal: "I was never guilty of anything but being a newspaper reporter."

But in Fidel Castro's regime, all newspapermen who report the truth are suspect. SPEAKING OUT IN CUBA TAKES MAN OF COURAGE

Our gratitude goes to William H. Cowles, president of the Inter-American Press Association and Russell Wiggins, president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, for their prompt intervention in behalf of Jim Buchanan.

We are grateful to Jorge Zayas, courageous publisher of Avance, for his attempts to gain Buchanan's release. And to Diario de la Marina for speaking so forthrightly of the Buchanan affair.

These two newspapers, together with Prensa Libre, are fighting bravely to preserve press freedom in Cuba.

Editors in the United States who are free to criticize anyone from the mayor to the President without fear of physical retaliation, should know that it takes real guts for a Cuban editor to oppose the policies of Fidel Castro.

Publishers such as Jorge Zayas have endured violent attacks over Cuban television networks by the Government. Vicious smear campaigns to frighten away advertisers are constantly in motion.

A new law, not yet invoked, makes newspaper editors liable to imprisonment for 6 to 18 years for publishing anything that "tends to limit the independence of the nation or provoke violation of existing laws."

But Herald Reporter E. V. W. Jones says that Revolution, the Government's official organ, is "free to defy Castro, propagandize the revolution, shape Cuban public opinion—and pour hell's fire and brimstone on the United States."

Fortunately, Publisher Zayas has not lost his sense of humor. He told Eddie Jones of a Cuban saying to the effect that if you are afraid, you buy a dog.

"I have bought a dog," he added with a wry smile and pointed to a puppy playing on his office floor.

MODERATE APPROACH SEEMED RIGHT COURSE

We appreciate the many offers of assistance that have come through various sources.

Some of them contained very useful suggestions which now need not be employed. Others were critical of my letter to Dr. Fidel Castro on the ground that it was too moderate.

A few thought the United States should bring Castro to his knees by reducing the quota of sugar we buy from Cuba.

But at no time did it seem wise to involve the U.S. Government, other than requesting our Embassy personnel to keep in touch with Buchanan and give him such assistance as was feasible and possible.

WE MUST BE FRIENDS WITH PEOPLE OF CUBA

We must never be tempted into believing that United States-Cuban relations have deteriorated to the point of no return. Historically, the two nations have long been friends.

And so it must be again, Castro or no Castro.

The point at issue in the Buchanan case is the right of a newspaperman to seek information and report it objectively. This convention is generally recognized in all free nations although periodic censorship is still employed in many.

The Castro government was hell bent upon teaching foreign correspondents a lesson, and Jim Buchanan's "indiscretion" in buying a bandage for a fugitive's injured leg provided the needed excuse to clap Jim in jail.

Jose A. Maestri, of the Havana Press Association, said as much when he declared: "Some Americans seem to feel they possess a freebooter's license authorizing them to commit any offense. The Buchanan case is one more instance of this."

PERHAPS DR. CASTRO CAN SEE THE LIGHT

We hold no bitterness toward Premier Castro and the members of his government for their incredible treatment of Buchanan.

Jim is home, and for the moment, nothing else seems important.

But a longer view suggests that the Inter-American Press Association and the American Society of Newspaper Editors should move constructively to bring about a better understanding between the government of Fidel Castro and the press which reports the facts of Cuban life.

I offered to discuss the problems of journalism, as they relate to Cuban press coverage, with Premier Castro but to my regret he has not seen fit to reply.

Possibly the ASNE, which entertained Dr. Castro in Washington last April, could arrange a meeting with the Premier in Havana for the purpose of clarifying in Castro's mind the traditional role of a reporter in a foreign land.

If we are to seek better understanding and promote the cause of press freedom in this hemisphere, such discussions with national leaders are at times imperative.

We shall gain nothing by denouncing Dr. Castro in bitter editorials as the enemy of freedom until such time as our press has made a constructive effort to have him see the light.

THEN WE WILL KNOW WHERE FIDEL STANDS

Perhaps a joint request by leaders of the ASNE and the IAPA to confer with Premier Castro would be productive.

It is far more important for a responsible press to seek such an understanding than to sit at a safe distance and berate Dr. Castro for the indignities heaped upon a reporter who was merely doing his job.

Should Castro grant such an audience, perhaps some barriers to understanding could be removed.

If the suggestion is spurned, we will know that Castro's words in Washington about press freedom were hollow and meaningless.

But let the effort be made.

Perhaps newspapermen can succeed where the diplomats have failed.

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 30, 1959]
THE YEAR OF CASTRO—AN ANNIVERSARY IN
CUBA

The revolution of the barbudos has a birthday Friday.

Just 1 year ago the henchmen of the defeated and discredited Batista were running for their lives while Castro's young men streamed down from the hills to take over Cuba.

Hope flamed in the breast of the campesinos, and the Habaneros lined the ancient streets to shout hosannas to their savior. Never had any victorious general entered so happily into his kingdom.

"I bring you freedom, and justice for all," said Dr. Castro. "This is the dawn of a new day for the people of Cuba."

The people of the United States applauded. The old bonds of friendship were strong. There was a general feeling among North Americans that the little man of Cuba would get a better deal, at last. They waited for the bright dawn.

It has been slow in coming.

First were the drumhead trials of the Batista followers. Many were convicted under the eyes of the mob and hurried to death by bullet beside the open graves. More than 500 perished before the blood bath was over.

Dr. Castro answered worldwide shock with the argument that it was necessary to stamp out the seeds of cruelty and death left by Batista to sprout again.

The program of agrarian reform had what seemed a laudable purpose. Castro planners wanted to root out the sugar plantation economy which benefited a few landowners. They moved to break up the estates and give land to the peasants.

U.S. interests, which had large holdings in sugar and cattle, complained that payment was inadequate, and was in 20-year bonds redeemable in pesos at that.

The new government reduced rents and utility rates, raised salaries and froze jobs. It moved vigorously into a program of social welfare, education, and medical care. Cuba's schools had been notoriously poor, but now there was improvement at all levels.

Talk grew of Communist influence. Schoolbooks were rewritten to advocate new beliefs. Leaders known to have Red leanings appeared in high places.

Castro repeatedly denied that he was a Communist or that Communists had undue influence. On at least one occasion, in a spectacular showdown fight for control of the labor unions, the Communists were defeated.

Castro moved steadily toward one-man rule, changing presidents, ministers, and Army leaders at will. Those who opposed him were traitors. He whipped up mob sentiment by marathon television speeches. Once he resigned, to resume office by mob acclaim.

The first year of Castro rule ends with United States-Cuban relations at an alltime low. Cuban economy is on the floor. Its tourist trade is almost destroyed, and unemployment spreads. Cuba's interference in the affairs of neighboring countries has cost it friendship in the Latin American community.

But the common man of Cuba has gained much. He has more money to spend, a better standard of living, and better prospects for his children.

Whether Castro can build a strong economy as a base for these social gains remains to be seen. Whether the people of Cuba can regain their liberties and free institutions, elect their own leaders and decide their own destiny are things for the sixties to reveal.

These are the questions as Cuba moves into the second year of the Castro era.

Whatever the answers the people of the United States have only good wishes for the people of Cuba. The hope for the new year

is that the Cubans survive their trial by fire and emerge a prouder, stronger, and happier nation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose the aspirations of a friendly people. Perhaps the second year in Cuba will be a better one. We Americans want for the Cubans the free government and the better way of life promised them. We hope these are achieved with dignity and responsible action.

BOTH MAJOR POLITICAL PARTIES SHOULD BE KEPT APPRISED OF NEGOTIATIONS AND DELIBERATIONS NOW BEING CARRIED ON BY THE PRESIDENT AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE

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

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to give notice of a recent recommendation that I have made to the President.

The year of 1960 will be a presidential year and it is entirely possible that 1961 will see a Democratic administration, including a Democratic President and a Democratic Secretary of State.

Unfortunately, however, the international problems of the United States are not bounded by the calendar or by the limitations of our political party organizations and these problems will be just as complicated and difficult of solution in 1961 as they have been in the past. In fact, in delicacy and complexity in many ways they will exceed those of the past.

For this reason, it is more important than ever that both major political parties be kept apprised in detail of the negotiations and deliberations which are presently being carried on by the President and the Secretary of State. I there should be a shift of administration in 1961, the times are too fraught with peril to permit a period of inaction while a new administration is learning the details of the negotiations which are now being carried on. And, the inability to make a prompt, well-informed decision at this time might well have disastrous results for the United States.

The President is now involved in negotiations on a summit meeting and discussions relating to future talks with Premier Khrushchev in Russia. The effects of these talks will last far beyond the end of this year, and I have stated to President Eisenhower my opinion that the welfare of the country would be served by the Presidential appointment of a member of the Democratic Party as a participant in these discussions. By such an appointment, the Democratic Party could be kept informed of the details of negotiations and would be much better able to act in the event that Democratic candidates are successful at the polls in November.

I realize that Senator Dobb recently made a somewhat similar suggestion when he recommended that President Eisenhower take a prominent Democrat on his recent trip to Europe and Asia.

In that connection, however, I could also see certain practical objections to the proposal. In this instance, however, there would be no possible partisan objection and only benefit could result.

As James Reston so well indicated in the New York Times of January 3, 1960, the President has already on other occasions taken Democrats into his confidence in various foreign policy matters and in this way has set a precedent.

I would make no particular recommendation as to a person who might be appointed but I will content myself with saying that the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee would be the type of key person who might well be considered in this connection. There are, of course, numerous other prominent Democrats who have had widespread experience in international affairs who could serve with distinction.

This suggestion is not made with the intent to embarrass, nor is it submitted with the idea of gaining political advantage. It is a proposal for a practical solution to a substantial problem which is inevitably presented by the periodic termination of the term of our national administrations.

I sincerely hope that the President will give every possible consideration to this proposal because I believe that he will be acting in the best interests of the country if he takes such a step.

ANTI-SEMITISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, after most careful and lengthy consideration on the merits and demerits of having additional attention focused on the matter, I have decided to take the floor to comment on the subject of the desecrations of places of worship which have been taking place in several nations. I am chiefly concerned with the recent anti-Semitic incidents in Germany. The possible implications in this area are, of course, horrendous. There have been incidents also, I am sad to note, in many nations including England, France, Norway, the United States, and, most recently, distant Australia.

There have been incidents recently in my congressional district in New York City, and in several other cities in this country.

Leaders of the various religious faiths have been quick to state their firm conviction that in the United States these incidents do not represent organized and growing anti-Semitism or other intolerance, but rather malicious mischief and hoodlumism. In Germany, however, as was stated by Benjamin R. Epstein, national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, these incidents "cannot be looked upon as isolated acts, but must be viewed against a nation's history."

The German Government under the leadership of Chancellor Adenauer, has acted responsibly and promptly. The

German Government has made anti-Semitic activities a punishable crime and we have every reason to expect that the matter will be dealt with adequately on a legal level. From all reports it was hardly necessary for our Government to express its grave shock and concern, as German leaders themselves were quick to express shock and concern. The Adenauer government has given every assurance that it recognizes that such incidents are not consistent with a society that is democratic in concept and practice, and it is fully aware of the damage that these incidents have done to its world image. It is obvious that Chancellor Adenauer has an abiding respect and affection for the United States and depends upon the United States. I can only imagine the anguish that this matter is causing him, knowing the concern that it raises in the hearts of many of our countrymen. Immediately following the desecration of the Cologne Synagogue on Christmas Eve, Dr. Adenauer said: "I heard with revulsion of this atrocious deed which all decent Germans join me in condemning." The German people are united in their condemnation of this kind of thing. Witness the parade of 40,000 youths in Berlin last Friday, in protest of such acts.

The most frightening consequence of this matter is that it serves to divide the NATO countries. Obviously, if tensions can be re-created between France and the lowland countries and Germany it serves the purposes of the Communists. This is not to say that these incidents have been inspired by the Communists, because as yet there is no proof, but it does serve, wittingly or unwittingly, the Communist purpose in that it creates a break in the solidarity of the free world against Communist purposes.

I have heard it said on several occasions that the less said about this subject the better, as publicity serves only to incite sick minds who see it in the press or on TV to commit similar heinous acts. Perhaps so. But this is not a problem that can be ignored or swept under the rug, nor will it disappear by itself. It seems to me that its needed correction requires the close attention of all governmental bodies. We expect the free German Government to take action in Germany and our religious leaders have so stated, quite properly. Can we expect less of our own Government here in the United States? Free people everywhere, and all people who cherish and pray for liberty, will look to our example.

In New York City, I am pleased to note that Police Commissioner Kennedy has increased his vigilance.

In Washington, I would hope that the Department of Justice would undertake an immediate examination of acts of desecration that have occurred in several cities, and of course the FBI may do so without attendant publicity in order to determine whether or not the matter is of an organized nature and interstate, and if so whether Federal crimes are involved.

Simultaneously, it seems to me entirely appropriate for the Civil Rights Com-

mission to make its own inquiry into the matter. The reasons are as follows:

The Civil Rights Act of 1957 established the Commission as a factfinding and investigatory body with a primary purpose to collect and accumulate information on matters of race, color, religion, or national origin so that a more comprehensive approach can be made by the Congress in protecting the rights of all citizens. In this context the Commission's authority should be invoked so that we in the Congress may have ample opportunity to gain insight into this problem. These deplorable incidents should be carefully scrutinized with a view toward swift and stringent remedies. We need facts immediately so that we can understand and approach this vital problem now.

These instances of vandalism in all probability will prove to be malicious mischief perpetrated by a few malcontents; but on the other hand such activities have been known to trigger hatred and violence on a grandiose scale.

I do not wish to be an alarmist in these matters but I am convinced that the harbingers of racial and religious hatred should be checked here in the United States and abroad before they can gain any foothold.

RED TIDE IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE REMEDY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Speaker, during the last 3 years I have devoted much time and study to the threats now rapidly mounting in the South: the rising Red tide in Latin America, the turmoil in the Caribbean, and the crucial question of sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal.

These developments cannot be viewed as isolated incidents but together constitute the gravest threat to the Western Hemisphere since 1823, when President Monroe, in his famous message to the Congress, announced what has become known as the Monroe Doctrine.

Though some publicists have presented accurate pictures of individual incidents and their significance, none have approached the problem from the perspective afforded by a lifetime study of history with a view to supplying the remedy. Thus, I read with fullest gratification an illuminating article in the December 28, 1959, issue of U.S. News & World Report by Dr. Samuel Flagg Bemis, distinguished American historian.

Accompanying his article, Dr. Bemis outlined the draft of a proposed resolution which he urges the Congress to adopt. Using this as a base on which to start, I have prepared and introduced today House Concurrent Resolution 450. This measure, together with House Concurrent Resolution 33, introduced in the last session, would clarify the present situation and provide a historically

based policy for putting an end to the current piecemeal conquest of the Americas.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to echo the extremely pertinent question of Dr. Bemis: "Why Wait for the Blows to Fall?" We should lead now before it is too late, for the ultimate fate of the United States and constitutional liberty are at stake.

In order that the notable thesis of Dr. Bemis may be recorded in the permanent annals of the Congress, the indicated article, the editor's biographical sketch of its author, and a copy of my House concurrent resolution are included as parts of these remarks and commended for perusal by all concerned with the question of hemispheric security, especially Members of the Congress.

The article, biographical sketch, and resolution follow:

A WAY TO STOP THE REDS IN LATIN AMERICA—A NOTED HISTORIAN SETS A COURSE FOR QUICK ACTION BY THE UNITED STATES

(By Samuel Flagg Bemis, professor, diplomatic history and inter-American relations, Yale University)

Prof. Arnold Toynbee—in a recent, 1958, brilliant study of "The Eve of War, 1939"—has called attention to the fact that in 1940 no power was threatened on more than two fronts, east and west, whilst now, 1959, each of the two surviving power groups—U.S.A. and U.S.S.R.—is threatened on three fronts, east, west, and north, "a first-class revolution in international affairs * * * that is not easily grasped or taken into account."

Now suppose the United States should be threatened on all four fronts, including south as well as north, from the Caribbean, as well as the Arctic? Instead of an expansive and friendly ally like Canada stretching for thousands of miles between us and Soviet jet, submarine, and missile bases, with a double line of distant early warning trips, we suddenly become exposed to such bases almost within sight of our southern coastal cities, and right athwart our naval communications from Atlantic to Pacific by the Panama Canal? Would this not tip the balance of power fatally against the United States in the present deadly crisis of power and politics which we call the cold war?

Since 1934, the first line of our defense has shifted from Panama to Europe and Asia. In this geopolitical framework, the strategic paths over the Arctic regions have indeed become of more immediate significance than the Caribbean. It has even been argued by some strategists that, in the atomic age, the Panama Canal is no longer a lifeline for the defense of this country; that we could well afford to have it neutralized under an international authority, so great is the danger that one atomic bomb could neutralize—i.e., paralyze it—by knocking it out.

Scarcely anything, short of withdrawal of American forces from Europe and the Asiatic littoral, or the dissolution of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) or SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) would please the Red imperialists more than the neutralization of the Panama Canal or the transfer of its control and defense to the Republic of Panama, like the Suez Canal to Egypt. It would split our present global strategy into a two-ocean strategy and prevent the Panama Canal's being used by the West as a substitute for a blocked Suez Canal, or to relieve the burden on our flagging railway system in case of war.

The Communist conspiracy is on its toes today in Panama trying to dislodge the

United States from control of this still-vital American lifeline.

The United States should make it clear to the world that in the Panama Canal Zone it will continue to act as if it were sovereign, as, indeed, it has an explicit treaty right so to do, and to stick beyond any cavil to the military defenses of that waterway.

MORE THAN THE CANAL CAN BE LOST

Much more than the canal, and all that means to American defense, can be lost. If international communism is allowed to jump the Atlantic and set up a rule in a state of the New World, the way it recently tried to leapfrog over Turkey into Syria and Lebanon, it would mean not only effective neutralization of the hemispheric lifeline in a strategic sense; it would create an active fourth front for the defense of the United States. We simply cannot allow that to happen.

Latin American Communists schooled in Moscow have studied just how to set up their system in the Americas. They tried it once already in Guatemala, while the United States stood by with arms folded around the doctrine of nonintervention, awaiting the uncertain action of a conference of foreign ministers which, thanks only to the counterrevolution of Carlos Armas, never had to meet.

When, finally, the diplomatic doctors did an autopsy on the fallen Arbenz regime in Guatemala, they found the disease of international communism to be far more deep-seated than they had suspected. In fact, it still lingers as a cancer in the body politic of honest liberalism, not only in Guatemala but in all the states of Central America and the Caribbean. It is festering now in Cuba, in Panama, in Venezuela where they spat on Vice President Nixon. The cancer is spreading.

What is there, within the inter-American peace system—pledged as it is to the doctrine of nonintervention—to prevent such a disaster in the New World?

Nonintervention is the keystone of the inter-American peace structure, put into place by the good-neighbor policy. In numerous treaties since 1933—subject to honorable denunciation by any of the parties on 1 year's and, in some cases, 2 years' notice—the American Republics have declared inadmissible the intervention of any one of them (1933, 1936) or group of them (1948) directly or indirectly or for whatever reason, within the internal affairs of another American state.

There is, however, one outstanding exception to this sweeping pledge: It does not affect existing treaty obligations. For example, it would not affect the existing treaties of the United States with Panama or Nicaragua by which the United States guarantees the protection of the Panama Canal and the Nicaraguan Canal site; it would not affect our treaty with Cuba giving us the naval base at Guantanamo; it would not affect the provisions of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, of Rio de Janeiro, of 1947.

The Rio Pact—the first regional alliance of the diplomatic revolution which now binds the United States to defensive alliances today with some 46 countries of the globe—provides for joint intervention, if two-thirds of the American States shall agree to assist in meeting an armed attack against an American State—the group acting within the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. The treaty also provides, article 6:

"If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack, or by an extracontinental or intercontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation

[of the Organization of American States] shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent."

The Rio Pact of 1947 is the same bond which brought inter-American diplomatic intervention to stop local wars between Haiti and the Dominican Republic, and between Nicaragua and Costa Rica. It is the same bond and principle which animated the meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs last August, in Santiago de Chile, invoked by four Republics, including the United States—that gentle pan-American huddle which weakly empowered the Inter-American Peace Commission to watch and study military movements in the Caribbean and report to the next (11th) Conference of American States at Quito, Ecuador, in February 1960.

This is the same *casus foederis* [a case within the provisions of a treaty] to which appeal had been made, upon the insistence of Panama, in the case of Guatemala in 1954, for a meeting of Foreign Ministers of American States to consider the crisis of Guatemala, but did not meet because of Carlos Armas' successful counterrevolution.

Today it is very doubtful whether the Organization of American States, through its Organ of Consultation, could muster the necessary two-thirds majority of the high contracting parties quickly enough to give a mandate, under the terms of the Rio Pact of 1947, for joint intervention to suppress a Latin-American government gone Communist by infiltration of a popular-front government or capture of a liberal revolution, and thereby threatening the peace and security of the American Continent.

It might be tried, but, if it failed, what then?

There remains the Monroe Doctrine, which declares that interposition by any European powers to extend their system to any region of this hemisphere is dangerous to our own peace and safety. There remains the inherent right of self-defense, both individual and collective, even if it is not agreed on by a two-thirds majority of American States.

"We owe it [therefore] to candor," pronounced President Monroe in his famous message of December 2, 1823, "and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those [European] powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety—we could not consider any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States"—which would induce measures on the part of the United States "indispensable to their security."

An important corollary to the Monroe Doctrine since its origin—indeed, a vital dictum of the doctrine since 1869—prohibits the transfer of any colony in the New World from one European sovereign to another—lest such an occurrence upset the balance of power against the security of the United States in this hemisphere.

This "no transfer" principle has been bound up in the Monroe Doctrine throughout its history. President Grant officially proclaimed it a part of the doctrine in 1869.

A 1940 PRECEDENT FOR ACTION

As Hitler's armies were overrunning Western Europe and threatening to take over French, Dutch, and British colonies in the Western Hemisphere—i.e., Guadalupe, Martinique, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Trinidad, British Honduras, the Guianas, Aruba, etc.—a joint resolution of the U.S. Congress of June 18, 1940, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, implement-

ing the sense of an earlier declaration by a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics at Panama in September 1939, at the beginning of the war, stated:

"1. That the United States would not recognize any transfer, and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer, any geographic region of this hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power; and

"2. That if such transfer or attempt to transfer should appear likely, the United States shall, in addition to other measures, immediately consult with other American Republics to determine upon the steps which should be taken to safeguard their common interests."

Shortly thereafter, a special conference of foreign ministers of the same Republics, facing the danger of Nazi conquest of Europe and England, gave a mandate to any one or more American Republics, in case of the imminent danger of transfer of colonial territory in the American continents from one European sovereign to another, to step in and act quickly to forestall such a transfer. A special convention provided for an inter-American committee to administer the government of the rescued region, pending its restoration to its inhabitants upon the return of peace.

But the Havana mandate of 1940 looks only to the actual transfer of an existing colony in America from one European sovereign to another European sovereign. It does not explicitly envisage the case of a European sovereign in fact, if not in name, extending its Communist system to a republic of the American system à la Guatemala—and will it be à la Cuba, à la Panama, à la Venezuela?

The Pact of Rio of 1947 does anticipate such a fact or situation endangering the peace and security of any republic of the New World, but it requires a two-thirds vote of the 21 republics to give a mandate to 1 or more republics to act in time to stop the danger.

It would be nice if there could issue from the 11th meeting of American States, to meet at Quito, Ecuador, in February 1960, a declaration on the lines of the Act of Havana of 1940, giving a mandate for individual or joint action to prevent the international Communist system of the Old World extending itself to an American State, directly or indirectly, and thereby threatening the peace and security of the American Republics.

It is not known whether our Department of State is endeavoring to put such a business on the agenda for the Quito Conference. It ought to be a major goal of our Government to secure this kind of declaration. Such a proposal, incidentally, would be a touchstone to reveal the degree of Communist power within the various delegations.

However, it is not likely, in the present condition of inter-American relations, that such a declaration would be accepted by even a bare majority of the states—and the emergency may be upon us even before the meeting at Quito next February. Already the Cuban dictatorship has announced its intention to buy jetplanes from inside the Iron Curtain.

The dilemma of our Latin-American policy today is whether, on the one hand, to interpret the inter-American doctrine of nonintervention so as to permit a non-American power to extend its revolutionary system to the New World by capturing a republic in the Caribbean or Central America, now within easy bombing range of the United States and of the Panama Canal; or, on the other hand, to prepare some anti-interventionist action within the framework of the inter-American peace structure that would really prevent the intervention of international

communism. That is: Inter-American intervention to prevent non-American intervention, one horn of the dilemma; or the other horn of absolute nonintervention to permit the intervention of international communism to establish its system in the Western Hemisphere.

In 1940, the Congress acted promptly in the face of the danger arising from the war in Europe. Let it now pass an analogous resolution, to make it clear to our friends and enemies, all over the globe, that this Government is determined within its inherent right of self-defense, and within the purview of the pristine Monroe Doctrine, and indeed of the Pact of Rio and the inter-American peace structure, not to permit the intervention of international communism to endanger the peace and security of the United States, and of all the Republics of this hemisphere—indeed, the balance of power for freedom against slavery in the entire globe.

Such a resolution against the intervention of international communism—couched in the language of the Monroe Doctrine, the Rio Pact, and the nonintervention declarations of Washington (1951) and Caracas (1954), and the recent Declaration No. XI of Santiago (1959)—should provide for the administration of the state thus defended or rescued, by the same Inter-American authority and machinery set up in the Havana Convention of 1940 for the provisional administration of European colonies and possessions in America threatened by a transfer of sovereignty.

Thus stipulated, there need be no apprehension on the part of our good neighbors that the United States would be reverting to the old system that characterized the interventions against European imperialist intervention in this hemisphere during the first quarter of our century.

Such a policy would protect the doctrine of nonintervention against the new technique of intervention by international communism, and would do so within the spirit of the inter-American peace and defense treaties. It would not wait for the accomplished fact of a leap of the Communist revolution across the Atlantic to uproot the Monroe Doctrine in the New World, as it has already destroyed the "open door" policy in China. By thus assuming the initiative in the New World, we can also defend the global balance of power on which the peace and security of the United States and of our sister Republics of America in the world must depend during the coming decade.

WHY "WAIT FOR THE BLOWS TO FALL"?

It is too much the practice of the United States, in the continuing world crisis of our time, to let the initiative rest with the enemy, to wait for the blows to fall and only then endeavor to improvise some action to fend them off.

Let something be done now, before it is too late, to deter the action. Congress ought, at the beginning of the next session in January, immediately, on the eve of the Quito Conference, to pass a joint resolution analogous to that of June 18, 1940, explicitly pointed at the present fact or situation.

If the Quito Conference doesn't back it up, then the United States, acting under the pristine Monroe Doctrine, must do so. The act of faith known as the good-neighbor policy, and the freedom of the New World—but, most essentially, the security of the United States and the blessings of liberty invoked in our Constitution—are now at stake.

EDITOR'S BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR

Samuel Flagg Bemis, 68, is widely recognized as an outstanding historian and authority on the diplomatic relations of the Americas.

Professor Bemis, now sterling professor of diplomatic history and inter-American

relations at Yale University, has taught at many of the leading universities in the United States and in Latin America.

Among his many books is "Diplomatic History of the United States," which is regarded as a classic on the subject. Professor Bemis won the Pulitzer Prize in history in 1927. His "John Quincy Adams and the Foundations of American Foreign Policy" received the Pulitzer Prize for biography in 1950. He has been described as a scholar who has "developed a continental and hemispherical, and finally a world outlook on American history."

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 450

Whereas the subversive forces known as international communism, operating secretly and openly, directly and indirectly, threaten the sovereignty and political independence of all the Western Hemisphere nations; and

Whereas the American Continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, are not subject to colonization or domination by any power; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, conflicts with the established policy of the American Republics for the protection of the sovereignty of the peoples of such states and the political independence of their governments; and

Whereas such a situation extended to any portions of the Western Hemisphere is dangerous to the peace and safety of the whole of it, including the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)—

(1) That any such subversive domination or threat of it violates the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and of collective security as set forth in the acts and resolutions heretofore adopted by the American Republics; and

(2) That in any such situation any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance may, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense, and in accordance with the declarations and principles above stated, take steps to forestall or combat intervention, domination, control, and colonization in whatever form, by the subversive forces known as international communism and its agencies in the Western Hemisphere.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. KARSTEN), on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. PRICE), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. REUSS, for 10 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. FASCELL, for 15 minutes, today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MONAGAN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. LINDSAY, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. COLLIER, for 15 minutes, on Monday, January 18.

Mr. STRATTON, for 1 hour, on Wednesday.

Mr. ULLMAN, for 15 minutes, on Thursday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for 10 minutes, on each day this week the House is in session.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 10 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter and a resolution.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 1 hour, on tomorrow.

Mr. COFFIN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK), for 30 minutes, on tomorrow, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO (at the request of Mr. MOORE), for 20 minutes, on Wednesday, January 13.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BARR.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BETTS.

Mr. COLLIER and to include extraneous matter.

(At the request of Mr. McCORMACK, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. DENT.

Mr. METCALF.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon in two instances.

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa.

(At the request of Mr. MOORE, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. BENTLEY.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

(At the request of Mr. FASCELL, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 12, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1637. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for 1959, pursuant to the requirements of the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1638. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report relating to the Puerto Rican hurricane relief loans, pursuant to Public Law 692, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1639. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a report on a violation of sec-

tion 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, pertaining to the budgetary allotment made from the appropriation "Operations, 1960" to the regional operations director, Cincinnati, Ohio, which was overobligated for the postal quarter ended October 16, 1959; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1640. A letter from the executive secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 46th annual report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the calendar year 1958, pursuant to an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1641. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1642. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a statement in writing exhibiting the several sums drawn by him pursuant to sections 78 and 80 of title 2, United States Code, the application and disbursement of the same, and the balance, if any, remaining in his hands, pursuant to section 84 of title 2, United States Code; to the Committee on House Administration.

1643. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a report of progress pertaining to the Federal Aviation Agency, pursuant to section 302 (e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 746); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1644. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 1, 1959, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Gilbert Run, Md., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved May 17, 1950; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 9483. A bill to deem teachers in the State of Mississippi to be employees of such State for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 9484. A bill to amend section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 entitled "Property Rights in Inventions," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 9485. A bill to increase from 5 percent to 10 percent the amount which corporations may deduct for tax purposes for charitable contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 9486. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to prohibit the concentration of control of a substantial portion of the television and radio broadcasting facilities and a substantial portion of the news publications in any section of the country, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 9487. A bill to establish a free guide service for the U.S. Capitol Building; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 9488. A bill to clarify the law with respect to transportation of airmail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 9489. A bill to permit visitors from abroad to bring a limited amount of gifts into the United States free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9490. A bill to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to permit residents of the United States who are engaged in transporting persons or property between the United States and foreign countries to bring into the United States articles for personal or household use free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE (by request):

H.R. 9491. A bill to provide increased retired pay for certain members of the uniformed services retired before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORAND:

H.R. 9492. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Navy to convey a portion of Fort Adams, Newport, R.I., to the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 9493. A bill to repeal section 502(d) and a portion of section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which requires bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders be approved under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 9494. A bill to extend the Library Services Act for a period of 5 years, and to amend such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IKARD:

H.R. 9495. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that rebuilt parts and accessories shall be exempt from the manufacturers excise tax on automotive parts and accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H.R. 9496. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditure for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9497. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood-control accomplishments of the multiple-purpose developments to be constructed on the Mokelumne River by the East Bay Municipal Utility District of Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.R. 9498. A bill to increase the authorized maximum expenditures for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961 under the special milk program for children; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 9499. A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, to contract for coal research and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 9500. A bill to provide that a motorized wheelchair shall be furnished veterans who have suffered the loss, or loss of use, of both legs by reason of service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 9501. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income-tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 9502. A bill to provide for greater competitive distribution throughout private industry of the economic benefits flowing from preparing the Nation's defense, to improve the opportunities for small business concerns to participate as subcontractors in Government procurement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9503. A bill to authorize the establishment of a National Showcase of the Arts and Sciences in the District of Columbia to encourage young American artists and scientists; to authorize the holding of an International Olympiad of the Arts and Sciences on a biennial basis in the District of Columbia and thus to enhance the prospects of a durable peace; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9504. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9505. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood control accomplishments of the multiple-purpose developments to be constructed on the Mokelumne River by the East Bay Municipal Utility District of Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 9506. A bill to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and children at the same rates as apply in the case of veterans of the Spanish-American War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 9507. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to waive collections on raised money orders cashed by banks and other business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9508. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Bong Air Force Base, in Wisconsin; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9509. A bill to amend section 709 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the effective date of national service life insurance applied for by members of the Armed Forces on active duty; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9510. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to provide pension for the widows and children of veterans disabled 30 percent or more while engaged in armed conflict or in extrahazardous service, including such service under conditions simulating war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9511. A bill to provide for the retirement of \$15 billion of the interest-bearing debt of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 9512. A bill for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 9513. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from \$1,200 to \$3,000 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H.R. 9514. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to waive collections on raised money orders cashed by banks and other business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 9515. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 9516. A bill to authorize and direct the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the reports on the East Pass Channel at Destin, Fla., with a view to widening, deepening the channel at its present or at a different location, and constructing rubble mound or other type protective jetties; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9517. A bill to determine the need for a navigable channel in Black Creek, a tributary of the Apalachicola River, Fla., in the vicinity of the Liberty-Franklin County lines; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 9518. A bill to determine the need for a navigable channel across the Santa Rosa Peninsula to connect East Pass with Santa Rosa Sound, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 9519. A bill to provide additional compensation for employees in the postal field service required to qualify on scheme examinations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9520. A bill to make permanent certain temporary increases in rates of compensation of employees of the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 9521. A bill to provide that certain real property of the United States shall be made a part of the Saguaro National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 9522. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 9523. A bill to simplify the payment of certain miscellaneous judgments and the

payment of certain compromise settlements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9524. A bill to provide for research into and development of practical means for the utilization of solar energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 9525. A bill to encourage the creation of original designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 544. Joint resolution providing that the Commission of Fine Arts render advice and comment on matters within its jurisdiction relating to parks and structures in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 450. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense and judgment of the Congress with respect to Canal Zone sovereignty; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 451. Concurrent resolution expressing the indignation of Congress at the recent desecration of houses of worship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause I of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H.R. 9526. A bill for the relief of Joseph Lednicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 9527. A bill for the relief of Jack R. Darling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 9528. A bill for the relief of Efstrtios Handrinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS (by request):

H.R. 9529. A bill for the relief of David Baker; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.R. 9530. A bill for the relief of Wallace R. Price and Nora J. Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico:

H.R. 9531. A bill for the relief of Yukie Arita Hale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 9532. A bill for the relief of Wang Li Chuang-nan, Wang Pal, Wang An, Wang Kang, and Wang Chien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 9533. A bill for the relief of Marie Jeanne Fehn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 9534. A bill for the relief of Jovito Batas Bacugan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 9535. A bill for the relief of Hideo Iwasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON:

H.R. 9536. A bill for the relief of Joao Ferreira and Maria Ercila Machado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9537. A bill for the relief of Julian Osuna-Cisneros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9538. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susie Lacacio and her son, John Peter Lacacio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

309. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Richard J. Taggart, Purcellville, Va., relative to a redress of grievance, calling for a government of, for, and by all of the people, all of the time, in lieu of the present government by a part of them; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

310. Also, petition of Charles S. Ballinger, Chattanooga, Tenn., relative to a redress of grievances against the U.S. Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Dr. Thomas A. Dooley Receives Criss Award for Outstanding Medical Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in 1950 the Mutual of Omaha Criss Award was established by V. J. Skutt, president of Mutual of Omaha, in honor of the late Dr. C. C. Criss, founder of the company. The award consists of \$10,000 and a gold medal, and is presented to the individual or individuals who, in the opinion of a distinguished board of judges, has made an outstanding contribution to public health and/or safety. This board of judges includes Dr. Charles W. Mayo, Mayo Clinic, who serves as chairman; Lt. Gen. (Ret.) James Doolittle, chairman, Space Technology Laboratories, Inc.; Irene Dunne,

actress; Henry Ford, II, president, Ford Motor Co.; Philip M. Klutznick, honorary president, International B'nai B'rith; William L. Lawrence, science writer for the New York Times; Harold Lloyd, actor; Don McNeill, radio personality; Dr. Louis M. Orr, president, American Medical Association; Dr. Thomas Parran, president, Avalon Foundation; Howard Pyle, president, National Safety Council; A. E. Stoddard, president, Union Pacific Railroad; and DeWitt Wallace, editor, the Reader's Digest, all of whom have made outstanding contributions to public health and/or safety.

RECIPIENTS OUTSTANDING

Drs. Philip S. Hench and Edward C. Kendall were the first winners of the award which they shared jointly for their work in the development and use of cortisone, a drug which has great value in the control of arthritis. The second award went to a man distinguished in a number of fields, the eminent medical editor of the New York Times, Dr. Howard A. Rusk. The award was given for his outstanding success in rehabilitating the physically handi-

capped. In 1954, Mr. W. Earl Hall, editor of the Mason City, Iowa, Globe-Gazette, and past president and member of the National Safety Council, received the Criss Award for his distinguished work in the area of safety education. In 1955, the world famed Dr. Jonas E. Salk received the award for his selfless contribution to the development of a vaccine against polio.

Mr. President, on November 10, 1959, this distinguished group of men was joined by Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, the American doctor who has devoted his career to caring for stricken natives in the jungles of Laos and Vietnam.

I have spoken before in the Senate of the humanitarian dedication of Dr. Dooley, and I have written in magazines of this great American's courage, his skill, and tender care. Here is a man, now only 32, who has become the symbol of lifesaving, selfless Americans. He is the antithesis of "The Ugly American." His good deeds have helped conquer the barriers of custom, language, and hate—good deeds that made him become, as the President of Vietnam said, "Be-

loved by a whole nation." Dr. Dooley is truly a great person.

Mr. President, Dr. Thomas A. Dooley is the type of man whom our country needs for its ambassadors abroad—indeed, he is the type of man whom all humanity needs.

The *Milwaukie Review*, of Milwaukie, Oreg., on November 19, 1959, published a very thoughtful and eloquent editorial discussing Dr. Dooley's outstanding medical achievement, and his receipt of the Mutual of Omaha Criss Award. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial from the *Milwaukie Review*, entitled "Another Tom Dooley," be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

ANOTHER TOM DOOLEY

Not too long ago there was a maudlin ballad about one Tom Dooley who was about to be hanged. Teenagers adored this character. His praises were heard wherever a jukebox blared, in adoration that was never clear. This teenage idol was a killer—and stupid, to boot.

This week another Tom Dooley should have become the idol of young people everywhere. In one place, he already is. In far off Laos, young Tom Dooley, now only 32, and 27 when he first came as a naval medical officer to the Orient, has become the symbol of life-saving, self-less Americans. He is the antithesis of the "ugly American."

Not financed by the Government, in fact at first scarcely financed at all, Dooley's outpost medical aid station in the tropic, disease-infected wilderness of Asia, became the hope of life itself for men, women, and children otherwise condemned to a hideous and inevitable death.

Dr. Dooley is an angry man. A young, ordinary, ambitious graduate medical student, he did a bitter internship in the rigors of the Korean war and its aftermath of refugees, of flood, famine, and disease. He couldn't forget the misery, the need, the swollen, dying children. He went back and stayed. With modern medicine and with his own talent and that of his recruited associates, he performed miracles.

This week, young Tom Dooley, M.D., received a coveted award. An award received in the past by such as Jonas Salk. It was the Criss Award of the Mutual of Omaha Insurance Co. for outstanding medical achievement. Young Dr. Dooley had thought he would have to use the \$10,000 he received to pay for his own recent cancer surgery, but that was subsidized. So he contributed it to another outpost in the wilderness, Africa.

Albert Schweitzer told Dr. Tom Dooley when he was so honored, "All the world should love you for what you do."

Hey, kids, how about this new Tom Dooley?

Citizenship Versus the Power Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, during the fall recess, I had the opportunity of reading one of the most challenging critiques of the current state of the American political system that I have

come across. It was an address by the Honorable George Romney, the dynamic president of American Motors Corp., to the Commonwealth Club of California. It was delivered on September 14, 1959.

The thesis of Mr. Romney's excellent address is that economic power or pressure groups have all but taken over from the individual citizen the control and direction of our political system and institutions. This power grab by the power groups, as Mr. Romney sees it, involves both of our great political parties. He seems to fear that the arena of American politics has, to a large and dangerous degree, become the exclusive battleground of big labor versus big corporations. The rights of the individual citizen and the general welfare of the country have been ignored in this battle of the giants.

Mr. Romney has an answer for the dilemma facing the American political system. He urges a revival and resurgence of participation and responsibility by the individual citizen in the political affairs of the Nation. This is the only hope for cutting the big power groups down to size.

Mr. President, I have long been alarmed by the growing power and influence of the political pressure groups over our Government. I have warned time and again that these groups are exerting power and influence out of all proportion to the numbers they purport to represent. Even worse, they callously disregard the general welfare of the country as a whole in the interest of their own selfish and narrow end.

Mr. President, these pressure groups do not confine their activities to the economic field; they operate in virtually every area of our national life. They appeal to the noble instincts of our people, to their patriotism, their devotion to their country, and the like; while actually they are seeking to impose their selfish philosophy on the Government.

I am delighted to hear an outstanding American business leader speak out frankly and courageously against the growing menace of the pressure groups. Mr. Romney's Commonwealth Club remarks amount to a ringing call to citizenship. I believe every Member of this body could profit by reading Mr. Romney's remarks and I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

CITIZENSHIP VERSUS THE POWER GROUPS (By George Romney, president, American Motors Corp.)

Some years ago, Justice Brandels, one of the most thoughtful and probing observers of the American scene, declared:

"It is not good for us that we should ever lose the fighting quality, the stamina, and the courage to battle for what we want when we are entitled to it."

Today, I think we have lost a great deal of that "fighting quality." The majority of our people have few flaming interests that they are willing to struggle for. In many important areas of our national life, the individual is being engulfed in vast organizations and power groups. In larger and larger numbers, he is transferring his rights of citizenship to the corporation or the union, or idly watching his responsibilities drift to Washington.

To a very large extent, the people owe their security to corporations or unions which are concerned with the most important single interest that individuals can gain from such association—the individual's economic interest. As long as this is reasonably secure, people have no burning interest that would move them actively into political participation. On the contrary, large numbers of them consider it safer to be nonpolitical.

Without personal interests or convictions, they remain nonpolitical because the ways in which politics operate on them are so generalized and so remote that they consider it all but impossible to interfere.

There are three major dangers from this renunciation of politics:

If the people as citizens are unable to fill the role in politics traditionally assigned to them, we will be confronted with a vacuum in political power and leadership.

Impersonal economic interests are replacing and eliminating political and citizenship interests. The substitution of economic citizenship for direct political citizenship could be the doom of our way of life.

Parallel economic and political conflict would destroy the social unity vital to society as a whole.

Today, I would like to deal with these fundamental problems. As the basis of discussion, let's review briefly the established principles of our American democracy.

First, the moral principles.

1. The rights and basic responsibilities of man are derived from the Creator, in whose eyes each man is an individual, created with equal rights and responsibilities and in perpetual brotherhood.

2. Each man in meeting his responsibilities has the right to all freedom that does not infringe on the rights of others.

3. Freedom can be a reality only with separation of church and state. Religious freedom is the key to all the others. If the civil and ecclesiastical governments were joined, the latter would necessarily have to dominate, since it could point to an authority higher than the people.

4. The state derives all of its authority from the people and should be responsive to their control.

With the moral principles established, the mechanics of the social order become the prime consideration, requiring basic agreement among citizens as to principles of government.

I believe these are the essential elements of that agreement:

1. A system of representative democracy most effectively insures individual liberty.

2. Government must limit itself to those rights specifically assigned to it by the governed.

3. The authority of government should be divided to provide cross-checking and dispersion of power.

4. Government should be as close as possible to the people it serves, therefore State and local governments should have adequate responsibility.

5. The people assume responsibilities to be met by voluntary means, in order to avoid excessive reliance on government and the consequent abridgement of liberty to obey or disobey their Creator.

6. The mainsprings of progress should be individual action or the voluntary cooperative action of free individuals.

7. The state should do for the people only those things they cannot do at all or as well for themselves, either individually or in cooperation with each other.

8. Economic and nonreligious social institutions derive their authority from the people and should be responsive to their control. As organizational magnitude and complexity grow, the state becomes for the people a joint instrument of economic and social control. Properly used, the purpose of the state is to maintain the ability of the

people to exercise direct ultimate control—as in the case of economic control through antimonopoly laws to enforce competition.

9. The exercise of direct ultimate economic and social control by the people requires the division and dispersion of economic and social power. Power concentration in one place fosters it in others. It diminishes control by the people, and thereby limits their freedom, responsibility, and development.

Taken together—these moral principles and principles of government are the foundation stones of our society; the authority of the Creator * * * the sanctity of the individual * * * the brotherhood of man * * * the state as the creature and servant of man * * * the dispersion of power, that freedom may be insured * * * that men should compete and cooperate and be rewarded on the basis of what they contribute to society.

Have these principles changed in any way? I can't see that they have. But circumstances change, affecting not the validity of the principles but their freedom to work. When the system falls in some degree or another, it is not the fallacy of principle but the failure of techniques or the failure of men.

Our techniques will continue to fail from time to time if we freeze them, if we fail to recognize that the American Revolution is a continuing process of applying our basic principles to new problems that arise out of new experience. The fact that new problems arise is in itself almost sufficient proof of the strength of the system, which is fluid rather than static. It produces new successes, new situations and, naturally, new challenges. As Whitman observed, the fruition of each success brings these new challenges, making a still greater struggle necessary.

In the early days of our Nation, it was hardly possible to foresee that our revolution would also embrace other revolutions, particularly in technology. Nor was it possible to anticipate our phenomenal growth, our ascendancy to world power, the enormous economic changes, the growth of the corporation and union concepts * * *. To name only these, is it possible to conceive of an ideal inflexible system? Or to deny the living character of our revolution?

Failure to modernize our techniques as we have moved along has created some severe problems, none of which, in my opinion, has exceeded the problem of power concentration.

This strikes at our basic principles. We fought against the power concentration that made our liberty and independence impossible. The weak state of the original Confederation reflected the peoples' fear of concentrated authority. The Constitution itself, while providing for a strong central government, bristles with safeguards against excessive power held in the hands of a few. Jefferson defeated Hamilton and his ideas, Jackson defeated the Bank of the United States, Teddy Roosevelt defeated the trusts, Franklin Roosevelt divided the power of big finance and big business. We are ignoring the problem when we allow the Federal Government, or unions and industry to assume too much responsibility.

I think one of the most regrettable aspects of American life today is a situation in which union power and employer power can be concentrated to the point that an industry which is basic to the economic welfare of the total nation can be shut down as a result of the position of either group. I think that is an unheard-of concentration of private economic power. I think it's going to be impossible to solve the economic problems of this country without dealing with that hard reality of excess economic power. I think any time we permit a few men in labor or a few men in industry to reach the point where they can cripple the economy and adversely affect the public interest, we have

created a condition completely contrary to the spirit of America. The employer and union power in the steel strike is a present example. I do not agree that it will impress Khrushchev favorably. I think it will impress him as an abusive exercise of excess private economic power.

When I have discussed concentration in labor and industry on previous occasions, some have remarked that I am seeking increased government regulation. Quite the contrary. We do not need more law but modern law. Neither our labor laws nor our anti-trust laws are up to date. Bear this in mind: when law is not clear or specific or up-to-date, either the problems grow or the intervention of government must necessarily be increased. Vague and outmoded laws are difficult to observe and to enforce. Our present anti-trust laws make their criterion the intent to use power wrongfully—opening up an endless field of litigation and legal interpretation. How can intent be proven and judged with accuracy in the field of business? As in the case of our Constitutional safeguards, the criterion should be the ability to wield power to excess. In the case of labor, our inconsistent laws encourage the fostering of labor monopoly and the creation of a concentration of power that could be matched only by a massive coalition of industrial power. The collision between these two excessive forces is confronting us with the necessity of intervention of government to protect the people as consumers—and the end result of the road we are on will be some form of totalitarianism.

The attitude of outspoken people toward highly centralized government may be divided generally into three categories: those who believe in the idea of social "drift" that, like a raft on a Gulf stream, society will somehow get where it's going. Another view is that big centralized governments are necessary for big societies, and that comfortable countervailing forces will keep the balance. A third view is that concentration of power ought to be fought wherever it exists or the individual will be smashed—one way or another.

I take the latter view. Certainly big societies, especially those in competition with other big societies, need strong—even big—governments and strong—even big—unions and corporations. But their power can and must be dispersed. The ultimate control can and must be in the hands of the people.

This will be impossible unless we recognize that it is morally and economically wrong for either unions as unions or corporations as corporations to get into politics directly or indirectly.

To me, it is wrong for the very simple reason that it is wrong for any American to transfer his personal rights of citizenship to an institution, and wrong for an institution to act in any way to encourage the relinquishing of such rights.

There is little difference in principle between the present excessive political influence of unions and the earlier excessive political influence of business denounced by both Roosevelts. One excess is as wrong as the other. Both are obstacles to political freedom, economic justice, and individual development. The creation of union power was a desirable offset to business power. Economic power is better distributed now between unions and business than it was earlier when exercised largely by business. Current union political activity does not differ in principle from earlier business political activity. Unions can try to justify their programs on that basis, but the question is whether in a democracy based on political freedom and the rights of the individual, economic organizations should be permitted to participate directly or indirectly in political affairs.

Let me be clear. I am not referring to individual union leaders or members partici-

pating in political activity. I do not mean individual business leaders or white-collar employees participating in political activity. Nor unions or businesses presenting economic facts to political bodies or to private citizens' groups. What I am talking about is direct or indirect political activity on the part of economic organizations, whether they are union organizations, business organizations, or other organized forms of economic endeavor.

Before church and state were separated, unquestionably church participation in politics and government exerted a direct influence on the political attitudes of church members. Similarly, political activity by a company is likely to cause an executive to feel that his economic opportunity in the enterprise is affected by his political support of company political thinking. Conversely, the attitude of many American businesses has resulted in political inactivity on the part of its executives.

The same thing is true of unions. How could union members or union officers fail to feel that their treatment by the union would be affected by conformity or opposition to union political programs?

I believe we must prohibit economic organizations from direct or indirect political activity and expenditures. What right have they to use the funds of stockholders or members to support specific political candidates or partisan issues? What right has either to create an atmosphere where a member's or employee's economic status can possibly be thought to depend on his political views and convictions—as long as they conform to the basic principles on which our free society depends to protect individual freedom and inalienable rights?

With the difficulty being experienced in securing competent candidates for local, State and even some Federal offices, it is obvious we must overcome the lack of political participation by individuals, whether they be corporate employees or union members. I believe that corporate officials and union officials should participate personally, as individuals, in political affairs * * * but I think they should take every possible step to assure members and employees that this right is a personal right not to be abridged in any manner, and to encourage others to use it.

We must bring back to life the feeling that each individual can participate with effectiveness.

One businessman wrote me the following question: "How can a public-spirited individual be effective or influential unless his energies are combined with similar energies of other individuals?"

He cannot. He must work with others. But his work must be personal and direct, not by proxy. He must be directed by what he believes in, not what his corporation or his union believes in. He must speak for himself, and not suffer his voice to be drowned in the loudspeaker of an institution. The instrument available to him for the combination of his effort with those of others is the political party, when the party system is functioning properly.

Unfortunately, our political parties at present have given victory at the polls such engulfing preeminence that neither will take a position that might offend any sizable segment of voters. The result is a close similarity between stated party objectives, with very little choice left to the voter. Attention is focused on money and organization power rather than broad citizen participation and sincere spontaneous support.

The parties have allowed themselves to a large extent to become the captives of dominant economic groups. In Michigan, for example, one party is largely under the control of big labor, while the other is largely in the hands of big business. The dominance of these power groups, expressed

through organizations and not individual citizens, resulted in a 7-month deadlock that thwarted the progress of the State. The individual has a sense of frustration and helplessness.

To combat this, we are developing a non-partisan citizens' program identified as Citizens for Michigan. It is made up of individuals acting for themselves and not as representatives of any organization of any type.

Through this effort, we hope, first, to establish a means by which an influence greater than the minority economic groups now dominating our two political parties can be created; second, to acquaint enough citizens with the facts on the State's problems and the means for their solution to secure essential political and governmental action; and, third, to restore citizen belief in the effectiveness of individual political participation.

The success of our program can provide the basis for releasing the political parties from their captivity and restoring to the people these necessary instruments for self-government.

To encourage an increase in political participation, we must have two political parties with programs and methods that provide the people a clear choice. At least one should be devoted to the interest and welfare of all Americans. At least one should be more dedicated to the principles of human liberty and justice than to political victory at any cost through economic power, subsidy and advantage.

Individuals of character and principle, working as free citizens with others of like mind and purpose, can achieve this. Individuals working politically as units of business or labor can only intensify special interest party domination and increase the magnitude and scope of our present economic conflict, while personally giving up the rights, responsibilities and respect of citizenship.

There are three important things we must do to stop the drift toward increasingly massive centralized government.

One, to make certain, by modernized law, that power outside government is dispersed and kept dispersed. Surely the principal way to reduce the size and power of centralized government is to disperse power that only big government can hold in check and increase the influence and control exercised directly by the people.

Two, to improve the character of State governments and modernize the smaller government units, such as the parish or the county, that were set up on the basis of travel and population distribution in a frontier country.

Three, to revive the political participation of the people in control of the government by dramatic steps that would bring back to life the feeling that they can participate with effectiveness.

The most effective means of putting some hope and zest back into political participation would be for the political parties to reject economic power group participation, reach out for citizenship participation, put less emphasis on dollars and more emphasis on people. The give-a-dollar-to-the-party-of-your-choice campaigns would be more effective with a give-an-hour campaign. The method today is too much one of guarded exclusion rather than participation. The parties are not going to get participation if the people feel they have no opportunity to choose anything but the word that is passed from the smoke-filled room. Widely publicized open forum-type meeting would put excitement and opportunity back into the political area at the local level.

Participation on an effective basis would arouse the interest of people who are today without interest. It would simulate people to take stands on issues and it would generate issues. One of our problems today is

issueless politics, with a tragic simplicity between party positions that give the voter little choice. How can a citizen help but vacillate between parties and be ill attracted to either in such circumstances?

We need to bring our political parties and the people together, if our democratic system is to continue to be truly representative. When the people have no choice, they are powerless to act, and control is defaulted to willful power groups that can be arrogantly unaccountable to a listless electorate.

Today, the power groups are rapidly extending control over the people, the political parties and the state. The individual must use his citizenship to bring the power groups under control, not primarily through the state but primarily through making them responsive to the people. The unions should be primarily responsive to the control of citizens who are members. The corporations should be primarily responsive to the control of citizens who are stockholders and consumers. The citizen must fight for his citizenship, or he will find himself enslaved by the power groups or an all powerful state that is exercising his inalienable rights on the premise that the state must protect him from the excesses of the power groups. The internal struggle of our age is citizenship versus the power groups.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt talked to your club on September 23, 1932, he discussed the necessity of curbing the barons of business, as it had once been necessary to curb the barons of feudalism. He led in releasing the forces that created the barons of unionism. This division of power was better than its unilateral exercise, but the existence of two sets of barons and their widening contest for economic, political, and social power threatens our future at home and abroad. The union barons and the business barons must be curbed anew. When both are so strong that separately or jointly they can jeopardize the interests and rights of the Nation as a whole, citizens are face to face with the age-old struggle to keep power in any form from becoming excessive.

Greater exercise of citizenship is an essential factor in America's future.

We need to reawaken the idea, I believe, that America has some important unfinished business. The American Revolution was not a distant explosion from which the dust has long since settled. It is a continuing process, and we should never forget this.

We must continue our revolution by restoring faith in the individual and helping the individual to restore faith in himself and his citizenship.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wish to supplement what the distinguished Senator from Georgia has said with respect to George Romney, the president of American Motors. He is not only one of the most courageous and dynamic and forthright leaders in American industry, but some years ago George Romney was associated with one of the senatorial committees, as I recall.

I remember that when he appeared before the Judiciary Committee at one time, he made some observations with reference to his committee experience on Capitol Hill. Therefore he sees the whole picture, not only from the standpoint of industry, but also from the basis of his experience in the legislative branch as a sort of working member of a committee. I share the high esteem which the distinguished Senator from Georgia has of Mr. Romney.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not recall ever having met Mr. Romney, although it is entirely likely that he was associated with a committee during the time that I have served in the Senate. It so happens that during the adjournment of the Senate I have more time to spend in my office than I am able to do when the Senate is in session, and therefore have more time to read material which comes to my desk. I read Mr. Romney's speech, and it impressed me tremendously.

I am confident that he points to one of the real threats to our system of government. It is the fact that the pressure groups operate in almost every area of our life, and in doing so they make more noise and receive more credit and claim more strength than they are entitled to, and exercise more influence on the operation of our Government and on the making our laws and the enforcement of our laws than their numbers and the merits of their case would justify.

Economic Trends, Labor and Management Conferences, and the Steel Strike Settlement—Address by the Secretary of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by the Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, before the Economic Club of Detroit, today.

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

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR JAMES P. MITCHELL BEFORE THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF DETROIT, DETROIT, MICH., JANUARY 11, 1960

Mr. Chairman, members of the Detroit Economic Club, distinguished guests, some 2 years ago I was invited to luncheon with you and, as some you may recall, I had to do it at that time by telephone, neither nutritious nor personally satisfactory.

I am happy to be here myself this time, and I want to thank you for again extending an invitation to me.

I have been asked to speak on the question: "Where are we and where do we go from here in the labor-management relations?"

I don't think that I can return a responsive answer to that question without indicating first what I believe to be important evolutionary changes in our economic life. For labor-management relations exist in a context of change.

It seems that the evolution of our economic life is leading toward larger concentrations of economic power within institutions—power based not on the ownership of wealth but on the control of wealth.

These institutions are various: corporations, of which 500 now account for two-thirds of our total industry; pension and trust funds, already totaling some \$40 billion and growing at the rate of \$4 billion

annually; labor unions, supported by 16 million members; mutual funds, trusts, insurance and banking firms and so on.

It has been estimated that 50 million citizens are now sharing in the profits of the 500 largest corporations, directly and indirectly. Since 1952, the number of direct stockholders in public corporations has risen from 6.5 million to 12.5 million.

In the United States more and more people are enjoying greater and greater degrees of wealth.

At the same time, the control of economic wealth is concentrated in greater degree in our economic institutions, and in the hands of the managers, administrators and leaders of those institutions.

Outside a free society, this might be a dangerous condition, but inside a free society it has an opposite effect; it places in the hands of private citizens both the power and the resources to attain the social and economic goals they set for themselves.

A free society, has within itself the weapon to curb injustice that might result from a selfish or blind use of economic power; that weapon is the political power that the people have reserved for themselves.

We are all familiar with the use of political intervention, from antitrust laws through the regulation of transportation and broadcasting the regulation of labor-management affairs.

Intervention usually results when economic institutions have not lived up to the responsibilities that society has expected of them, either through incompetence or willful mismanagement and abuse of control.

We have, in America, a rapidly growing society, one with impressive needs, and even more impressive wants.

America will be looking to its private institutions to initiate and support positive programs for social and economic advancement.

At the same time intervention by political power has the latent danger of sapping the vitality of private responsibility, frustrating private initiative, and, most importantly, creating a drift toward vesting government with more and more controls over private affairs.

When political power and economic power are joined, as they are in Russia, it can be devastating to the ambitions of freedom.

At the same time, the vigorous and expanding society of tomorrow will not hesitate, I believe, to exert its political power if the needs and the wants the people feel are not met by private means.

That is one of the reasons why it was all-important that the recent steel strike be settled voluntarily—to preserve these vital institutions from political regulation.

And that is one of the reasons why more has to be done in the private sector to solve the social needs represented by the older worker, by the minority group—and on down a long list of problems waiting for remedies.

I disagree vigorously with those who believe that government is the only institution committed by nature to a forwarding of the common good.

We have estimated, at the Department of Labor, that the population of the United States will increase to 226 million by 1975. The labor force in that period will grow to 95 million, an increase of 23 million. Eight million of that increase will be men and women over 45 years of age.

At present, because of senseless prejudices, because of changes in business technology, the older worker is often excluded from employment. He finds that his age has erected invisible barriers around him, cutting him off from participation in the active economic life of his society.

Well, whose problem is this?

Is it the problem only of the mature worker himself, and one that he can meet only by recourse to his political power?

In New York and in other States there are now laws on the books that prohibit discrimination in employment because of age. Is it possible, unless the managers and the leaders of our centers of private economic power realize that this is their problem too, that a national law might someday be on the books—and it will be there not because the Government is seeking to control but because millions of people, frustrated in their desire to join into society in an active way, have demanded such control.

The fact that this economy will be called upon for a maximum response to meet domestic needs and international commitments makes it plain that the maximum utilization of human resources is not a choice but an imperative.

And it is plain to me that business management and labor unions have prime responsibility to get this job done.

A corporation must exist for larger ends than the mere accumulation of profit, the production of goods or the payment of wages. It must also use its economic power to further national goals and serve society's purposes.

It can't do this if it has, for example, discriminatory employment policies in regard to minority workers.

It can't do this if color is made a condition of employment.

I think you will agree with me that the clamor for general use of political power to meet social ends is based on a vote of no-confidence in the ability, and the intention, of the private sector of our economy to assume the responsibility.

I do not mean to give here the impression that the private and public powers stand at opposite poles. On many of the social needs of today they must join. Certainly the problems afflicting those areas of chronic unemployment require such a dual approach—legislation by government and action by the private economy.

The older worker, the minority worker, the area of chronic unemployment—add to these urban renewal, educational facilities, civil rights, housing and health. These, and many more, are problems of total society, and total society solves them in its own way, using the instrument that works best.

I believe that the concentrations of economic power in America have a responsibility to the common good, and that many of our needs can best be met through the exercise and the initiative of that private responsibility.

This is one of the reasons why there must be wider, better, more profound, more continuous communication between those in whom the power to control resides.

Last Thursday, in his state of the Union address, the President spoke of "voluntary, dependable, abiding cooperation among the important segments of our own free society."

Such cooperation rests upon voluntary, dependable, and abiding communication.

The time for labor and management to start talking to one another is now.

To forward this end, I have been suggesting for some time now that labor and management provide a means for communication outside the bargaining table. I suggested this need to the construction industry when I met with them in New York a few years ago, and I am happy to see that a committee has been formed within that industry, with representatives from labor and management, to address itself to mutual problems.

The President announced last week that it was his intention to "encourage regular discussions between labor and management outside the bargaining table to consider the interests of the public as well as their mutual interests in the maintenance of industrial peace, price stability, and economic growth."

We hope to encourage labor and management themselves to begin communicating with each other. For in order for anything

practically useful and sound to come from such communication, it seems to me that the parties themselves must first want to communicate.

Without that desire for understanding, without that condition of good will, they are "doomed before they take the vow."

Certainly none of you sitting here this afternoon need an engraved invitation from the White House to talk out mutual problems with your employees or your employer.

It is true that the Government has been talking, and will continue to talk, with men in both labor and management, encouraging them to get together. It is my hope that this encouragement will prompt the representatives of labor and management to initiate conferences in every industry—without waiting for Washington to fire the starting gun.

The advantages of open, continuous communications outside bargaining are, it seems to me, clear. Problems not susceptible to bargaining can here be met—the impact of research and development on employment, any practices that may be detrimental to labor or to management or to an entire industry, the impact of foreign competition and the maintenance of a high order of productivity. I am sure that many things come immediately to your minds as well.

And I would hope, finally, that out of these industry conversations, both labor and management will agree to the principle that owners, workers, and consumers are all entitled to a fair share of the fruits of increasing productivity.

And, in line with my previous remarks, it would be a demonstration that the public welfare can be forwarded by private interest.

It is my hope that eventually the bargaining table will become not an isolated battleground upon which hereditary opponents infrequently meet for an often-bitter Indian wrestle over the size of shares but the logical culmination of a continuously developed understanding, where the public interest and the welfare of the industry find their formal expression and their most positive fulfillment.

I was pleased that the steel agreement provides for a Human Relations Research Committee that will recommend solutions to mutual problems in the areas of wage and benefit adjustment, job classification, wage incentives, seniority and medical care.

In regard to the total steel settlement, there have been many misleading reports as to its cost.

I am sure that all of you are interested in the cost aspect of the settlement, and I would like to clarify it for you.

Mr. Roger Blough, chairman of the board of United States Steel, has said that the average annual increase in hourly employment costs resulting from this settlement will be 3.5 to 3.75 percent.

This is in contrast to other steel settlements during the postwar period, during which hourly employment costs have been rising, according to Mr. Blough, at an average of 8 percent a year.

The steel companies and the steel union, in the present settlement, have cut the postwar trend by half.

A comparison of the average annual increase in hourly earnings between the steel and other major settlements shows the following:

Aluminum, 5.2 percent; can, 4.5 percent; Kaiser, 3.82 percent; steel, 3.75 percent.

When compared with other wage settlements reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1950, the steel wage increase of 7 cents—which does not go into effect until next December—is less than the average. As a matter of fact, 65 percent of wage increases in 1959 exceed that figure.

What this means is that the steel wage settlement is in line with others negotiated this year, and thus cannot set off a wage pat-

tern with highly inflationary effects, as has happened sometimes in the past.

A great part of the misunderstanding about this settlement is due to news accounts that failed completely to take into account the fact that the steel settlement has been described in terms of total employment costs while other major settlements have been described in terms of wages and benefits to employees.

Thus, to say that the reported steel package of 39 cents is comparable to the reported aluminum package of 28.2 cents is not only untrue but meaningless. The steel package figure describes total employment costs to the companies; the other is a description only of the wages and benefits received by employees.

Mr. R. Conrad Cooper, in comparing recent major settlements in terms of employment costs, said: " * * * the effect on our employment cost of the contractual arrangements we made is from 3½ to 3¾ percent per year. We estimate the can, aluminum, and Kaiser settlements would have approximated 4½ to 5 percent if they had been accepted by the steel industry, or nearly 30 percent more."

On the basis of this settlement—I am convinced that if management and labor mutually seek, as I know they will, to increase the rate of productivity in the steel industry, Mr. Blough's statement that there will be no price increase at present will be good for some time to come.

Certainly no one can predict price stability indefinitely because other cost factors than wages enter into the determination of price policy.

With good will and good sense, and with awareness that an economic institution like a steel corporation or a labor union must serve the public interest as fully as its own interests, it could be possible—on the basis of this settlement—that the United States will have seen its last major steel strike.

It has always been the pride of our people that we have been worthy of freedom. That is because we have turned power to the use and the betterment of the individual; we have made free decision and voluntary cooperation the touchstones of a system that serves and honors the highest ends of society—the elevation of each man toward wider horizons.

The issue before us is the old test of freedom with the new forms of power. It is an issue we should meet with full confidence in our private institutions, and in the ideals of reliance and service that have brought us successfully to this new decade. Thank you.

A Review of the Activities of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy During the 1st Session of the 86th Congress and a Look Into the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to attend the meeting of the nuclear energy committee of the National Association of Manufacturers held in New York City, at 10 a.m., on Friday, October 23, 1959.

The program consisted of a review of NAM policies in the nuclear field and a

general discussion of the Federal-State relationships in this field.

During the course of the program, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I delivered the following address in which I discussed the activities of the Joint Committee during the 1st session of the 86th Congress as well as the prospects for the 2d session.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE NUCLEAR ENERGY COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS, OCTOBER 23, 1959

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the distinguished chairman of your nuclear energy committee, Mr. Fairman, in his letter of invitation, suggested that I speak today on the activities of the Joint Committee during the 1st session of the 86th Congress as well as the prospects for the 2d session.

With all due respect to your distinguished chairman, I believe he has given me quite a large order.

As you will see, the activities of the Joint Committee during 1959 ranged all the way from radioisotopes to reactors, and from the genetic effects of fallout to the fine print in insurance policies.

Our committee held hearings on waste disposal, employee radiation hazards, workmen's compensation, patents, liability, Federal-State relationships, atomic power, new weapons, nuclear war, our nuclear submarine program, and a host of other subjects.

The testimony varied from atomic energy regulations in local communities all the way to international atoms-for-peace agreements, Euratom, and the Geneva negotiations with the Russians for cessation of nuclear weapons tests.

Our committee, and its various subcommittees, held a total of 84 public hearings and 77 hearings and meetings in executive session.

Some 25 publications, consisting of reports and hearings were printed by the Joint Committee during the first session, amounting to over 11,000 pages.

And so I say, Mr. Chairman, you have given me a fairly good sized order.

But, with your indulgence, I will try to touch briefly on most of the activities of the Joint Committee during this past session, and then look into my crystal ball for 1960, as you requested.

I am very glad to begin with the 1959 amendment to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to permit greater participation by State and local governments in regulating the atom, because I understand it is on your agenda this morning.

The 1946 and 1954 Atomic Energy Acts both set forth comprehensive frameworks for regulation of the atom by the Federal Government, but were silent as to the role of State and local governments.

As the peacetime uses of atomic energy spread throughout the country, a growing crescendo of interest by State and local officials developed.

In particular, radioisotopes began to find more and more applications in the fields of biology and medicine, agriculture, and industry.

By 1959 the AEC had outstanding over 4,500 radioisotope licensees, spread throughout our 50 States and in almost every community.

In May of 1959, the Joint Committee held 4 days of public hearings and received testimony from representatives of the AEC, Public Health Service, State and local governments, industry, and labor.

As a result of these hearings, the Joint Committee made a number of changes in the bill originally proposed by the AEC.

After a number of committee meetings, we then unanimously reported out the bill, with amendments, together with our committee report.

Let me quote briefly from some of the comments of the Joint Committee in its report: "2. The approach of the bill is considered appropriate, in the opinion of the Joint Committee, for several reasons:

"(a) The approach is on a State-by-State basis. * * * The bill does not authorize a wholesale relinquishment or abdication by the Commission of its regulatory responsibilities but only a gradual, carefully considered turnover, on a State-by-State basis, as individual States may become qualified.

"(b) The bill applies to some, but not all, atomic energy activities now regulated exclusively by AEC."

It applies principally to radioisotopes, whose use and present licensing by AEC is widespread, but whose hazard is local and limited.

Licensing and regulation of more dangerous activities—such as nuclear reactors—will remain the exclusive responsibility of the Commission.

When the bill was considered on the floor of the House, it was my privilege, together with my colleague, Representative MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, to explain its purposes and intent to the other Members of the House.

After explaining some of the provisions, I summarized for the House as follows:

"In summary, Mr. Speaker, this bill would help the States assume independent regulatory jurisdiction in areas which are now regulated exclusively by the Federal Government under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act.

"It would assist the States to prepare themselves for assuming such responsibility by increased training and programs of assistance for the States.

"As pointed out in the Joint Committee report, this would increase the protection of the public health and safety because most citizens look to their local health officers for advice and protection against hazardous materials used in the community."

I am happy to say that the House, as well as the Senate, passed the bill in the form recommended by the Joint Committee.

It was signed by President Eisenhower on September 23, 1959, as Public Law 86-373, and is now the law of the land.

The AEC is developing regulations under the new law and has entered into discussions with representatives of at least one State (New York) leading, we hope, to an agreement whereby that State will begin to assume some of the regulatory responsibilities of atomic energy applications.

I think most of you will agree with me that this new law to shift some responsibility out of Washington and to the States represents an important and healthy development.

All of us realize that it is going to take a number of years to develop commercially atomic energy, especially atomic power.

But some day we will have atomic power stations, as well as research reactors and radioisotopes, spread throughout the country.

It's time now for our State and local governments to start preparing to assume increased responsibilities in understanding and controlling this new force.

I would like to emphasize three things about this legislation.

First, it attempts to provide, for any given operation, that either the Federal Government will be responsible, or the State government, but not both.

From the point of view of industry, this should tend to prevent over regulation.

The Joint Committee put it this way:

"3. It is not intended to leave any room for the exercise of dual or concurrent jurisdiction by States to control radiation hazards

by regulating byproduct, source, or special nuclear materials. The intent is to have the material regulated and licensed either by the Commission, or by the State and local governments, but not by both."

Secondly, the bill, as amended, tries to encourage uniform standards.

On this point the Joint Committee said:

"5. The Joint Committee believes it important to emphasize that the radiation standards adopted by States under the agreements of this bill should either be identical or compatible with those of the Federal Government. The committee recognizes the importance of the testimony before it by numerous witnesses of the dangers of conflicting, overlapping, and inconsistent standards in different jurisdictions, to the hindrance of industry and jeopardy of public safety."

Third, this is only the first step toward increasing State and local responsibility.

The committee's final comment, number 7, in its report was:

"7. The bill recognizes that this is interim legislation. The committee believes that the uses of atomic energy will be so widespread in future years that States should continue to prepare themselves for increased responsibilities."

Related to, and prior to, the Federal-State hearings, the Joint Committee held hearings on industrial radioactive waste disposal, and also on employee radiation hazards.

Disposal of radioactive wastes from reactors is recognized as one of the growing problems in atomic energy.

We therefore wanted to assess the extent of the hazards, the quantities of wastes being generated now and estimated in the future, and explore the new research on treatment and disposal now underway in our AEC laboratories.

We held 6 days of hearings and received testimony from 52 scientists and experts working in this field.

As finally printed, the waste disposal hearings, including the technical papers for the record, run over 3,000 pages in length, and consist of four volumes.

They are without a doubt the most complete library yet compiled on this important subject.

I have copies of our committee's summary analysis of the hearings here with me if any of you would like one.

The hearings in March on employee radiation hazards also explored workmen's compensation problems.

In the past, workmen's compensation has always been handled at the State level, but there are suggestions now that a Federal workmen's compensation law for radiation injuries should be considered.

We found certain areas of agreement and certain areas of disagreement growing out of our hearings.

We then listed 10 possible future courses of action in the summary analysis which we prepared after the hearings.

The Joint Committee took no action on this subject this year, but it will no doubt be before us again when we return in January.

The Joint Committee also held hearings this year on insurance and liability problems.

Nuclear reactors are designed with every possible safety device and precaution, and the record of the AEC and industry in operating reactors to date has been fantastically safe.

However, there is always the remote possibility of an accident which could cost hundreds of millions of dollars of damage.

Private insurance companies managed to put together pools totaling \$50 or \$60 million.

Above that amount, the Congress in 1957 enacted, as recommended by our committee, the so-called Price-Anderson amend-

ments to the Atomic Energy Act to provide governmental indemnity and limitation of liability.

This year we reviewed the operation of these indemnity amendments, including international liability problems, and possible insurance and indemnity coverage for nuclear powered merchant ships.

In general, the indemnity amendments seem to be working well.

There has been no major reactor accident, and no call upon the governmental indemnity funds.

The best insurance, of course, is preventive insurance, and to this end we receive an annual report from the members of the advisory committee on reactor safeguards.

One bad accident would set this industry back many years in terms of public confidence.

We must continue our efforts to prevent this possibility.

After hearings on liability and reactor safety, we held hearings on fallout.

We read in the papers every day about the dangers of radioactive fallout, and it is a difficult subject to evaluate.

In 1957 the Joint Committee held voluminous hearings on this subject and in 1959 we wanted to bring ourselves up to date.

We therefore heard statements from the leading scientists and experts in the field as to the hazards, and as to our program to protect the public against fallout.

The Joint Committee then prepared a summary analysis of these hearings, following our usual practice.

In general, I think we are in agreement that the fallout caused by debris from past bomb tests, both on the ground and still in the atmosphere, does not constitute a hazard to our public.

If we were to resume atmospheric tests, however, levels of strontium 90 could become uncomfortably high.

We said in our report:

"Thus for testing already conducted, man's exposure to fallout radiation is and will be relatively small compared to the normal background radiation or the standard recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP)."

"Assuming successive cycles of testing over the next two generations or less, following the same pattern as the past 5 years, the predicted average concentration in bone will be about 48 strontium units."

"This is close enough to the maximum permissible body burden of 67 strontium units recommended by the ICRP to suggest that a hazard to the world's population could result during this period."

This suggests the advisability of tests underground rather than in the atmosphere.

This is, of course, one aspect of the prolonged and difficult negotiations with the Russians now taking place in Geneva.

Many military experts believe we may need to resume testing in order to improve our weapons program, including development of small, low-yield tactical weapons.

If the President should decide that we need to resume testing in the interests of national defense, it may be possible to reach an agreement with the Russians to conduct all future nuclear tests underground.

I think we would be willing to do this, and underground tests cause no fallout, of course.

But we have been talking with the Russians on this subject for almost a year now, and it is difficult to predict what, if anything, they will agree to.

Our final hearings this year were on the biological and environmental effects of a hypothetical nuclear war.

For the purposes of the hearings, the subcommittee set up an assumed attack pattern of nuclear weapons by an enemy against the United States.

We received testimony from military and civil defense experts, medical doctors and scientists.

After the hearings, the joint committee met to discuss the results.

Our summary analysis of these hearings on the effects of a nuclear war are also available, and if any of you would like a copy, I will be glad to send one to you.

I think that you would find it very interesting reading.

The attack pattern assumed for the purposes of the hearings was that the enemy had delivered 263 nuclear weapons in 1, 2, 3, 8 and 10 megaton sizes, with a total yield of 1,446 megatons on 224 targets within the United States.

An additional 2,500 megatons were assumed to be detonated elsewhere in the northern hemisphere in attacks on overseas U.S. bases and in retaliation against the aggressor homeland.

Some of the subcommittee's conclusions were as follows:

"Probably the most significant finding presented to the subcommittee was that civil defense preparedness could reduce the casualties of the assumed attack on the United States from approximately 30 percent of the population to about 3 percent."

"The provision of shielding against radiation effects would at the same time protect against blast and thermal effects for the vast majority of the population."

"The cost of providing high-performance shelter protection for 200 million people was estimated at between \$5 billion and \$20 billion."

"The main conclusion presented to the subcommittee was that the country must have a national radiological defense system if the Nation is to withstand and recover from an attack of the scale which is possible in an all-out nuclear war."

We all hope to avoid a nuclear war, of course, but we have been less successful in some past years in avoiding a congressional war on another subject: The development of atomic power.

For the past 2 or 3 years before 1959 this had become an annual slugfest.

We used to debate, warmly and with some feeling, the issues of public versus private power, the rate of atomic power development, comparison with other countries, the role of government and industry, the advantages of different reactor types, and so forth.

However, this year, primarily because of the excellent relationships between the new AEC Chairman, John McCone, and our distinguished chairman, Senator CLYDE ANDERSON of New Mexico, the Joint Committee and the Commission, after hearings, were able to reach agreement on a balanced atomic power development program for this fiscal year 1960.

This year the AEC authorization bill was approved unanimously by the committee, after a number of amendments to which the Commission consented.

The bill was then passed by both the House and Senate in the exact form recommended by the Joint Committee.

I hope that this spirit of harmony and cooperation will continue, and that we can find means for the Government and industry to work together to develop commercial atomic power.

The Joint Committee also held hearings in April of 1959 on the subject of atomic energy patents, and I know that this is a subject of considerable interest to your committee.

The AEC recommended, and the committee and the Congress approved, after our hearings, a 5-year extension of the so-called compulsory licensing provisions of the Atomic Energy Act.

The Commission testified while the industry is still in its infancy, the "reserve

power" of the compulsory licensing section should continue to be available.

The compulsory licensing provision has never been invoked since enactment in 1954.

We wrote in many limitations and restrictions on its use, and it is truly a "reserve power" which I doubt will ever be used.

Our hearings disclosed, I am glad to say, that the number of applications and patents by private inventors is steadily increasing.

In 1947 AEC filed 282 patent applications, and others 110.

Ten years later, by 1957, AEC filed 260 patent applications, and 715 patent applications were filed by others, mostly private industry.

The other patent amendments requested by the AEC are still pending before the committee and will be considered further next year.

One of the most interesting problems is in the international field.

It presents the question whether AEC contractors should receive preferential patent rights abroad on research and development financed by the Commission.

I am not a lawyer—and I can assure you that this subject is very complicated.

But we will continue to try to follow policies of encouraging inventions and development by private industry, and at the same time making any technology developed by AEC financing available to all of industry generally.

Now for the crystal ball.

What will be the activities of the Joint Committee in 1960?

First of all, we normally begin each year with hearings on the development, growth, and state of the atomic energy industry, under section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act.

That section provides for annual hearings by the committee during the first 60 days of the session, with testimony from representatives of industry, labor, science, and the public.

I hope that some of the industry leaders in this audience will take advantage of this opportunity to make known to the committee your views, either by written statement or by oral testimony.

The "202" hearings are scheduled for February 1960.

Also on the docket for next year will probably be further discussions of radiation standards and allocation of responsibility between the AEC, Public Health Service, and other agencies in formulating standards of protection.

In the past, the National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurement has recommended standards which have been adopted with only minor changes by the AEC.

In 1959 the President established by Executive order a Federal Radiation Council to review these standards and to advise the President as to policies in the radiation field.

Our committee, in the Federal-State bill which I mentioned earlier, established by statute the Federal Radiation Council, adding the Secretary of Labor as a member, and providing that the council should receive the best possible technical advice.

This year I am sure we will be concerned with the operations of the council and the Federal agencies in developing new radiation policies and standards.

These will, of course, be very important to the atomic energy industry, as well as to labor groups and the public.

We can also look forward next year to a review of the atomic power program.

I believe that the Federal Government should devote its efforts primarily to research and development, and that private industry should concentrate on construction of reactors.

The building of atomic power stations is a very complicated and expensive business.

It requires dollars for bricks and mortar and standard generating equipment which industry should provide.

But new atomic power stations also require heavy research and development expenditures, as Mr. Fairman can testify.

The Commission can, and should, stand ready to bear some of the research and development expenses, in order to accelerate our atomic power program.

Government construction of some small prototypes of new reactor types will probably also be necessary.

New reactor types are being developed, and further refinements and advances are being made in some of our older reactor types, such as the pressurized water and the boiling water reactors.

The committee will review the entire atomic power program thoroughly again next year, probably in connection with AEC authorization bill, since Government assistance in this program requires annual congressional authorization.

I think we can look forward to an interesting year, but it is still too early to predict what reactor types, if any, the committee will add to the Commission's recommended program.

Finally, it is likely that the committee will make an overall review of our international atoms-for-peace program next year.

Many of our friends abroad are fascinated with the atom, and there are many ways that we can work with them to mutual advantage.

Many of them are naive and do not realize the technical, financial, and legal problems involved, but all of them are anxious to work closely with the United States, and to improve their atomic know-how.

But how do our 48 bilateral agreements, our cooperation with Euratom, and our participation in the International Atomic Energy Agency all tie together?

What were the original objectives of each type of program?

What has been accomplished?

Should we redefine our objectives in our international atoms-for-peace programs?

These are all interesting questions which grow out of the past, but also have real significance for all future policies.

So you can see that we have not been idle in 1959, and that we have a very interesting agenda to look forward to in 1960.

The atom was developed during wartime and under conditions of secrecy, but is now finding more and more peaceful uses, with increasing possibilities for bettering the future of mankind.

I hope that this association will keep up its good work, and will make known its views to our committee during the forthcoming year, so that our committee can carry out its responsibilities in formulating policy, both with respect to the military and the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

A Possible Solution of the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most highly publicized issues facing this session of Congress is the ever present farm problem. Constant reference is made to the mounting surplus of grain and the tremendous cost to the taxpay-

ers of the subsidies involved. Since none of the past or present programs have solved the problem, I have introduced a bill which I hope will be given consideration as a possible solution. Briefly it provides for living off the surplus rather than increasing it. It applies only to wheat, is purely voluntary, and would replace the present cash subsidies. Any farmer desiring to enter the program would agree to take out of wheat production a number of acres equal to the average number of acres planted to wheat by the producer for 1958, 1959, and 1960. In return he would receive a certificate entitling him to 50 percent of his average annual production of wheat during the years 1958, 1959, and 1960. He could accept the wheat, or he could endorse the certificate and deliver it to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The endorsement would authorize the Corporation to sell the wheat to which he is entitled at the market price and remit the proceeds to the farmer.

I have limited the provisions of the bill to wheat and for a period of 2 years, simply as an experiment to see if it works. It has a twofold purpose of reducing the surplus and relieving the taxpayers of the present burdensome subsidy. I have discussed it with some farmers in the district I represent and they believe it has some merit.

It is not intended to be the perfect answer or a cure-all. However, it has the virtue of being new and different and I hope it may serve as a contribution to the solution of the farm problem.

Raising the Philippine Quota in the Next Revision of the Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the 1956 amendments of the Sugar Act the Philippines alone received no increase in quota. It is hoped that in the present Congress when consideration is given to a further extension of the act more equitable provision for the Philippine sugar producers will be made.

Indeed such action in behalf of the Philippines has been promised. When the President signed the law in 1956 extending the Sugar Act for 4 years, he expressly indicated that when new amendments were being prepared at the conclusion of the present act, consideration should be given to increasing the Philippine share of U.S. sugar consumption. A press release to this effect was issued on May 29, 1956, which I take the liberty of quoting in full:

MAY 29, 1956.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have today approved H.R. 7030, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

In addition to extending the Sugar Act for 4 years, the bill restores to the domestic

areas the right to supply 55 percent of this country's increased requirements of sugar. The amendments also permit foreign countries to supply as much as they have been, plus 45 percent of the increases in our requirements. These increases will be most important relatively for the countries that heretofore have been minor suppliers.

It was not considered feasible to recommend an increase in the Philippine quota at this time. I believe, therefore, that when new amendments are being prepared at the conclusion of the present act, consideration should be given to allowing the Philippines to share in increased consumption, as is now provided for other foreign countries by this bill.

H.R. 9378—Requiring a Fair Return on Veterans' Life Insurance Trust Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the session I introduced H.R. 9378. This bill was introduced to make changes in the procedure for investing the national service life insurance trust fund and the U.S. Government life insurance trust fund.

The national service life insurance trust fund exceeds \$5,625,000,000 and this fund is invested in special issues of the Treasury, with 5-year maturity periods, bearing 3 percent interest. The U.S. Government life insurance trust fund exceeds \$1,120,000,000. This fund is invested in special issues of the Treasury, with 1-year maturity, and bearing interest rates of 3.5 percent. It is the responsibility of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Secretary of the Treasury to supervise investment of these funds. In my opinion, these officials have failed to discharge their obligation and are investing the veterans' life insurance trust funds at interest rates below the current market.

The investment policies of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Secretary of the Treasury have been reasonably satisfactory until recently, but the administration's hard-money policy has changed the situation. As a result of calculated policies of the administration, interest rates have risen steadily for the past few years. During 1959 the Treasury issued obligations for sale to the public throughout the year with maturities varying from 1 year to 21 years at interest rates varying from 3¾ percent to 5 percent. On June 30, 1959, \$1,111,000,000 of the U.S. Government life insurance trust fund was invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in 1-year certificates at 3½ percent. On the same date, \$2,689,000,000 of the national service life insurance trust fund was invested in 5-year certificates at 3 percent. About this same time the Treasury was offering securities to the public for sale at considerably higher interest rates. In May 1959, issues with 1-year maturity and interest rate of 4 percent were offered. In July 1959 the

Treasury offered securities to the public with 4-year 10-month maturity at 4¾ percent. In October an issue with a 4-year 10-month maturity was offered at 5 percent.

Despite the fact that the interest rates have been rising steadily, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Secretary of the Treasury have shown no disposition to secure for the veterans' trust funds interest yields commensurate with the current market. Despite the lack of initiative demonstrated by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the administration to secure for veteran policyholders a fair return on their trust funds, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the administration have been very aggressive in urging legislation to lift interest-rate ceilings on home loans for veterans. During the last session of Congress, when the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was considering legislation to raise interest rates on veterans' home loans, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs insisted that the interest-rate ceiling on veterans' home loans be lifted because, according to the Administrator, such action "was urgently needed to insure an active and fully effective loan guaranty program. In other words, the administration has been keenly aware of the rising interest rates and has shown no hesitation in demanding high interest rates in instances where the veteran pays; however, the administration has shown a marked lack of interest in securing better interest returns where the veteran is on the receiving end.

In passing, Mr. Speaker, I must observe that this situation is not confined to veterans' programs. Comparatively speaking, the veterans' life insurance trust funds have fared better than some of the other similar trust funds. On November 30, 1959, the civil service retirement fund had \$8,813,974,000 invested in special issues of the Treasury at an average interest rate of 2.58 percent; the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund had \$15,891,845,000 invested in special issues of the Treasury at an average interest rate of 2.56 percent; and the Railroad Retirement Fund had invested \$3,428,174,000 at an average interest rate of 3 percent. In my opinion, there is cause for concern about the low interest yields being paid to these funds. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the administration has shown a great determination in its program to lift the 4¼-percent ceiling on Government bonds, while on the other hand shows a considerable apathy for this side of the interest-rate picture.

It appears the administration is perfectly happy to see the bankers and private investment institutions of America receive high interest returns on their investments, but have little interest in securing equitable treatment for the trust funds which back up our social security program, Federal civil service retirement program, the veterans' life insurance program, and other similar retirement plans, which affect millions of ordinary Americans.

We all know that from time to time there has been considerable concern expressed for the actuarial soundness of

the civil service retirement fund and the Federal old-age and survivors insurance fund. From time to time the administration has taken a negative position on proposed changes to these programs on the basis the changes would endanger the actuarial soundness of the funds. One of the best ways to improve the actuarial soundness of these funds, or any trust fund for that matter, is to see they are properly invested at the highest yield available.

As I pointed out, the Treasury is paying 3½ percent on the U.S. Government life insurance trust fund and 3 percent on the national service life insurance trust fund. At the same time, the Veterans' Administration is loaning money to veteran policyholders at 4 percent. This practice demonstrates the unfairness of the Administration's policy. In other words, if a veteran borrows his own money back from the Veterans' Administration, using his life insurance policy as security, he must pay 4 percent, yet the Secretary of the Treasury has the use of the bulk of these funds at a 3-percent interest rate.

Mr. Speaker, these trust funds which I have been describing are in the nature of captive funds. In the case of the veterans' insurance trust funds, these matters are left entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. There is no need for a change in legislation to insure the veterans' life insurance trust funds receiving fair treatment. Legislation has become necessary because the Administrator of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Treasury have failed to act. It is for this reason I have introduced H.R. 9378. I have notified the Veterans' Administration and the Treasury I expect to begin hearings on this legislation on February 2.

Congressional Action on the President's Requests for Appropriations and New Obligational Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the last session of Congress, the 85th, and the 1st session of this Congress, the 86th, have been labeled by partisans and propagandists as "reckless spenders" by those who would seek political gain by this misrepresentation. As we begin this new session and again undertake the serious and demanding undertaking of appropriating necessary and adequate fund needs to assure the continued progress of our Nation, I think it is appropriate that we review the actions of the Congress on budgetary matters in the past and in particular during the last 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, first let us look at how our national spending has increased through the years as our country has grown and as we have faced grave crises both internally and nationally.

For almost three decades, preceding the turn of the century, the budgetary appropriations by the Congress were at a \$300 million level. Then in 1891, the 51st Congress appropriated for the first time funds totaling more than half a billion dollars. The Federal budget remained at approximately this level until 1398 when it reached almost \$900 million.

The 60th Congress in 1908 was the first Congress to break the \$1 billion mark and I am sure that there were those in 1908 who labeled the Members of that Congress "reckless spenders."

Financing World War I made it necessary for the 64th Congress, 2d session, to appropriate the largest percentage-wise jump from one year to the next that the Nation has ever known when the total budget jumped from \$1.6 billion for the year preceding to \$18.8 billions for fiscal 1918.

As the country grew internally and as World War II approached the budgetary appropriations continued to grow until the 2d session of the 77th Congress—in the midst of World War II—appropriated the largest sum ever appropriated when the budget figure stood at \$147 billions for fiscal 1943.

After the war spending was reduced sharply and hit a postwar low in 1946 when the 2d session of the 79th Congress appropriated \$35.7 billions.

Mr. Speaker, now let us look at what has happened to the budget during the last 6 years—since the Eisenhower administration has been in office. The budget estimates and requests for fiscal 1955 was \$60.77 billion. The Congress cut and reduced this by some \$2.6 billion and appropriated \$58.16 billion. Again for fiscal 1956 the Congress cut the President's budget by more than \$2 billion as his estimates totaled \$66 billion and the actual appropriations totaled only \$63.9 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the Congress has consistently cut the President's requests for appropriations and has made substantial reductions each and every year. The largest cut was made by the 85th Congress when more than \$5 billion was slashed by the Congress from the President's request for \$78.1 billion of appropriations. That year \$73 billion was actually appropriated by the Congress.

Last year alone \$1,881,410,083 was cut from the President's budget. Thus, the Congress during the last 6 years has cut the President's appropriations requests by approximately \$12½ billion. These are the true facts.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, the Congress during the last 6 years has cut and reduced the administration's request for appropriations by approximately \$12½ billion. This vividly demonstrates and should make it clear to all that the Congress is not the heavy wild spender that the partisans, both in and out of Congress, the President and the propagandists would lead the country to believe. The misrepresentation that has been made in this area has been made, I repeat, for political gain.

The true facts are, the President over the past 7 years has repeatedly asked for larger and larger appropriations, for big-

ger and bigger spending. The Congress has exercised its collective judgments on these big spending programs and consistently cut and reduced them as the record indicates.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues, the press, and the public generally a concise and accurate report—Senate Document No. 67, 86th Congress, 1st session—relating to "Congressional Action on the President's Requests for Appropriations and New Obligational Authority"—a statement by the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, majority leader of the Senate.

In this connection, Senator JOHNSON comments that the Congress has consistently made cuts in the President's budget, and regarding the so-called backdoor financing. The report points out that the President has either advocated bills approving new obligational authority before the Congress acted or else they were approved by him after the Congress acted.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this report be reproduced in the RECORD following my remarks hereon. The report and appropriation tables follow:

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON THE PRESIDENT'S REQUESTS FOR APPROPRIATIONS AND NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY—86TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

COMPLEXITY OF FEDERAL BUDGET

The Federal budget and budgetary procedures are very complex and difficult to discuss or explain in simple fashion. It is easy to see why this is so, from the simple fact that the budget document for fiscal year 1960, submitted to the Congress at the beginning of the session, was the size of a metropolitan telephone book, weighing over 5 pounds and containing over 1,000 pages—most of which consisted of detailed statistical and fiscal tables.

Even this document presented only a portion of the facts. The congressional committees dealing with the various programs involved in the budget held hundreds of hearings—and printed tens of thousands of pages of testimony—in an effort to get at all the facts and have a basis for sound legislative action.

Apart from the problems arising from the very size and scope of the Federal budget, there is a very real problem in talking simply and intelligibly about the budget because of the many technical details involved. For example, no money can be placed under contract (obligated) or spent unless the program has first been authorized by the Congress. In some cases this authorization is in a separate law, which must be followed by a specific appropriation act. In other cases, the authorization is contained in an appropriation act. In still other cases, the authorization act itself provides the contracting and spending authority. Finally, there are some cases, such as interest on the debt, where permanent authority exists and whatever amounts are needed become automatically available each year, without any action by the Congress.

AUTHORIZATIONS VERSUS APPROPRIATIONS

If this sounds complex and confusing, the actual budgetary procedures are even more tangled than indicated by the above description. For example, there is no requirement that the amounts authorized to be appropriated in an authorization act be matched by actual appropriations. The fact is that many billions of dollars have been authorized which have not been appropriated. Consider these examples:

1. Rivers and harbors and flood control: Between fiscal years 1936 and 1959, projects totaling \$17,811,405,000 were authorized for rivers and harbors and flood control projects. Actual appropriations, however, totaled \$9,987,622,000. This means that appropriations have not been provided for authorized projects involving \$7,823,783,000.

2. Reclamation: Since fiscal year 1902, authorization has been enacted for projects involving \$7,906,092,000. Actual appropriations, however, total \$3,509,869,000, leaving an unfinanced balance of \$4,396,223,000.

3. Military construction: During the past 8 years, authorizations have been enacted for military construction projects involving \$13,021 million. Appropriations have totaled \$11,784 million for this same period, or \$1,237 million below the amounts authorized.

4. Mutual security (foreign aid): During the past 8 years, a total of \$34,005 million has been authorized to be appropriated for the mutual security program. Actual appropriations, however, have amounted to \$29,229 million, or \$4,776 million below the amounts authorized.

In these four areas alone, actual appropriations have been \$18¼ billion less than the amounts authorized. Despite this clear evidence that authorizations are not the same as appropriations, a good deal of misguided information has been released to the public in which authorizations and appropriations are lumped together as if they were one and the same thing.

DISTORTION OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION ON BUDGET

Because of the complexity of governmental budgeting, it is easy to understand why people who are not expert in this difficult field can make honest mistakes in interpreting the facts. Getting the true story, however, is made even more difficult when the facts and figures are manipulated or distorted to prove a political slogan. This is what has happened in the incredible campaign to convince the American people that the Congress is a collection of irresponsible spenders and that only the executive branch stands like Horatius at the bridge to stem the onrush of the congressional spenders.

CONGRESS DOES NOT PRESCRIBE EXPENDITURES

Despite impressions to the contrary, the Congress does not prescribe the amount to be spent in any given fiscal year. Instead, the Congress provides spending authority, a large part of which remains available indefinitely until it is spent. In carrying out the various programs authorized by the Congress, the executive branch has exercised considerable latitude in determining both the rate and manner of using this spending authority. This extends from outright refusal to use funds provided by the Congress for specific purposes—as in the case of a large part of the \$1.3 billion increase in defense appropriations last year—to the other extreme of spending at a deficiency rate.

In addition to this latitude, there are certain important areas of spending over which the Congress exercises no direct control. Thus, the executive branch has just announced that spending for interest on the debt during the current fiscal year will be \$1 billion greater than had been estimated in January 1959. The Congress found out about this only when it was announced to the general public.

In truth, it is impossible for anyone to dissect the amounts spent in any fiscal year and determine with any degree of accuracy exactly how much the total spending has been increased or decreased by actions of the Congress or of the executive branch. This would be as accurate—and as rewarding—as unscrambling an omelet. Yet some people persist in trying to do this, apparently assuming that few people would realize the degree to which any such estimates are really slanted guestimates.

TABLE I. APPROPRIATION BILLS

Bill No.	Title	House					Senate					Final amount approved	Increase or decrease compared to President's budget estimates to date	Date approved by President	Public Law No.
		President's budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	President's budget estimates to Senate	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed				
H.R. 5916	1959 SUPPLEMENTAL 2d Supplemental	\$2,864,954,526	Mar. 20	\$2,479,522,494	Mar. 24	\$2,657,402,994	\$2,900,799,370	Apr. 15	\$2,820,040,054	Apr. 30	\$2,843,902,805	\$2,764,500,380	-\$136,298,990	May 20	86-30
H.R. 7978	1960 APPROPRIATIONS SUPPLEMENTAL Supplemental	888,931,417	June 26	632,568,845	June 29	609,843,845	1,218,090,555	July 31	1,076,186,108	Aug. 3	1,076,186,108	977,345,608	-\$240,744,947	Sept. 1	86-218
H.J. Res. 439	Temporary (July)		June 25		June 30			June 30		June 30				July 1	86-76
H.J. Res. 475	Temporary (August)		July 24		July 29			July 29		July 29				July 31	86-118
H.J. Res. 510	Temporary (September)				Aug. 31					Aug. 31				Sept. 3	86-224
H.R. 5676	REGULAR District of Columbia Federal payment	(246,698,000) 34,218,000	Mar. 13	(237,186,112) 27,218,000	Mar. 16	(237,186,112) 27,218,000	(245,900,000) 34,218,000	May 21	(241,569,402) 29,218,000	May 28	(241,702,402) 29,351,000	(241,289,076) 27,218,000	(-4,700,924) -7,000,000	July 23	86-104
H.R. 5805	Treasury-Post Office	4,688,327,000	Mar. 18	4,628,097,000	Mar. 20	4,628,097,000	4,688,327,000	May 21	4,663,158,600	May 28	4,664,027,600	4,643,363,000	-44,964,000	June 11	86-39
H.R. 5915	Interior	491,101,400	Mar. 20	472,198,800	Mar. 23	472,198,800	491,101,400	June 5	487,211,025	June 8	481,809,100	481,809,100	-9,292,300	June 23	86-60
H.R. 6769	Labor-HEW	3,756,848,581	Apr. 28	3,915,084,181	Apr. 30	3,915,084,181	3,756,848,581	June 23	4,124,460,581	June 24	4,016,485,981	4,016,485,981	+259,637,400	Aug. 14	86-158
H.R. 7040	Independent offices	6,586,418,000	May 8	6,441,069,800	May 11	6,459,887,800	6,586,418,000	June 22	6,561,578,600	June 23	6,504,382,200	6,504,382,200	-82,035,800	Sept. 14	86-225
H.R. 7175	Agriculture	4,081,364,863	May 15	3,939,165,498	May 20	3,939,165,498	4,081,364,863	May 28	3,975,505,148	June 3	3,971,362,673	3,971,362,673	-110,002,190	July 8	86-80
H.R. 7176	General government	13,608,500	May 15	13,338,500	May 27	13,338,500	13,608,500	June 22	13,568,500	June 24	13,463,500	13,463,500	-145,000	July 8	86-79
H.R. 7343	State-Justice-Judiciary	682,387,600	May 21	649,896,700	May 27	651,896,700	682,387,600	June 22	650,674,700	June 23	650,924,700	648,941,200	-33,446,400	July 13	86-84
H.R. 7349	Commerce	732,191,000	May 25	674,687,300	May 28	675,297,300	732,191,000	June 16	715,328,500	June 18	715,328,500	712,672,900	-19,518,100	July 13	86-88
H.R. 7434	Legislative	105,460,005	May 28	100,279,350	June 1	100,279,350	105,460,005	June 16	128,797,380	June 18	128,797,380	128,797,380	-4,850,500	Aug. 21	86-176
H.R. 7454	Defense	39,248,200,000	May 28	38,848,339,000	June 3	38,848,339,000	39,248,200,000	July 7	39,594,339,000	July 14	39,228,239,000	39,228,239,000	-19,961,000	Aug. 18	86-166
H.R. 7509	Public Works	(1,185,406,259)	June 2	(1,185,406,259)	June 9	(1,185,406,259)	(1,185,406,259)	July 8	(1,265,565,559)	July 9	(1,265,565,559)	(1,215,477,808)	(+30,071,549)	Vetoed	
H.R. 8283	Atomic Energy	2,718,715,000	July 17	2,660,529,000	July 21	2,660,529,000	2,718,715,000	July 30	2,711,829,000	Aug. 3	2,711,829,000	2,683,029,000	-35,686,000	Aug. 18	86-164
H.R. 8388	Mutual Security	4,436,277,000	July 24	3,209,782,000	July 29	3,191,782,000	4,436,277,000	Sept. 8	3,691,269,508	Sept. 14	3,692,262,137	3,626,718,137	-1,197,768,000	Sept. 28	86-383
H.R. 8375	Military Construction	1,563,200,000	Aug. 7	1,285,002,700	Aug. 10	1,285,002,700	1,563,200,000	Aug. 20	1,428,178,700	Aug. 21	1,428,178,700	1,363,961,200	-199,238,800	Sept. 16	86-275
H.R. 9105	Public Works	1,185,406,259	Sept. 4	1,185,309,093	Sept. 8	1,185,309,093	1,185,406,259		1,185,309,093	Sept. 8	1,185,309,093	1,185,309,093	-97,166	Veto over-ridden	86-254
	Total regular	70,323,723,208		68,049,996,922		68,053,424,922	70,740,118,520		69,960,426,335		69,962,940,664	69,235,752,364	-1,504,366,156		
	Total, all bills	74,077,609,151		71,162,088,261		71,320,671,761	74,859,008,445		73,856,652,497		73,883,029,577	72,977,598,352	-1,881,410,093		

TABLE II. NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY PROVIDED OUTSIDE THE APPROPRIATION PROCESS (SO-CALLED BACKDOOR FINANCING)

Bill No.	Title	House					Senate					Amount agreed to by conferees	Increase or decrease made by the Congress	Date approved by President	Public Law No.
		President's requests	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	President's requests	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed				
H.R. 4452	Bretton Woods Agreement Act	\$4,550,000,000	Mar. 18	\$4,550,000,000	Mar. 25	\$4,550,000,000	\$4,550,000,000	Mar. 18	\$4,550,000,000	Mar. 19	\$4,550,000,000	\$4,550,000,000		June 17	86-45
S. 1094	Housing Act of 1959	(1,650,000,000)	Feb. 27	(1,975,000,000)	May 21	(*)	(1,650,000,000)	Feb. 3	(2,625,000,000)	Feb. 5	(2,525,000,000)	(1,300,000,000)	(-\$350,000,000)	Vetoed	
S. 2539	Housing Act of 1959	(1,650,000,000)	Aug. 25	(825,000,000)	Aug. 27	(825,000,000)	(1,650,000,000)	Aug. 13	(825,000,000)	Aug. 18	(825,000,000)	(825,000,000)	(-\$825,000,000)	Vetoed	
S. 2654	Housing Act of 1959	1,650,000,000	Sept. 10	925,000,000	Sept. 10	925,000,000	1,650,000,000	Sept. 8	925,000,000	Sept. 9	925,000,000	925,000,000	(-725,000,000)	Sept. 23	86-372
S. 1	Aid to airports	200,000,000	Mar. 2	297,000,000	Mar. 19	297,000,000	200,000,000	Feb. 5	565,000,000	Feb. 6	465,000,000	126,000,000	(-74,000,000)	June 29	86-72
H.R. 1011	Veterans' Housing Loan Act		Jan. 29	300,000,000	Feb. 4	300,000,000		Feb. 3	300,000,000	June 16	100,000,000	100,000,000	+100,000,000	June 30	86-73
H.R. 2256	Tennessee Valley Authority bond issuance	750,000,000	Apr. 14	750,000,000	May 7	750,000,000	750,000,000	July 2	750,000,000	July 9	750,000,000	750,000,000		Aug. 6	86-137
H.R. 3460	Total	7,150,000,000		6,822,000,000		6,822,000,000	7,150,000,000		7,090,000,000		6,790,000,000	6,451,000,000	(-699,000,000)		

*Authorized \$1,975,000,000 to be appropriated.

NOTE.—Amounts shown represent total new obligational authority actually provided by each bill. Differences in amounts may include changes in scope of programs and differences in time periods covered by various versions of each bill.

Grand total, all bills, tables I and II	\$81,227,609,151	\$77,084,088,261	\$78,142,671,761	\$82,009,008,445	\$80,946,652,497	\$80,673,029,557	\$79,428,598,352	-\$2,580,410,093
---	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------

CONGRESSIONAL CUTS IN BUDGET REQUESTS

This does not mean that there is no way of determining accurately what the Congress has done in acting on the President's budget. What the Congress has done in acting on the President's requests for spending authority is a matter of public record and can be documented beyond question. This should be well known to those who prefer—for reasons of their own—to present a distorted picture of what the Congress has done. Perhaps this is the reason why such persons persist in proving their misconception with figures attained by scrambling together appropriations, authorizations, expenditures, backdoor finances, failure to enact tax proposals, and other ill-assorted and unrelated fiscal concepts.

Just what are the facts concerning action by the Congress on the President's requests for appropriations and other spending authority? The facts concerning the last session are summarized in two tables printed on the last page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. All the figures in these tables have been compiled by, or verified by, the Bureau of the Budget.

These tables, which are reprinted in this document exactly as they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, show:

1. The Congress cut the President's requests for appropriations by a whopping \$1,881,410,093.

2. The Congress cut the President's requests for new obligational authority contained in bills other than appropriations bills (this has been politically referred to as backdoor financing) by \$699 million.

3. Thus, the Congress cut a total of \$2,580,410,093 from the President's requests for new spending authority.

BACKDOOR FINANCING

Perhaps a few additional words should be said about the so-called backdoor financing. No one knows exactly who coined this phrase but it succeeds in giving the impression that there is something wrong with providing spending authority outside of an appropriation bill. This just is not so. Regardless of whether spending authority is provided by an appropriation bill or by an authorization bill, the same congressional and Presidential action is required to enact the spending authority into law. The only real difference is that the preliminary work is handled by a different set of committees before the bill in question is acted upon.

Perhaps those who imply that there is something sinister in the so-called backdoor financing are unaware of these significant facts:

1. During the 6½ years of the Eisenhower administration, the President has requested the Congress to enact 24 separate bills involving backdoor financing of \$20,029 million.

2. The Congress has enacted 38 bills involving new authority of \$25,726 million.

3. The President has approved 36 of these bills, involving new authority of \$25,289 million.

In short, of the more than \$25 billion of new authority that has been enacted into law outside of appropriation bills during the present administration, every cent was either advocated by the President before the Congress acted, or else approved by him after the Congress had acted.

CONGRESS HAS CONSISTENTLY CUT PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The cut of more than \$2½ billion in the President's requests for new spending authority clearly demonstrates that it is a sheer fabrication to describe the 86th Congress as a group of reckless spenders. Because of the widespread circulation given to this charge, however, some people may wonder whether the record of the last session was a "fluke" and think that the Congress normally votes for increased spending.

The fact is that the Congress has consistently cut the President's requests for appropriations each and every year. In addition to the \$1,881,410,093 cut from the President's budget in the past session, the Congress cut over \$10,600 million from the

appropriation estimates in the preceding years. Thus, the Congress has cut the President's appropriation requests by approximately \$12½ billion during the last 6 years.

These reductions are shown in detail in the following table:

Congressional reductions in the President's appropriation requests

Congress and session	Budget estimates	Appropriations	Decreased by Congress
83d Cong., 2d sess.....	\$60,770,315,686	\$58,160,445,563	\$2,609,870,123
84th Cong., 1st sess.....	66,023,089,195	63,947,281,321	2,075,807,874
84th Cong., 2d sess.....	73,298,859,629	73,041,364,417	257,495,212
85th Cong., 1st sess.....	78,108,417,112	73,064,958,328	5,043,458,784
85th Cong., 2d sess.....	81,737,060,999	81,119,818,276	617,242,723
86th Cong., 1st sess.....	74,859,008,445	72,977,598,352	1,881,410,093
Total budget cuts by Congress in last 6 fiscal years.....			12,485,284,809

The NATO Parliamentarians Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, during the week of November 15-21, the Fifth Conference of NATO Parliamentarians was held in Washington, with the general assemblies held in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building and committee meetings in various committee rooms.

Members of the 14 visiting delegations told me that they thoroughly enjoyed the visit to Washington, which was appropriately held here in the 10th anniversary year of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Much of the credit for the successful meeting, together with the arrangements for extending the hospitality of the U.S. Congress to our visiting colleagues, should go to Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, chairman of the House delegation to the conference, and the U.S. member of the NATO Parliamentarians Standing Committee. Mr. HAYS served 1 year as president of the Conference and is presently a Vice President. His work with the NATO Parliamentarians Conference has brought great credit to the United States and to the U.S. Congress among our allies in NATO.

The Parliamentarians meeting here was very successful from the standpoint of discussion of some of the critical problems which face the NATO alliance. The Military Committee, for example, recommended in a resolution approved by the entire Conference immediate action to improve the air-defense system in Western Europe. The gravity of this problem has been made clear in the Council of Ministers meeting and in the conferences in which the President participated last month.

It is now conceded by all concerned that if NATO is to fully meet the challenge to strengthen Western unity, there must be far greater cooperation in political, economic, and cultural fields among the members of the alliance. I think the NATO Parliamentarians Conference should receive a major share of the credit for the impetus given this idea

since the Parliamentarians meetings began. Most of the practical proposals for more fully coordinated activity in these broad fields were originally given responsible support in the NATO Parliamentarians Conference.

Challenges and Problems Facing the United States in the Sixties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, in the past few days I have been attempting to define some of the issues facing the United States in the next decade—the sixties. Frankly, I am not certain what the answers will or should be. But certainly the first step is to define the problem.

Representing the 11th Congressional District of Indiana is not easy. We have one of the largest, richest, and most intelligent districts in the country. I have found that one very helpful way to represent this great district and to work through a problem is to ask for advice from my own people in Marion County, Indiana.

Listed below are two challenges and 10 problems that concern me. I am inserting this statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with the hope that my voters will study it and then give me their advice on these issues.

CHALLENGES AND PROBLEMS FACING THE UNITED STATES IN THE SIXTIES DOMESTIC

I believe that our domestic challenge is roughly this: "Can we establish an economic climate that will provide job opportunities and a chance for every worker to earn his fair share of his productive contribution to this Nation?"

Under the challenge I see these specific problems:

First. What can we do about an agricultural policy that is clearly a failure from the standpoint of the farmer, the taxpayer, and the consumer?

Second. What can we do to encourage the savings that must finance the approaching technical and population explosion? (Both demand exorbitant

amounts of new capital.) A stable population and a technology that is not changing require very little savings or capital.

Third. What should we, or can we, do to soften the blows of industrial strife—management-labor conflicts?

Fourth. Is our tax structure just and equitable? Does it provide a reliable source of national revenue? Does it dampen out, or does it exaggerate the swing of the business cycle?

Fifth. Can we afford to react to foreign competition by crawling back into a high-tariff box?

Sixth. Are we getting our money's worth from the \$45 billion a year defense expenditure? Is interservice rivalry getting out of hand and hampering our defense efforts?

INTERNATIONAL

In my opinion the international challenge is basically, "How can we achieve peace in the world without surrendering our rights and our dignity as free men?"

The problems underlying the challenge seem to be:

First. Can the United States encourage the NATO nations to shoulder a more realistic share of the military burden?

Second. Can we shift to the World Bank, the Monetary Fund, the Inter-American Bank, and the International Development Association the burden of assisting the underdeveloped nations of the world attain a measure of economic sufficiency?

Third. Can this Nation somehow get its agricultural surpluses out of expensive storage and to the starving peoples of the world?

Fourth. In spite of a shortage of exportable dollars can this Nation step up its assistance in technical, agricultural, and medical counseling to the underprivileged peoples of the Middle East, Africa, and Asia?

CONCLUSION

These are the areas of policy that concern me. I know that there are probably other problems in which my constituents are also interested. Their opinion on these and other issues will be welcome!

The Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an organization which is performing a very valuable service to our Nation. I am speaking of the Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, founded 51 years ago this year. This organization has expanded to include 170,000 members of more than 3,400 clubs who are dedicated

to community service, to helping those who are in need, and to improve the working conditions and opportunities in the business world for womankind.

In my own home State of Michigan, the federation has conducted numerous research projects which have proved of great value to some of our Nation's leading universities and to research agencies of our Federal Government.

The efforts of the federation in my own congressional district of Oakland County, Mich., have been outstanding. Many civic projects would never have come to pass if it had not been for the dedication, the hard work and the ability of the members of this group of business and professional women's clubs. In every worthy cause, these ladies are in the forefront.

It is well for all of us to pay tribute to the Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, to recognize the valuable contribution which these clubs and their respective members have made to our society, and to let them know that we appreciate their efforts.

A Bill To Increase Social Security Benefits, Improve Trust Fund Earnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, I introduced H.R. 9372, a bill making a number of important changes in the Social Security Act, including improving the earnings of the social security trust funds, and increasing social security benefits.

I am confident that the Congress will make social security improvements in 1960. I hope that the improvements will be comprehensive, rather than piecemeal, and will correct not just one but many of the shortcomings of the present law. I believe that H.R. 9372 fits that description.

Of vital importance is that provision of my bill which will increase the earnings of the social security trust funds, to permit payment of more realistic benefits and to insure soundness and fairness in the social security system.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 105, part 11, page 14390, I pointed out that the social security trust funds were being short changed by some 260 million a year, and introduced H.R. 8407, a bill to insure an adequate return on the social security trust funds by removing the Secretary of the Treasury as managing trustee of the social security trust funds, substituting for him a person without conflicting interests, and requiring a return on the trust funds as near as possible to the return being realized by regular investors in U.S. Government securities.

The situation which I described last July has not changed. I have therefore

incorporated the provisions of H.R. 8407 in the new bill.

The Treasury is still depriving the social security trust funds of interest earnings amounting to about \$260 million a year.

While private investors average more than 4 percent interest on Government securities, the Treasury Secretary, who manages the trust funds, has invested virtually all of the \$20 billion in social security funds in Government securities earning only 2½ percent.

We can correct this situation by reconstituting the Board of Trustees of the social security funds and requiring the new board to take all needed steps, including proposing legislation if necessary, to bring the interest yield on the social security funds up to the level of earnings from Government securities of other investors.

In addition, H.R. 9372 will improve social security in the following ways:

First. A 10 percent across-the-board increase in old-age, survivors and disability insurance benefits, with a minimum increase of \$5 a month.

Such an increase is needed to restore the dollar power which steady inflation has taken from our elderly citizens and others dependent on social security payments as their financial base.

Although Congress has several times raised benefits, they have never caught up to overall cost increases in our economy. A 10-percent increase will put social security payments back in a fair, realistic relationship to the cost of living in 1960 and, we can hope, long after that.

Second. An increase in future benefits by raising the earnings ceiling for contribution and benefit purposes from the present \$4,800 to \$6,000 a year.

No matter what a person earns in any year, only the first \$4,800 of income is counted for social security purposes. This means that social security benefits are limited by that figure.

In 1939, the earnings limit was \$3,000. That was fine then, because 97 percent of all workers covered by social security earned \$3,000 or less. Today, however, more than 25 percent of covered workers earn more than the present earnings ceiling of \$4,800. Unless that ceiling is raised, the future benefits of millions of retired workers will be considerably less than realistic in relation to the actual wages they had been earning. Raising the earnings ceiling to \$6,000 will produce realistic future benefits for more than 90 percent of covered workers.

Third. Repeal the existing requirement that a disabled person must be at least 50 years old before he can qualify for disability insurance benefits.

As an army of experts has testified to congressional committees, there is absolutely no justification for denying disability benefits to persons under 50, who otherwise meet the requirements of the law. The younger disabled man needs help just as much, and sometimes more, than the older. For example, the disabled person of 35 or 40 is less likely to have children old enough to help support the family than is the man over 50. This arbitrary disability age should definitely be removed.

Fourth. Permit persons receiving benefits to earn up to \$1,800 a year, instead of the present \$1,200, from outside sources without a reduction in benefits.

Many older men and women are able and eager to work part time and feel they are contributing to society in a productive way. The present limit on outside earnings penalizes many such persons unduly. I believe that a modest increase, letting a person earn up to \$150 a month without a cut in social security payments, is justified.

Fifth. Increase the maximum family benefit by removing the present arbitrary ceiling of \$254 a month. The bill would increase the maximum family benefit to 80 percent of average earnings. This would mean a maximum of \$320 a month under the present earnings ceiling—\$4,800—and \$400 a month under the proposed \$6,000 ceiling. The existing \$254 ceiling deprives large families of the full survivorship benefits to which they are entitled.

According to figures supplied by the Social Security Administration, the proposed additional benefits, offset by the increased earnings of the social security trust funds, would require an increase in the social security tax of only one-half of 1 percent in the employer's and employee's respective contributions.

Federal Aid for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, today I have had the pleasure of introducing a bill to establish an emergency 2-year program for Federal aid to the States and localities for school construction. This bill, it is no secret, is a companion measure to the bill which has been reported to the other body by that body's Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The fight for Federal aid to education is an old one, Mr. Speaker. As in so many other legislative areas, the friends of the schools have marched up many a hill, only to fall a vote or two short of the summit. In assessing causes for the defeat of previous school legislation, I believe no single factor can be given greater weight than the constant and well-publicized willingness of the administration to give courageous and unstinting support to any school aid bill—any bill, that is, except the specific bill that happens to be before the House at any given moment. In past sessions, the House, having failed to pass a generous school aid bill sponsored by Democratic Members, has turned its efforts to inadequate bills offered by the administration. In most, if not all cases, the administration's ardor, even for its own "teeny-weeny" bills, suddenly cooled.

In this 2d session of the 86th Congress, in this closing year of the Eisenhower era, I hope the Congress will be able to enact some kind of legislation to assist our public elementary and high schools meet the desperate challenge which this age has thrust upon them.

There are those of us who believe that education is a sufficiently important and proper sphere of governmental activity to be federally supported in its own right. But there are many who will point, with some justice, to the titanic struggle for existence in which the free world is engaged, and suggest that all our energies should go into this struggle. In a sense I agree. All of our energies, developed to their highest degree, should go into the fight to maintain the future of freedom. I would differ completely with those sincere Members of this House who feel that only our military energies, or only our military and propaganda, or even only our military, propaganda, and scientific energies ought to be put into the balance against the challenge and the threat that is communism. I say that unless we develop our full intellectual armory, our weapons stockpiles will be useless. Unless we utilize our resources, including our financial resources, to help men learn . . . that it means to be free, what it means to be educated, what it means to be fully alive, then we have little left to defend. If our schools fail to meet the challenge which has been thrust upon them—and it is a different challenge than the challenge Soviet schools are meeting with success—unless they meet this challenge, then the free way of life is doomed. I believe this with all my heart. I hope and trust that my colleagues in the Congress agree. I trust that we will not let the "budget firsters" again frighten us away from our plain and inescapable duty to the future of the Nation.

In this context, I ask unanimous consent that a penetrating editorial recently printed in the Pendleton East Oregonian, be printed at the end of my remarks.

This editorial does not mince words or dodge issues. It points to the Federal control bugaboo as the phony issue it is. The editorial refutes this argument in telling and persuasive terms. It is a good text from which to begin this year's debate on Federal aid for education—the most important legislation before this Congress.

[From the Pendleton East-Oregonian, Dec. 8, 1959]

OF NATIONAL CONCERN

Whenever somebody tells us that Federal aid to education is as dangerous as the bubonic plague we suggest that he take a look at Hermiston High School, talk to teachers and administrators at Hermiston High School. That school received substantial Federal aid while McNary Dam was under construction and a lesser amount thereafter. There isn't a speck of evidence that anybody in Washington, D.C. has ever attempted to dictate to Hermiston High School.

The Oregon State Board of Education revealed this week that 31 of Oregon's 36 counties are getting Federal aid under the National Defense Education Act. In the current year, \$711,000 will be spent in 133 Oregon school districts to improve teaching of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. The act also offers Federal aid to districts

that want to improve their counseling service to students, and several districts are accepting that aid.

We doubt that any school district that is participating in the National Defense Education Act program has had any unpleasant experiences with it. We doubt that any has lost control of its educational processes.

Education is a matter of national concern. If a school district is doing less than an adequate job the entire Nation suffers. If a school district is doing an above-average job the entire Nation benefits. It is as important to you that a boy in Mississippi who has a high IQ is properly prepared to go to college as it is to his school district in Mississippi.

The fight against Federal aid to education is phony. The opponents place their emotions ahead of good sense.

Proposed New Veterans' Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a veterans' housing bill which I hope will revitalize the veterans' housing program.

The bill which I am introducing makes substantial changes in the veterans' housing program. These changes have become necessary since the veterans' housing program is becoming inoperative as a result of the administration's hard-money policy. Last year the Congress raised the interest rate on veterans' home loans from 4¾ percent to 5¼ percent. This action did very little to improve the supply of mortgage financing for veterans' home loans. The rapid rise in interest rates resulting from the policies of the administration exceeded the increase in interest rates authorized by the Congress. Very little additional mortgage financing became available as a result of the interest rate increase. The situation has become progressively worse. High discounts are being charged throughout the country in connection with veterans' loans. These discounts range upward to 12 points and increase the interest yield to the lender to rates of 6 percent and above.

Interest rates have increased rapidly as a result of the administration's hard-money policy, and are now conflicting with the usury laws of the various States. Suits are now pending in local courts to determine whether the high interest rates being charged, together with large discounts, are a violation of State usury laws. This has resulted in many institutional lenders withdrawing from the mortgage financing field until the issue is settled. The administration has offered, as its only solution to the shortage of mortgage financing funds for veterans' home loans, increases in interest rates. It is apparent this is not the solution, since lending practices based on present high interest rates are now being questioned in the courts as violations of State lending laws.

In a recent survey by the committee, the loan guaranty officers of the Veterans' Administration in offices throughout the country have estimated that if the current tight money condition continues the Veterans' Administration will make only about 150,000 home loans in 1960. These same offices estimate that if mortgage financing were available, with moderate or no discounts, the veterans' home loan program would increase to 368,000 loans during 1960.

There is no prospect that there will be a change in the near future in the Administration's hard money policy and there appears to be little likelihood an increase in interest rates would produce the desired result. The bill which I have introduced makes several major changes in the housing program and seeks other sources for veterans' home loans.

This bill authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to issue debentures for sale with maturity varying from 10 to 30 years at an interest rate of not less than 4½ percent. These debentures will be offered for sale to the general public; however, they are designed to appeal to the major private trust funds of the Nation, such as union trust funds, welfare trust funds, private estate trust funds, and trust funds developed through the retirement programs of the various States and municipalities for public employees. The debentures to be issued by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs will be guaranteed both as to principal and interest by the U.S. Treasury. The funds obtained through the sale of debentures will be utilized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for veterans' home loans.

The bill provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may loan these funds any place in the United States where a shortage of mortgage financing exists. The maximum loan is to be \$17,500. Discretion is left with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as to down-payment; however, 100 percent loans are permitted under the bill. The bill authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to charge the veteran borrower a 1-point fee at closing. Builders or sponsors who receive a commitment will be required to pay a 2-point fee for a fund commitment or fund reservation under the bill. These funds will be deposited by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in a revolving fund to protect the Government from loss. The bill provides that the Administrator may sell debentures at 4½ percent. The interest rate for the veteran's loan will remain the same as provided in the existing program—5¼ percent. The Administrator will have available the margin of three-quarters of 1 percent to offset his administrative costs in placing and servicing the loans.

The bill provides that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may sell not to exceed \$5 billion in debentures in any one fiscal year. It provides that the Administrator may invest not to exceed 25 percent of the national service life insurance fund in the debentures. The bill extends the housing program for World War II veterans until February 1, 1965, so that the World War II program

will be scheduled to expire on the same date with the program for Korean veterans.

This bill does not alter the guaranteed home loan program in any way. Private lenders may continue to participate in the veterans' guaranteed home loan program. It is intended that the program of home loans to be made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs through funds obtained by selling debentures will supplement the guaranteed home loan program which is presently operating through private lenders for World War II and Korean veterans.

It is expected that early hearings will be scheduled on this legislation since the outlook for mortgage financing for veterans' home loans is very bleak for 1960 unless a solution can be found. The direct loan program, which has depended on appropriations directly from the Treasury, will not be continued past its scheduled expiration date of July 25, 1960. It is not expected that this program will be necessary if funds become available through sale of debentures.

Young and Old Fogeys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, senior Senator of Minnesota, was one of the principal speakers at the national convention of the Young Democratic Clubs of America in Toledo, Ohio, November 17 to 20, 1959. He addressed the convention on the subject of "Young and Old Fogeys." As chairman of the convention, I had an opportunity to witness the great enthusiasm with which his speech was received and given and so that those who were not among the 2,000 delegates at the convention may read his remarks, I under unanimous consent, include excerpts from his remarks in the RECORD:

YOUNG AND OLD FOGIES

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota)

I take particular pleasure in addressing this national convention of Young Democrats, for as far as I'm concerned, what America needs most today is to regain its youth.

America is showing distressing signs of middle age.

And there's a very simple reason for it: The Republican administration in Washington today is made up of old men.

As a matter of fact, some of us have been thinking of rechristening the Cabinet the "Ten Old Men."

Now when I say "old" I don't necessarily mean old in years. I mean old in spirit. All of us know men who are old at 30—and we also know lots of men who are still young at 75.

A great former President we all love has more youth in him at 75 than this whole administration put together—yes, I mean our own special young Democrat, Harry S. Truman.

When I say that America and this Republican administration are showing signs of middle age, this is what I have in mind:

It's a sign of middle age when the obstacles loom larger than the challenge of overcoming them.

It's a sign of middle age when you can think only of reasons for not doing things, instead of discovering ways to do them.

But that, unhappily, is the spirit of '59 in Washington today. And when that is the spirit in Washington—in the White House, if you will—it spreads through the country like an epidemic.

I find it sad to think of America, the richest Nation in the world, making excuses to the world and to her own people that she can't afford to help other nations build their economies and can't afford to build proper schools for her children or proper houses for her slum dwellers.

Incidentally, you may have heard a lot of talk about the anti-intellectual atmosphere in Washington. But you shouldn't believe everything you hear. It's no longer considered subversive to have an idea in Washington—so long as it doesn't cost any money.

I am ashamed when I think of the millions of people throughout the world, barely staying off starvation, while America complains of the burden and cost of storing huge surpluses of wheat and corn and cotton.

I am embarrassed to think that America, the Nation that led the technological revolution, the Nation that produced the atomic bomb in a brief 5 years, has been surpassed not just once but many times by a nation that 40 years ago had no science, had no technology, and had virtually no industry.

What has happened to America? What has happened to our muscle? What has happened to our will to achieve, to create, to progress?

What has happened, I ask, to the America of the 1930's—an America beset with problems that make today's difficulties pale by comparison?

Today Washington worries about a balanced budget. Twenty-five years ago Washington worried about an entire national economy out of balance, about 10 to 13 million people without jobs, about dust bowls and breadlines.

That was a time that cried out for leadership—and the leadership was there in the person of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

That was a time that cried out for new ideas—answers to problems new and old. And the answers were found.

And why? Because there was a will to find them, a will to sweep aside obstacles and move on to get the job done.

Do you remember the CCC—the Civilian Conservation Corps? In the 1930's America needed the CCC and America got it, and thousands of young men went into our forests and parks and went to work conserving some of our greatest natural resources.

Well, America needs another CCC—and that's one of the things I have worked to get passed this year. But what does this Republican administration say to that? They say it costs too much. They say it will unbalance the budget.

Of course, this administration doesn't seem to mind giving billions to bankers by raising interest rates. That sort of spending it can afford. But it can't afford to spend a few million dollars to build human and natural resources through a Youth Conservation Corps.

The era of the 1930's, the era of the New Deal, was an era of youthfulness for America. We were challenged, and we rose to meet the challenge.

Today again we are challenged, but the youthfulness of our response is gone. This Republican administration is so beset by worries about bankrupting the country that it cannot even make the prudent investments that will add to the Nation's wealth. It is so beset by its concern over subversion

at home—a leftover from the McCarthy days—that it throws a cloak of conformity over America and discourages new ideas.

The Republican Party has always been known as a party of old fogies.

But this, we are told, is the era of modern Republicanism. The Madison Avenue boys would like us to believe that the old guard is on the wane and that the young Turks are in the saddle.

Of course, all they're really saying is that the old fogies have been replaced by young fogies.

And there are some Republicans who are sounding these days more like Democrats than anything else. But let's not be taken in. It is still the party of the fogies, and if the GOP bosses pick someone who looks liberal, because they know it will take a liberal to win, they're not fooling anyone. You'll still have an administration of Republican fogies—the Republican Party will see to that.

My friends, we are not going to send rockets to the moon as long as we are led by a bunch of fogies—old or young.

And we're not going to close the science gap or the space gap or the missile gap with the Russians as long as we're led by fogies—young or old.

I have met with Mr. Khrushchev face to face, and I can tell you that whatever else he may be, he is young in spirit. No challenge is too great for him—whether it be the challenge of the free world or the challenge of his colleagues in the Kremlin for supremacy in the Soviet Union.

I shudder at the ruthlessness of the methods he uses to meet those challenges, and I do not propose for a moment that we imitate them.

I merely ask that we recognize that we are up against an adversary who is bound and determined to meet challenges and surmount obstacles and solve problems.

We can't meet Khrushchev's youthful spirit with America's middle age.

America had better begin thinking less about how we can't do this and can't afford that, and begin thinking more about how we can use our full powers and energy using the methods of free people, in the cause of freedom.

So I think America's hope lies in its young people. And I think the Democratic Party's hope lies in its young people, too—in every one of you young Democrats at this convention.

You know, a party can suffer from middle age, just as a nation can. And I sometimes wonder if our party hasn't lost some of the scrap and youthfulness that once characterized it.

Now I am not one to pick a fight solely for partisan advantage. No one gains from such a fight. The country suffers; our party suffers.

But I deeply believe that the Democratic Party has not only a right but a duty to draw issues. Our party is one of youth and controversy. Out of both we draw the vigor and the issues to go to the people and win elections.

Our job in the Democratic Party is to fight bad public policy wherever we see it, no matter how popular the man behind the policy; to fight for good public policy—for the people if you will—whenever we have a chance to do so; and to write a record, a Democratic record, that every voter in the country can recognize that has the stamp "Made by the Democratic Party" clearly written on it, for all to see.

For only on the basis of such a clear-cut record can we give the voters a clear-cut choice next year—a chance to express themselves so clearly that neither the next President of the United States, nor the 1961 Congress of the United States, can mistake the mandate.

U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Unemployment Visited Altoona, Pa., October 26, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of gathering firsthand information on the unemployment situation in the central Pennsylvania area a Senate Subcommittee on Unemployment, composed of Senator JOSEPH CLARK of Pennsylvania, as chairman, and Senator HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania, as a member, visited Altoona October 26, 1959, taking testimony from over a score of witnesses at both a morning and afternoon session held in Altoona's city hall. Those testifying represented a cross section of business, labor, and industry.

It was my privilege to not only make the following statement to the committee on the unemployment conditions in the three counties of my congressional district but I was accorded the privilege of sitting with the committee in listening to the testimony of other witnesses, many of whom shared my concern over the unemployment situation in my congressional district.

My statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, over a period of years it has been my privilege to appear before numerous congressional committees in support of area redevelopment legislation.

As a matter of fact, I am among a group of Representatives in Congress who are recognized as pioneers in this particular field.

My congressional district comprises the counties of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield, and has been plagued with chronic unemployment for years due to depressed conditions in the coal and railroad industries. At times as much as 18 percent of our total labor force has been unemployed.

Therefore, the residents of the 20th Congressional District know the meaning of ghost towns and the misery that follows in the wake of unemployment as we watch good American families being forced to exist on public assistance and surplus commodities.

Speaking of surplus commodities as of October 1 in my three-county area there are 36,758 persons eligible for surplus food or 12.6 percent of the overall population.

In fact, in Clearfield County nearly 20.1 percent of the population are recipients of surplus commodities and dependent upon them for the necessities of life.

Mr. Chairman, at the present time in the two labor forces in my congressional district, here is the picture.

As of October 1, 1959, in the Altoona area, out of a labor force of 53,700 there were 4,600 unemployed, or an average of 8.6 percent of the labor force; while in the Du Bois-Clearfield area, out of a labor force of 35,400 there were 5,300 unemployed, or an average of 15 percent of the labor force.

Therefore, the unemployment situation in my congressional district is simply this. Out of a labor force of nearly 90,000, there are 10,000 unemployed, or 9 percent of the labor force.

As I have said before, unemployment in my congressional district has been as high as

18 percent of the labor force. One point I want to emphasize is that unemployment conditions are not temporary or seasonal nor can we see any improvement in the coal and railroad industries.

As a matter of fact, employment in these industries is still on the downward trend and nobody dares to predict when employment will level off.

For an illustration my hometown of Altoona is principally a railroad town because it is the site of the largest railroad shops in the world operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. Early in 1951 these shops employed 14,361; while August 1958 employment dropped to 2,500.

According to information at hand employment is expected to level off at 7,000 as it was on October 1, 1959. This means that in the city of Altoona alone, there has been a loss of over 7,000 jobs.

Mr. Chairman, this situation in Altoona is duplicated in the city of Du Bois where hundreds have been furloughed by the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

Instead of having around 1,200 employees, as of October 1, 161 were employed with the expectation that employment in Du Bois will level off at 600, which means that 50 percent of the B. & O. labor force will be jobless.

I have been pinpointing unemployment in the railroad industry in an effort to show the permanent loss of jobs. Similar facts reveal that the same condition exists in the coal, brick, and related industries in my congressional district.

One often hears the question: "Why is it that these areas of chronic unemployment cannot help themselves?"

The answer is that while some 1,800 communities throughout the country have active area redevelopment corporations, I can only speak for my own congressional district where such groups have been active for years and have enjoyed a measure of success.

For example, since 1946 in my hometown of Altoona, Pa., as a result of an active industrial redevelopment group that raised nearly a million dollars mostly through voluntary payroll deductions, 11 new industries have been brought into the Altoona area solely through community, State, and Federal effort.

These new industries have provided 3,600 new jobs and a \$12 million increased annual payroll.

Seventy percent of the new jobs are for men.

This highly successful effort stems from what is commonly known nationally as the Altoona plan.

Mr. Chairman, in attaining this remarkable record the Altoona group like other groups in my congressional district has borrowed at the banks to the legal limit.

In addition, the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority, as well as the Small Business Administration, have assisted to their legal limit.

Therefore, in my congressional district these area redevelopment groups are in need of further financial assistance such as is provided for in the area redevelopment legislation now before Congress.

I think I can speak for all area redevelopment groups in my congressional district when I say that they do not want any Federal handout.

What they need primarily is additional borrowing power which coupled with other forms of Federal assistance as contained in the pending bills will enable them to assist in wiping out these pockets of unemployment and their human wastage.

In achieving this objective, we will not only rehabilitate our economy through diversification of industry, but we will, in effect, be barring a repetition of this chronic unemployment that we have been faced with for years.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to repeat a question constantly asked by many of my constituents—"Why is it that Congress sends billions of dollars to so-called underprivileged nations yet ignores the plight of good American citizens who through no fault of their own are unemployed?"

The answer to this question is that Congress too long has ignored "the pockets of unemployment" that have brought suffering and despair despite national prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I hold no brief for those who quibble and employ delaying tactics over the cost of area redevelopment legislation. Since we have billions to pour into foreign aid, we certainly have a moral obligation to care for the needs of America's unemployed.

The fact that area redevelopment legislation is fully justified makes it pertinent to ask, "Why solicit a repetition of last year's veto by having the pending Douglas-Flood bill given similar treatment since it resembles to a marked degree the Douglas-Spence bill of the 85th Congress?"

Frankly, it will not be difficult for me to support the Douglas-Flood bill, but I must confess the possibility of another veto is a cause for great concern.

While there is no one in the Senate or the House who would stoop to playing politics with the misery of unemployment, we cannot ignore the fact that unless a bill is enacted the suffering of the people in the depressed areas is not going to be alleviated.

Mr. Chairman, among the sponsors of depressed area legislation there exist two conflicting points of view.

To begin with, in principle the administration has endorsed aid to depressed areas.

In addition, the two great major political parties also endorsed the principle in their 1956 platforms.

Therefore, the question that Congress must resolve is the extent of aid to the depressed areas of the Nation.

In an effort to reach this common objective, it is imperative that reasonable people should be willing to compromise.

In this connection, it is my belief that the President will find it possible to accept a reasonable compromise between the administration bill and the Douglas-Flood version of the legislation.

In my plea for a reasonable compromise, it must be thoroughly understood that I am not presuming to speak for the administration, nor have I had any consultations with administration leaders on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, let us be practical and face the facts concerning depressed-area legislation. In the event of a Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill, I have been unable to find anyone willing to flatly predict that the veto will be overridden by the House of Representatives.

The fear of being unable to override a veto is based on the fact that it requires two-thirds of the votes cast to accomplish that purpose.

Therefore, looking the facts right in the face, when you review the position of those Members of the House today in relation to their last year's vote on the Douglas-Spence bill, one finds that the margin of victory would be insufficient to override a possible Presidential veto of the Douglas-Flood bill.

Mr. Chairman, to improve the chances of enacting depressed-area legislation, I introduced H.R. 4878, a bill which represents a compromise between the administration's approach and the Douglas-Flood proposal.

With a few exceptions, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, offers the same types of aid contained in the Douglas-Spence bill vetoed last year.

For example, instead of making every depressed area eligible for the same types of assistance, my bill provides different degrees

of Federal assistance based upon the level of chronic unemployment and the need in such areas.

In this connection, it is my belief that areas which have suffered greater levels of unemployment should be entitled to a greater degree of aid than those communities whose problems of unemployment are of a lesser degree.

Briefly, my bill, H.R. 4878, provides for the following programs:

(1) Technical assistance: Depressed areas would be eligible for technical assistance to help the communities to appraise their physical and human resources, which would prepare them to plan constructive programs to attract new businesses and expand existing businesses in these areas.

(2) Community loans: Depressed communities would be eligible to receive loans from a revolving fund of \$100 million.

We know that the conventional lending facilities in depressed areas are not as venturesome as those in growing and expanding communities.

The fund would put the depressed areas on a more equal footing with other communities in attracting new jobs.

(3) Public facilities: Some communities need improvement in public facilities before they would become sufficiently attractive to new businesses which might desire to locate in these areas.

My bill provides for an establishment of a \$25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

While the figure may appear modest, attention is called to the fact that legislation is pending before the House which would establish special funds for community facilities.

Meanwhile, under my bill, H.R. 4878, a smaller fund would be allocated and earmarked to aid depressed areas.

In addition, the most depressed communities which do not have the sufficient resources to borrow funds would be eligible to receive grants up to a maximum of \$25 million.

At this point, let me stress that this is not an annual appropriation but is intended to be a \$25 million revolving fund from which these communities would be able to borrow.

The administrator of the program would be expected to limit the grants only to communities with the greatest need for aid and which do not have sufficient resources to repay the loans in the foreseeable future.

It should be stressed that this is no giveaway program; under the provisions of my bill grants would be made only for projects which would provide lasting improvements and thus broaden the economic base of the communities.

(4) Vocational training and subsistence: One of the big problems of the people in depressed areas is the fact that many of their industries have declined or disappeared and, consequently, the demand for the skills acquired by the people in these areas has also diminished or vanished.

In order to enable these people whose skills have become obsolete to gain new employment, we must provide facilities to retrain them.

Therefore, it is urged that we enact the program contained in my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, as a realistic means of providing an effective program to aid the chronically depressed areas of the Nation.

Since the cost of depressed area legislation has proved a stumbling block in the past and impeded our efforts, let me point out that the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill is \$369.5 million as compared to the cost of the administration bill which is \$58 million.

By ways of contrast, my compromise bill, H.R. 4878, will cost \$158 million or just about midway between the cost of the Douglas-Flood bill and the administration bill.

In connection with depressed area legislation, let me state that I have no pride of authorship.

My sole desire is to aid the people in the depressed areas and to attain such a laudable objective the spirit of compromise should be dominant in our minds.

As one who represents two chronically depressed areas in Pennsylvania with unemployment at times as high as 18 percent of our labor force and which has plagued us for years, my goal is that Congress enact without delay an effective bill in a form acceptable to the President, thereby eliminating the prospects of another Presidential veto.

Mr. Chairman, the residents of the 159 depressed areas of the Nation are entitled to this type of legislation, and it is my sincere hope that Congress will compromise any differences and enact a depressed area bill without further delay.

Extension of Rural Library Services Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have today had the pleasure of introducing a bill to extend the Library Services Act of 1956 for a period of 5 years, and to make certain technical amendments which will not change the effect of the act, but which will, rather, simply take cognizance of the admission of the States of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union, and to leave in abeyance until the Congress has before it the results of the 1960 decennial census, certain policy decisions in regard to the communities covered by the act, as extended.

Let me briefly explain the purpose of my bill. The Library Services Act, as passed by this Congress in 1956, provided for a program of grants-in-aid to the States to stimulate and assist in the provision of library services to the residents of rural communities. Under the original act, \$7,500,000 per year was authorized to be appropriated, to be divided among the States wishing to participate on the basis of a formula recognizing the State's share of the rural population of the Nation as the major factor. The original act further provided that no community with a population of more than 10,000 would be eligible for assistance under the act.

Generally speaking, the first 4 years of this act's history have justified the high hopes those of us who originally sponsored it had for its effect upon the spread of library services to rural communities.

Forty-nine of the fifty States are now participating in this act, and these States have all increased their rural library services programs, not only to the degree made possible by the allocation of Federal funds, but out of their own resources, with the Federal funds serving largely as stimuli, and as a symbol of the national interest in this matter.

State activities in aiding public libraries have increased by 54 percent in

the 4 years of the life of this act. Thirty million Americans living in rural communities now have library services available to them which were either not available at all, or not to the present degree, as a result of the working of the act. Sixty-five counties and an equal number of New England towns, which formerly had no library service, are now receiving such service. Two hundred new book-mobiles are in service under the Library Services Act. Two hundred and eighty separate projects were included in the State plans for 1959. Over 5 million books and other informational materials have been added to the library resources of rural communities.

This much has been done, Mr. Speaker, under the Library Services Act in its first 4 years of operation. But, it should be pointed out, this is only an indication of what could have been done, if the act had been allowed to operate at its fullest. The Congress has not been reluctant to appropriate funds for this program, but the Budget Bureau has seen fit, here, as in so many other areas, to pursue its standard policy of penny wisdom and dollar folly. In the 4 years of the act's history, a total of \$30 million could have been appropriated, under the authorizing legislation. But in no one of those years was the full amount requested or appropriated. In fiscal 1957, \$2,050,000 was appropriated; in fiscal 1958, \$5 million; and in the last 2 fiscal years, \$6 million each. As a result of action taken by the Congress, allocations to States were made on the basis of the full authorization in the last fiscal year, but the growing needs of our rural libraries might well have come much closer to fulfillment, had the full amount been available through the appropriation process each year. It is too soon to tell what funds will be available in the fiscal 1961 budget, which will be the last appropriation under the initial authorization. But so far, only 63 percent of the total funds authorized have actually been appropriated, and even if the full amount is requested and appropriated next year, nearly \$11 million of authorized funds will have been denied this important and profitable program.

The amendments contained in the body of my bill, Mr. Speaker, are simple, and do not change the policy of the original act. The first subsection simply extend the life of the act for an additional 5 years. Subsections (b) and (c) make technical amendments reflecting the fact that Hawaii and Alaska have been admitted to the Union and are already subsumed under the term "State." The final subsection, in effect, freezes the present coverage of the act. Under the present act, no assistance can be extended to a community with a population of more than 10,000. The Department, in issuing its regulations has taken the 1950 decennial census as its guide. The extension bill retains the 1950 census as the guide for eligibility. In this way, the communities now being served will continue to be eligible; none will suddenly be excluded from the act by population growth reflected in the 1960 census.

CVI—20

Mr. Speaker, the Rural Library Services Act is not the most extensive or the most costly of the Federal grant-in-aid programs. But this program is surely one of the most rewarding, one of the most encouraging, and one of the most productive of the educational grant programs. The experience we have had in the first 4 years surely augurs well for what can be accomplished in the next half decade, as library doors swing open for more and more of our people.

Fate of Young Hungarian Freedom Fighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD the following exchange of correspondence with the White House regarding the fate of the young Hungarian freedom fighters facing execution by the Communist regime:

DECEMBER 9, 1959.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
White House, Washington, D.C.:

I have been asked by certain Hungarian friends and constituents of mine to request your personal intervention with respect to the youthful Hungarian freedom fighters who are allegedly facing execution by the Communist regime of that country. I am aware that this subject is presently being debated by the General Assembly of the United Nations but feel that a personal statement expressing your horror at such a report might be helpful in marshaling world public opinion against this barbaric undertaking.

Respectfully yours,

ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
WASHINGTON,
December 14, 1959.

Hon. ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
Member of Congress,
Owosso, Mich.

DEAR AL: For the President this will acknowledge and thank you for your December 9 telegram respecting your plea in behalf of the 350 Hungarian freedom fighters.

While the State Department has no information at this time concerning this matter, you can be sure that we will continue to follow the situation in Hungary with close attention. In this connection you may wish to have the enclosed statements by Ambassador Lodge on the question of Hungary.

Kindest regards and best wishes for the holiday season.

Sincerely yours,

JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

STATEMENT BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ON NOVEMBER 25, 1959, ON THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY

Mr. President, the United States supports the recommendation by the General Committee that an item entitled "The Question of Hungary" be included on our agenda.

Last year in Resolution 1312 the General Assembly declared that the United Nations will continue to be seized of the situation in Hungary, in view of the fact that the Government of the U.S.S.R. and the present authorities in Hungary are disregarding earlier resolutions of the General Assembly. By the same resolution, the General Assembly appointed Sir Leslie Munro to represent it for the purpose of reporting on developments relating to the implementation of the Assembly resolutions on Hungary.

Sir Leslie Munro has now requested the General Assembly to consider the Hungarian situation. He reports that there has been no improvement of conditions in Hungary and calls attention to the refusal of the Hungarian authorities to cooperate with the United Nations in any way in this matter. In these circumstances, the United States also requested inscription of this item. I may say in our opinion the request of the Representative of the U.N. on Hungary would have been enough.

Nothing we know today leads us to believe that the States concerned have ceased their defiance of resolutions which were adopted by overwhelming majorities at previous sessions. As recently noted by the United Nations Representative on Hungary, foreign armed forces remain in Hungary and the framework of repression remains unchanged. In the shadow of continued trials and executions of Hungarians whose only crime was their barehanded fight for independence against Soviet tanks in 1956, and in the shadow of the continuing reports of impending executions, it is clear that the end of the reign of terror is not yet in sight. It seems clear to the U.S. delegation, therefore, that we must inscribe this item and that we must consider the Report of the United Nations Representative on Hungary.

As I explained in my statement in the General Committee on November 23, we regret the circumstances that gave rise to the necessity for inscribing this item. Recent events encouraged us to hope that there might be real relaxation of international tensions and improved international cooperation, which are, of course, the goals for which this very international organization was established. We still hold to that hope, Mr. President, but we must set down that to attempt to sweep crimes like these under the rug will not cause these hopes to be fulfilled and will not promote peace. We accordingly urge members to join in supporting the inscription of this vital question.

STATEMENT BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, IN THE GENERAL COMMITTEE ON THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY, NOVEMBER 23, 1959

Mr. Chairman, before we adjourn this meeting there are certain fallacies which have been expressed here which I should like briefly to rectify. I took some notes during Mr. Kuznetsov's speech, and I noted some of these phrases: "Dirty work," "sordid assignment," "mouthpiece for slander," "puppet," "slandorous assertions and concoctions" in my letter.

Now, I am not fortunate enough to be familiar with the Russian language, and maybe these are ordinary, routine phrases in Russian. But I have some familiarity with English and with French, and I can say that in those two languages these are extremely violent words. If Mr. Kuznetsov is really interested in lessening the cold war, he could very easily prove that fact by using parliamentary language in a parliamentary assembly. I say that to him in as bland a tone as I can use.

Then he also referred in his speech to the conversations between Chairman Khrushchev and President Eisenhower which were held at Camp David and which in a press

release the other day the Soviet delegation characterized as the spirit of Camp David.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we prize—we in the United States—prize what was achieved at Camp David, and none are more opposed than we to doing anything which would destroy it.

One way to live up to that spirit is to conform with United Nations resolutions.

I feel that perhaps I have some right to talk about Camp David for the simple reason that I was there. In fact I was present at all the meetings which took place. These meetings were adequately summed up in the communique which is well known and I can assert that there is nothing in that communique or in what happened at Camp David to justify the declaration that the very modest action on Hungary which we are discussing today is against the spirit of Camp David.

What is against the spirit of Camp David Mr. Chairman, is the subversion of small countries.

What is against the spirit of Camp David are acts which turn a brave little country into a moaning colonialist slum.

What is against the spirit of Camp David is any behavior which makes a veritable mockery of peaceful coexistence.

Mr. Chairman, nothing happened at Camp David which requires us to condone evil.

Nothing happened at Camp David which requires us to pass by in silence on the other side of the street when a brutality is being committed.

Nothing happened at Camp David to prevent us from acting like human beings made in the image of God when cruelty is being practiced.

The spirit of Camp David was not intended to be a soporific to peoples in the democracies to put them to sleep in the belief that this dangerous world—which we all hope may some day be safe—has actually been made safe.

No one looks more eagerly than I do for the day when the United States and the Soviet Union can work regularly together for the peace of the world. This is an end devoutly to be wished and I shall always work for it.

But we work against such a day when we distort the spirit of Camp David into something which was never meant at all and which no one present thought that it meant.

I realize that there may be colleagues of mine here in this room who think that in speaking as I am now doing I am striking a false note. But I do not agree.

We can only build a peaceful world on truth—and the spirit of Camp David never told us to close our eyes to the truth.

We can only build a peaceful world on deeds—deeds of justice—and the spirit of Camp David never told us not to do such deeds.

Instead of criticizing this proposal, why don't you do something to show that you really believe in the true spirit of Camp David? Why don't you take down the barbed wire and the observation towers which now divide the poor Hungarians from Austria and the free world and which have turned Hungary into a vast human cage? Why don't you chain up the savage dogs which roam along the border to catch the miserable human beings who are seeking freedom?

It is by deeds such as these that we can best live up to the spirit of Camp David.

Let me say in conclusion that the Camp David communique states "that all outstanding international questions should be settled not by the application of force but by peaceful means through negotiation." If, therefore, we are really to live up to the spirit of Camp David, Sir Leslie Munro ought

to be admitted into Hungary, the United Nations resolutions adopted by overwhelming votes should be carried out in Hungary, and the Soviet Union, instead of working against the United Nations, should work with the United Nations. That would be really carrying out the spirit of Camp David.

The United States supports the request of the United Nations Representative on Hungary that an item of an important and urgent character entitled "The Question of Hungary" be inscribed in the agenda of the 14th General Assembly. The United States as a member of the General Committee has itself also requested the inscription of the item.

This request, Mr. President, was necessitated by the resolution on Hungary adopted by the 13th General Assembly and the continued defiance by the present Hungarian regime and the Soviet Union of the General Assembly resolutions on Hungary.

Resolution 1312 declared "that the United Nations will continue to be seized of the situation in Hungary in view of the fact that the Government of the U.S.S.R. and the present authorities in Hungary are disregarding the above-mentioned resolutions of the General Assembly." By the same resolution the General Assembly decided "to appoint Sir Leslie Munro to represent the United Nations for the purpose of reporting to member states or to the General Assembly on significant developments relating to the implementation of the Assembly's resolutions on Hungary."

On July 9, 1959, the United Nations Representative on Hungary in a public statement revealed that his patient and quiet efforts to gain admission to Hungary in order to obtain firsthand information concerning the implementation of the Assembly's resolutions had been rebuffed by Soviet and Hungarian authorities. Sir Leslie Munro announced his intention of submitting a full report on his activities to the 14th General Assembly.

In the explanatory memorandum attached to his request for inscription, the United Nations Representative on Hungary has stated that foreign armed forces remain in Hungary and that the framework of repression remains unchanged. In spite of public assurances of the representative of the present Hungarian regime that reprisals against Hungarian patriots who fought in the 1956 uprising have ceased, the explanatory memorandum records the harsh fact that trials and executions of Hungarian freedom fighters have taken place since the last General Assembly. Apparently, the end of the reign of terror is not yet in sight, for there are disturbing rumors that more executions are pending.

The United States supports the initiative of the United Nations Representative on Hungary. We deplore the circumstances that gave rise to the necessity for this important and urgent request. All members should hear what Sir Leslie Munro has to report and consider appropriate further steps to achieve the objectives of the United Nations.

Transportation Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the State of Montana, as well as many other

Western States, depend to a very great extent on the airlines, the railroads, and the bus companies to provide fast and dependable transportation between our cities which are separated by great distances. For more than 15 years our citizens have been taxed every time they used these vitally necessary common carrier facilities. At present this transportation tax is 10 percent but by virtue of the passage of Public Law 86-75 in the last session of Congress, beginning July 1, 1960, this tax will be reduced to 5 percent.

I was very pleased with this progress but I sincerely feel that during this session we must abolish the remaining 5 percent. What was the original purpose of this tax? Certainly the raising of wartime revenue was one consideration, but the primary purpose was to discourage nonessential travel during the emergency thereby freeing our facilities for military and defense use.

I feel that it is self-evident that this purpose no longer exists. On the contrary, one of the paramount objectives of our national transportation policy is to foster and encourage travel to strengthen our transportation companies.

Only by increased passenger patronage can the airlines carry out the massive jet conversion that is presently under way and for which over \$2¼ billion of capital investment is committed. The Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board has urged the repeal of this tax on the ground that it deters travel and depresses airline revenue.

Similarly, the Interstate Commerce Commission has urged repeal because "the tax on passenger travel tends to discourage the public from using common carriers, it thereby aggravates the ever-mounting passenger deficit."—ICC Docket No. 31954, page 70. We all know the plight of the railroad passenger operation and we all know that the only real answer is more passenger revenue.

The bus situation is no different. The number of inter-city busline companies declined from 2,858 in 1950 to 1,700 in 1957; revenue passengers declined from 815 million to 516 million; and busline employees declined from 66,570 to 52,900 during the same period.—Bureau of Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1958, page 571.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that continuation of a 5 percent excise tax designed to discourage travel is against the national interest and extremely unwise. As the ICC stated in the Railroad Passenger Train Deficit Case:

In strongly urging that the Congress take action to repeal the tax outright, we are not unaware of the efforts which various members of the Congress have made and are presently making in this regard. We are also not unmindful of the revenue needs of the Government. We are, however, convinced that any possible loss of revenue would be more than offset by the public interest in strengthening and preserving a transportation system capable of meeting adequately the country's need for service both in peacetime and during emergencies

in conformity with the national transportation policy as declared by the Congress. (p. 70).

I realize that any proposed legislation which would eliminate a source of Federal revenue should be subjected to close scrutiny. However, I am convinced that repeal of the remaining 5 percent tax will not result in any substantial net loss of revenue.

It is widely recognized that the some \$110 million gross that the fact that a high proportion of common carriage travel is business in nature and the amount of transportation tax paid is taken as a corporate income tax deduction.

In addition, an offset would result if the tax were removed by virtue of increased taxable income resulting from increased travel once the deterrent tax is removed.

In the airline industry the Federal government pays some \$60 million in subsidy per year to make up operating losses of local service and helicopter companies. Yet this tax discourages passengers from traveling on these carriers.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it appears that on the merits no one can justify this tax and everyone agrees it is harmful and outdated. The only question is whether we should sacrifice a revenue source. But even on this score it appears clear that the net yield is not substantial and would probably be more than offset by increased corporate income taxes and by subsidy savings.

The Full Potential of Educational Television Must Be Realized Without Prejudiced Obstruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment months of Congress several members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce conducted an extensive field study on educational television and its present and future place in our American system of education. This study was done in western, middle-western and southern States and covered all phases of educational work now being done through the facilities of television on both an in-school and home study basis.

One of the principal benefits cited in favor of educational television and its expanded use is the opportunity offered to equalize educational opportunities between areas with scattered populations, limited financial resources and inadequate or smaller schools with the better resources of other larger and better equipped schools. A second major argument for the expansion of educational television is one which must be given

conscientious and unbiased evaluation, namely its wider use of superior teaching skills in the sciences and foreign languages. Subjects such as Spanish, Russian, German, chemistry, biology, physics, and mathematics may now be included in school curriculums through the use of educational television by expert teachers who become a part of the daily schooling in several classrooms at the same time. The number of students who seek instruction in highly technical subjects, like advanced mathematics, physics and chemistry, is constantly increasing, thus opening the door to a greater use of superior teaching skills through the medium which can be made available in practically every village and hamlet across the country.

As in any other field where established and conventional methods are employed, a wider and more effectual use of educational television is likely to encounter initial opposition in some quarters because of the normal tendency to resist changes from that which is customary. Progressive educators in some areas have moved forward with enthusiasm in this field. One very interesting presentation which I heard personally during the field study came from Mr. Joseph Hall, superintendent of the Dade County Public Schools, who pointed to an actual savings of \$3 million in capital outlay in classrooms. Most interesting in his testimony was the following statement:

By using the large groups (300-400 students) involved in the television program and the extended school day, we are able to accommodate 30 percent more pupils in a building than we can otherwise handle. It works in this manner: Approximately one-third of the pupils report to school at 7:30 a.m., another one-third at 8:30, and another one-third at 9:30 a.m. They leave school at 2:15, 3:15, and 4:15 p.m. This means that for four periods during the middle of the day, the entire group of students is present in the building. In this period, by utilizing our school auditoriums for the large groups, we are able to accommodate a much greater number of pupils within the same facility. With the program we now have involving only a limited number of our schools, we feel that we have saved at least \$3 million in capital construction. To provide for the number of pupils in the established pattern for education that we now have in our buildings would require an immediate capital outlay program of at least \$3 million. We believe as we involve other schools that the amount of capital savings will be increased far beyond this point.

Mr. Speaker, during the course of hearings in which I participated, I had an opportunity to go into several classrooms during the televising of a variety of in-school programs. In a biology class, for example, we watched youngsters intently observing the dissecting of small animal life which had been magnified to a greater degree than would ever be possible under a normal microscope. We saw fourth- and fifth-grade youngsters who had learned Spanish through daily in-school television instruction carry on classroom conversations fluently in that language. We spoke to both grade school and high school youngsters in schools to get their reaction to the

value of learning through this medium. We saw the specialized teaching personnel of the stations which work in the ETV studios. We studied with them their financial problems and the potentiality of expansion.

The work of the committee and the statements of a parade of witnesses was far too vast and detailed to permit a complete presentation at this time. It will, of course, be available to every Member of Congress when the subcommittee report is issued in the near future.

However, there is one conclusion that must be recognized. In-school educational television has a tremendous potential. It is now and can become an effective tool for better education, particularly in specialized fields. Every obstacle of prejudice must be removed so that its full potential, its advantages and its disadvantages, can be fully realized.

Address by Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, Before the AFL-CIO Legislative Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 11, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives has been blessed by having many good and great Members.

The mark of a great public servant is the ability to be able not alone to think and act in the public interest but even more so to be able to so express himself that little doubt is left as to his position on any public subject or under any given circumstance.

Recently I was privileged to be in attendance at a meeting where the great bulk of American labor was represented.

Many speakers graced the speakers' list and all of them were capable, able, and articulate. However, it remained for a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives to make the greatest contribution in oratory, in facts, in logic, and finally in sound common sense.

I speak of our esteemed, able, and forthright majority floor leader, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts.

His speech is so full of the kind of advice and information so badly needed in today's confused atmosphere of politics, labor, and the people's problems that, under the unanimous consent of the House, I include it in the RECORD in order that all the Members can have the same privilege granted to all of us who heard Mr. McCORMACK deliver it at the conference held at the Willard Hotel, this city, January 11, 1960:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN McCORMACK, DEMOCRAT, OF MASSACHUSETTS, BEFORE THE AFL-CIO LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE, WILLARD HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 11, 1960

President Meany, my fellow Americans and outstanding leaders of labor from the various

sections of the country, ladies and gentlemen and friends. I have a great admiration for Congressman Ford and he and I are personal friends, so that any remarks that I make, of course, have no direct application to him, particularly on the level of friendships. I just want to make a few observations before making some brief remarks about his speech of admonitions to labor and his very fine general platitudes about rededicating ourselves—everyone here is a dedicated American—and also about the Modern Republican philosophy of government. If any exists, I fail to see it.

I do not feel strange in this gathering because I come from a working district and a working family. I think the philosophy of government and practical operations that you entertain and I entertain are the same. I think an examination of my voting record would show that fact. My voting record is the result of my own thoughts and considerations about our Government in practical operation. For years, I stood shoulder to shoulder with the late Franklin D. Roosevelt agreeing with him and his philosophy of government and also a great former President Harry S. Truman.

Broadly speaking my philosophy of government is to strengthen the family life of America. I think that's the dedicated duty of a legislator and I did that as a member of the Massachusetts Legislature and in my 31 years as a Member of Congress. The very strength of any government or any society is based upon these little units called the family life. Your family, my family, the other person's family, and the strength or weakness of a government is dependent upon the strength or weakness of family life, those little units that collectively make up the very broad foundations of any government and in our case of American government and American society.

I can go back to when I first came here, when 5 cents an hour was paid to human beings in wages in certain sections of the country. I can go back to the dramatic fight of minimum wage, when we tried to get a minimum of 25 cents through and it was riddled to pieces on the floor of the House under the leadership of Mary Norton, great legislator, great girl, recently passed away. It was riddled so badly, we voted to send it back to committee, rather than pass it. Then a couple of months later we got another bill out and finally got it through, struggling to get something on the statute books that represented progress. I can remember social security; I was one of those who drafted it. I remember all those fights. In many of these fights—damaging amendments, that's where the damage is done. The thing to watch in Congress are the amendments that are offered. And the motion to recommit with an amendment which, if adopted, would destroy, practically destroy the bill and let only a title go through.

My philosophy of government in practical operation is that government functions for the weak. The strong don't need it. That doesn't mean we destroy the strong, but we lift up the weak. And the weak is a broad class. It isn't only those out of a job. It might be the small and independent businessman, if he is discriminated against by too many contracts being given by the Defense Department, for example, to a certain large group of companies. It might be the failure to pass an adequate small business administration act.

The philosophy of the government of Roosevelt and Truman was to look forward, to recognize that government is not a status quo institution, because when government becomes status quo it begins to decay and disintegrate. With all regard to my dear

friend, the record of the Democratic Party shows that we're the party of the people. I can't say that for every member of the Democratic Party—I wish I could—but I can say it for the great majority of the Democratic Party. We are the party of the people and the party of progress.

The record of the years that have gone by clearly show that fact. Minimum wages, starting at 25 cents, now a dollar; and when President Eisenhower recommended the last increase to 90 cents, we made it a dollar. I am confident we can get another increase through this session, if there's teamwork all around.

My dear friend talks about the national economic growth. I agree with him. I remember, not too many years ago, when Harry Truman said the goal is a \$500 billion national economy and my Republican friends laughed and stomped him. It is now up to \$485 billion. And if we didn't have the tight-money policy carried on to the extent that it is, the high-interest policy, the tight-money policy, our national economy today would be \$550 billion, in my opinion.

My dear friend didn't talk about business. I don't know many businessmen who vote Democratic. They have a right to vote Republican, but when my friend admonished, particularly labor in Michigan, for supporting the Democratic Party, I didn't hear my dear friend make any references to the big businessmen throughout the country who vote Republican. They have a right to do so as individuals. Nevertheless, whatever is goose for the gander is also goose for someone else.

I think you are more interested in knowing—coming down to 1960—about this session of Congress. Knowing some of the things that might happen, some of the things I'd like to see happen and without proper assistance might not happen. Now the Republican Party has its responsibility. The Republican Party owes an obligation to the people to act constructively, to constructively oppose, constructively propose, and constructively criticize. That's the role of a minority party under the constitutional role of the Government, not to be a blind party of opposition. Each individual Republican is elected by the people of the district they represent, Republicans, Democrats, and independents in the Congress, and they have their individual responsibility to vote and not hide behind the cloak that this is a Democratic Congress. Whenever they pass over their responsibility, they are simply adopting the roles of a party of blind opposition, not the role properly that should be adopted by a minority party, not under parliamentary government, not under constitutional government such as we enjoy.

The most important question confronting us is the survival of America. What good is a constitution, what good is anything, if we have Communists in control of our country? We have got to have an America not only for ourselves but for the generations to come, the youngsters who are walking the streets now. Their fate is involved in what is being decided today. Not only you and I of today, but the generations to come, that of young Americans, their fates and their lives. The kind of life they are going to lead—your children, your children's children—is being decided today and history is being made while you and I are sitting here. The first thing we've got to do is to preserve America; to be sure we maintain this government of laws of ours and it doesn't turn into a government of men. That depends upon human leadership, wisdom, sagacity, ability, foresight, vision, courage.

So far as I am concerned, if I'm going to err in judgment, in the world of today, I'd

rather err on the side of strength and on the side of wisdom. And I'd have felt happy if the President, in his message of a few days ago, had recommended more taxes for greater national defense. I think that would have appealed to the American people to make sacrifices and certainly it would have been the wisest thing to do, because America is second best in the world today. We are certainly second best, particularly in the field of outer space.

One of the things we can bring up this session—one of the things we should bring up is civil rights. The Democratic leadership is determined to bring up a bill this year. The President recommended it strongly in his message. In all our hopes and plans for a better world, we all recognize that provincial and racial prejudice must be combated as it goes along. He says "I hope there will be among the matters to be seriously considered in the current session—civil rights legislation."

While I am talking on civil rights legislation, let me make this observation which cannot be contradicted. The first civil rights bill that ever passed Congress since the Civil War, close to 90 years, was passed by the 85th Congress, a Democratically controlled Congress. We had a split in our party. You know it; I know it. But it put it through just the same with the Democratically controlled Congress. Yet only 4 years before in the 83d Congress, controlled by the Republican Party, both in the House and the Senate with President Eisenhower in the White House, complete control of our Government, not divided control, complete control, the Republican Party did not even report a civil rights bill out of committee in the House and the Senate.

So we have the fact that the 86th Democratically controlled Congress put the first bill through, even with a division. The Republican Party, 4 years before, with their promises contrasting with their performances, failed even to report a bill out of committee.

Civil rights is now out of the House Committee on the Judiciary before the Rules Committee. You and I know the practical situation. There are eight Democrats and four Republicans, four Democrats from the North and four Democrats from the South; there are Republicans from the North. The Republican Party is a sectional party. If we get three Republican votes in the Rules Committee and they ought to give them to us, we can get that rule or resolution out of the Rules Committee. And if that resolution comes out of the Rules Committee, Speaker RAYBURN and I will bring it up immediately thereafter for consideration by the House of Representatives. The Republican Party has their responsibility, we have ours. If they don't give us those three votes, we will have to resort to a discharge petition.

Only this morning JOHN BYRNE, who is the chairman of the Republican policy committee, said he was confident there would be civil rights legislation this session, but he held there was no reason to rush special tactics. The old delay. What they want is to try to have the Senate act on the bill. I know what they want. They know if the Senate acts first on the bill, the Democratic leadership has more difficulty in bringing that bill out under Senate rules than if the House passes the bill. If the House passes the bill first, the Democrats, under the rules of the Senate, have much more freedom in calling it up for consideration of the Senate than if they are forced to take the Senate bill.

Another important bill we expect to get up this year is an increase in the minimum wage and an extension of its coverage. We'll

get it out of committee, but again when it goes to the Rules Committee, we need seven votes. On that bill, the Democratic leadership does not ask the Republicans to give us three votes. All we ask is that they give us one Republican vote on the Rules Committee. On that we have six Democratic votes. We are sure of six Democratic votes. Another bill is the depressed area bill. That bill has passed the Senate. We brought it out of the House committee. It's now before the Rules Committee and all we ask our Republican friends who have a responsibility, is to give us one vote, just one vote in the Rules Committee. That's all we want.

Another housing bill is to be reported out. You remember the housing episode of the last session. The President vetoed the bill we put up to him. It wasn't as broad as I would like, but we didn't want to put something before him that would be vetoed. Then nothing would go through. So we tried to consider the thing practically. But the President vetoed the bill, so we put another bill up to him which he signed. It was identically the same as the first bill he vetoed with one exception. We deleted \$50 million in loans for classroom facilities in colleges and universities of our country. We put that in there so that they could borrow money from the Government at reasonable rates of interest in connection with the scientific field in particular in connection with this great race in science that is going on now between our country and the Soviet Union.

We are going to have a housing bill and all we need is one vote from the Republican members of the Rules Committee. That housing bill will include urban rehabilitation and community facilities. We are going to bring up a school construction bill. We will try to improve the social security law. But we need one vote—one Republican vote—in the Rules Committee. We've got six Democratic votes. I can state that with confidence. All we ask JERRY, again, is one vote—one Republican vote on the Rules Committee.

Water pollution, important to many parts of our country, purifying the streams and rivers of our country, not only connected with business but with the health of our people, the bill has passed the House, passed the Senate, come back to the House to go to conference, objected to in the last session. We have to go the Rules Committee to get a rule out to take to the Speaker's desk to send to conference. We have six Democratic votes and all I ask of our Republican Party is to assume their responsibility to the people. Show their good faith by performance, not by promise, and give us one Republican vote on the Rules Committee.

We are going to increase the money for a revolving fund for small business administration. Well, I think we might get one or two votes, Republican votes, in the Rules Committee on that. Another bill is the unemployment compensation standardization bill. We are going to try to get it out of committee. We need your help. We would like to get 2 Republican votes in the Ways and Means Committee out of 10.

Is that asking too much? Are there not two of them that feel that they represent the people? Are there not two of them that come from laboring districts? Or districts where the people are essentially workers? We need two votes—Republican votes in the Ways and Means Committee. We could have gotten it out last session if we had gotten two Republican votes. Again when the bill comes out we are going to do everything we can, but we need your help. We need the teamwork we have a right to. We would like to get two Republican votes in the Ways and Means Committee, and when it comes to the

Rules Committee all we ask is that they give us one Republican vote. Is that asking too much? You, the people, that's the minimum they should give us.

There is going to be health legislation, extending the Hill-Burton Hospital Act. Additional hospitals are a crying need of our country. The Hill-Burton Act has done immeasurable good and should be broadened. Furthermore, we are going to try to increase the appropriations—and in this I say JERRY fought shoulder to shoulder for the increases—increase the appropriations for medical research in the field of medical research.

Last year, we increased the President's budget, I think about \$75 million. We have as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations one whom I consider one of the greatest legislators I've ever met, one of the finest gentlemen I've ever met, and thank God we have him there. I refer to JOHN FOGARTY of Rhode Island.

JOHN FOGARTY's name will go down in history as a man who has done more to contribute toward increased appropriations for further medical research, beneficial to the health of our people here and people abroad, unfortunate human beings who are sick, holding out to them the hope of the future. He has made a greater contribution than any Member of Congress that I have ever served with. JOHN FOGARTY's name, in my opinion, will go down in the legislative history of our country as making one of the greatest contributions in this field than any legislator in the entire history of our country.

Now, I want to make another observation, on the broad scale. I'm alarmed, my friends, at the complacency and apathy that exists among our people. It reminds me of the days before Pearl Harbor under Hitler. When you talked about Hitler then, they thought you were a warmonger. Now if you talk about communism, some people look at you blankly. I'm capable of interpreting the thoughts of people from my years of experience. Oh, they give me a polite hearing when I talk about communism. I'm not talking about labor, I'm talking about the people generally, they listen to me with attention but I cannot get across an idea to the great majority of those I'm addressing. They're living in a dream world of hope. That was the world we lived in before Pearl Harbor. When we tried to put a bill through to extend the selective service 3 months before Pearl Harbor, it passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 203 to 202. Every Member who voted against that bill was just as good an American as John McCormack who voted for it, who led the fight for it.

I wouldn't want to see another day like that come in the history of my country where the margin was so close on a bill that it might involve the very preservation of our country. Complacency and apathy existed widespread, you know that as well as I do, in the days of Hitler before Pearl Harbor. We find in America today the same spirit. Complacency and apathy, dangerous because that's construed by the dictator as weakness and fear just as Hitler did. When they allowed him to get away with the Ruhr they said they hoped he would be satisfied. He wasn't. Then he moved into Sudetenland. Oh, he will be satisfied, we hoped so. He wasn't. Then he moved into Austria. They said they'd let him get away with it, they hoped he would be satisfied with it. He wasn't. Then he moved into Czechoslovakia. They let him get away with it. Then Munich, and after that, the raping and the invasion of Poland. I hope we don't take that journey again.

Throughout the country there is today that complacency and apathy, and it's grow-

ing. Right at our back door we find communism attacking us in the Caribbean. If you think there's nothing to that, you'd better awaken. The situation is very acute there. I was one who opposed Khrushchev addressing a joint meeting of Congress, and I think that's one of the finest things I did during my 31 years as a Member of the Congress. I'm not afraid of him.

I say negotiate them and negotiate them. I've told the Assistant Secretary of State to keep on negotiating with him, but I didn't think Khrushchev should be permitted to travel the country, using the United States as a sounding board for the circulation of Communist propaganda throughout the world. I said it before the fact. I'm not saying that now after the fact, I said that before the fact.

We have to realize that the only thing that the Communists respect is what they fear. The one thing they fear is military power greater than they possess themselves. There's the record. You know the record of the Republican Party. There are some progressive members in it and I take off my hat to them. But the progressive element of the Republican Party is liquidated for political purposes. They have no influence. As a matter of fact, I think one of the contributing factors in Rockefeller's announcement—I said so last January—I said then he wouldn't let his name go into the convention because I knew the Old Guard was in control of the Republican Party though the great rank and file of the Republicans throughout the country in spirit supported the Old Guard. Last January I expressed the opinion because Rockefeller was too progressive, and would not be accepted. I think that's one of the main reasons that he made the decision he did because in his trips throughout the country, he couldn't separate the professionals in the party, the Old Guard from the people—the rank and file of the Republicans. He realized he was running up against a stone wall. You have the record of both parties. I'm not appealing to you to be Democrats. It's a matter of which party serves the American people the best. With all of our weaknesses, the great majority of the Democratic Party are representing the people. The great majority of the Republican Party represent the vested interest in big business. I'm not saying all of them do, it wouldn't be fair, but the great majority does. I see it on the floor of the House. You see it. We have the record of the past.

We are not going to confine ourselves to the program I have just stated to you. We need help, we need one Republican vote in the Rules Committee on most of these measures with the exception of civil rights, where we need three. We need a couple of Republican votes in the Ways and Means Committee on the unemployment compensation standardization bill. We need help from you, we need help from other interested Americans who are interested in progressive, visionary, forward-looking government. We also need help from the American people.

America is strong. If the day ever comes when the Soviet Union can hit us, and we lose our retaliatory power they'll not wait for us to catch up. We are already 3 to 5 years behind in outer space. We might be 5 to 7 years behind when they unfold what they plan in the Pacific.

We've got to preserve America—not as Democrats, not as Republicans, not as independents, but as Americans. We have much to do; we must work together and when we come on to the legislative level, the best interests of America calls for progressive government. The record of both parties shows that the Democratic Party is the party of progress.